

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-003216

THE
SPEECHES AND PUBLIC LETTERS
OF
THE LIBERATOR
WITH
PREFACE AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

BY
M. F. CUSACK,
AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE LIBERATOR,"
"THE ILLUSTRATED HISTORY OF IRELAND,"
ETC. ETC. .

"I have struggled for happy homes and altars free."
Speech at Athlone, Aug 1825.

VOL. I.

DUBLIN
M^oGLASHAN & GILL, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
1875.

V34: L75

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

A875

3216

~~I~~ DEDICATE THIS WORK

TO

HIS GRACE THE MOST REV. DR. MAC HALE,

Archbishop of Tuam,

A S A M E M O R I A L

OF THE

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS CONSECRATION TO THE EPISCOPATE,

AS A PERSONAL TOKEN OF AFFECTIONATE RESPECT

AND GRATITUDE,

AND

IN THE NAME OF THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND,

BY WHOM HIS GRACE IS SO DEEPLY AND JUSTLY REVERED.

KERNABE, JUNE 5TH, 1875.



INTRODUCTION.



THE careful student of the history enacting at the present day, for we are all enacting history, and of the history of the past century, cannot fail to observe how singularly pertinent the speeches of O'Connell are to current events.

Genius is mental power, and as we are reciprocative beings genius leaves its impress, deeper or less deep, on the lives of others. In some genius develops itself exclusively in action. The combination of successful general and skilful statesman, as, for example in Wellington or MacMahon, is rare. The mental power which has its outcome in physical force is seldom beneficent, nor are its effects lasting; the mental power which is exercised in moral or intellectual suasion is lasting, generally in proportion to its beneficence. It is simply a law of Eternal Truth that good shall triumph, *magna est veritas et prævalebit*, and even in time it prevails; it triumphs though we may not always recognise its victory, because we do not always recognise the form of its apotheosis.

It is not altogether to the credit of humanity, nor to the glorification of a much-boasted march of intellect, but it is simply true that there is scarcely a speech uttered by the Irish-

man whose voice echoed through the old Parliament of the early century, which might not be proclaimed with equal force and truth in the new and ornate House of Commons. It would seem almost as if everything was new except prejudice, as if the advance of Liberal principles was a step in advance towards a licentious freedom rather than a forward march to the banner of true liberty.

We find O'Connell in his earliest speeches pleading with incontrovertible eloquence to the common sense of his fellowmen, to convince them that Catholic and traitor, that Romanist and perjurer were not convertible terms. Nearly half a century has passed away—no act, no word of disloyalty has been proved against Catholics, no oath has been violated, no treason has been discovered, and yet all O'Connell's words are needed again: one statesman, who might be excused from the puerility of age, if his life had not been consistent with his later words, having reiterated the foolish accusations against the Catholic clergy which O'Connell was weary of contesting and answering, and though Lord John Russell has long ceased to have disciples, he is not altogether without followers;* while Mr. Gladstone, whose fame culminated when he indicted the

* In a chapter entitled "Justice to Ireland," he lays down the following propositions:—

1. That murders in Ireland are not the isolated crimes of persons excited by covetousness or revenge, but the deliberate acts of a powerful confederation, which, in defiance of the Queen and Parliament, orders the infliction of a criminal law more formidable than the law of the State. The proposition can be demonstrated both by authority and by numerous instances.

2. That the Roman Catholic clergy in the capacity of parish priests have great sway over the minds of the people of Ireland, but being entirely dependent upon the voluntary offerings of their flocks, are, from sympathy or from fear, unwilling to appear as the prosecutors of the confederacy that directs and executes murder.

King of Naples for tyranny, has found, or forestalled his declension by indicting the Pope.*

One fact is worth a good many assertions. The ex-premier, capable man as he is, has not been able to find a single instance in which English Catholics have been disloyal to their country or deceptive in their oath of allegiance. He might have found an instance of deceptiveness and disloyalty amongst those modern Italians, of whose general proceedings, both sacred and secular, he has become so singularly enamoured.

Signor Cavelotti, an "older" Catholic than Dollinger, who rejects not merely a few creeds, but all, has declared himself, in undeniable terms, on the subject of an oath—this gentleman, whom, we suppose, Mr. Gladstone would delight to honour, was elected by the citizens of Corteolona to represent their opinions in Monte Citorio. He objects to taking an oath, not believing in divine or human rule, but he objects still more strongly to the renunciation (for such a trifle) of parliamentary honours. He takes the oath, he is advanced in the liberality and civilization which this English statesman so ardently admires. But to reconcile the matter to his conscience, he de-

* We take the following extract from the Report of her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed to inquire into the management and government of the College of Maynooth in 1855:—

"We should, however," say her Majesty's Commissioners, "be doing injustice to the College if we failed to report as the general result of the whole evidence before us, that we see no reason to believe that there has been any disloyalty in the teaching of the College, or any disposition to impair the obligations of an unreserved allegiance to your Majesty."—*Maynooth Commission*, 1855, page 64.

At the time of the report the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was taught in the College to the future priests of Ireland, yet the Commissioners saw no reason on this account to doubt the "unreserved allegiance" of Catholics to her Majesty.

clares that he has no intention whatever of keeping it. The "public conscience of Italy," he says, "has already proclaimed the nullity of political oaths." If a Catholic had made such a declaration, or uttered such a sentiment, what vials of indignant wrath would have been justly poured forth upon him; but the author of these exceedingly enlightened sentiments is only a follower of Victor Emmanuel, and an advanced specimen of that perfection to which everything Italian has attained since its Government ceased to be Catholic.

Burke said,* that "the Popery Laws were one leading cause of the imbecility of the country:" had he lived in our own times he might have said that an anti-Popery mania was a painful indication of the mental failure of eminent men.

But, as our present object is merely to indicate the relevancy of O'Connell's speeches to subjects of the day, we pass on.†

* Works, vol. i., page 325.

† It is observable, and characteristic of the times, that a Comtist, Mr. F. Harrison, has come forward in defence of Catholic liberty of conscience, and to condemn Protestant intolerance. Writing to the *New York World*, he says: "It is easy to force Catholics or any other theologians into logical dilemmas; but, as a matter of fact, we all know that a more loyal, conservative, and national body of men does not exist in this island. They cause no Government trouble, neither embarrass Church nor State. Mr. Gladstone, Lord Acton, and Dr. Dollinger, appear to have put their heads together to start an 'Old Catholic' movement in England, as a pendant to the ridiculous neo-Christian bubble in the Anglican Church. Even in Germany, where Old Catholicism is supported by the whole force of the Government (which takes it up just as Napoleon III. used to subvention an inspired newspaper), it is a miserable abortion. Here it will be welcomed by only half a dozen archæologists, and die out like 'Lady Huntingdon's Connection.' As to the deeper principles in this discussion, it certainly seems to me that those who attack the Church are asking of it admissions which they never would make themselves. If they would they are teaching doctrines more dangerous to liberty and morality than any attributed to the Popes. To tell a Church that it is never to meddle with politics, never to teach a duty different from that approved

The Irish magistrates of O'Connell's time were the frequent and deserved objects of his strongest animadversions. A glance at his parliamentary statements, always too well-founded for refutation, will show that his interference was not unneeded. Times, or rather opinions, have changed since the day when men could be judges in their own cause, and could condemn the innocent because they happened to be personally obnoxious. But since human nature does not change, except in the form of its developments of evil, we may even yet find cases to which O'Connell's words are singularly applicable.

One of his most powerful speeches was on the subject of Coercion Laws for Ireland, and on the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* (Feb. 18, 1833). It is painful to record that much which it contains is equally applicable in February, 1875. He showed that the supposed necessity for treating the Irish virtually as a nation at war with England was "gossiping stories" of less value than the "ravings of antiquated womanhood." He asked, in stern tones of indignant remonstrance, to whom the Irish people were to look when they were liable to imprisonment and loss of property and perhaps life at the suspicion or caprice of the Irish Government. He gives

by the Government of the day, is to tell it that it is not to be a religious community at all, but a Government bureau on a par with the official gazette. There is no religious community, no moral or intellectual association which would honestly accept these terms. If every opinion a man may hold is to be followed out to what we think the logical result, and every man is to be supposed in any dilemma which our ingenuity can frame, every man is a rebel. If Mr. Disraeli and the Archbishop of Canterbury succeeded in passing an Act to burn every copy of the Bible, Mr. Newdegate and Mr. Whalley would be preaching sedition and heading a rebellion. If they passed an Act abolishing in Anglican churches vestments, crosses, fonts and organs, rubrics, prayer-books and hymn-books, Mr. Gladstone would be raging about the country as the Hugh Peters of a new rebellion."

instances, within his own knowledge, of the cruel injustice of arrests on simple suspicion and imprisonment without trial, and yet we find that such practices are not discontinued in peaceful Ireland—that the people of the King's County are obliged to protest, and have protested in calm and dignified language, against the continuation of Coercion Acts, where, out of a population of 75,900, there was only one prisoner in jail, who had two chaplains, a doctor, a governor, a deputy governor, a matron, in fact a staff of fifteen officials for his own special behoof and benefit. Mr. Stirling, one of the Town Commissioners of Tullamore, having well observed that under such circumstances it was essentially bad policy to renew the Coercion Act, for “instead of uniting England and Ireland in a mighty friendship, it only tended to intensify the hatred and bad feeling prevailing between the two peoples,” thus unconsciously re-echoing the very language and argument of O'Connell.

In this peaceful county, 268 policemen are occupied in doing nothing, and in this meeting, which was composed of men of the most opposite politics, Home Rulers, Liberals and Conservatives, it was suggested with laughter, but not without reason, that the few magistrates who were desirous of thus “preserving the peace” had more probably in view “preserving their game.”

It is singular that men of the highest intellectual ability, of unquestionable rectitude, of benevolent habits, and of general information, should be so singularly beguiled or blinded by prejudice to facts when Ireland is concerned or when its faith is in question.*

* In the end of last century the well-known Father O'Leary wrote thus. His letter, dated June 5, 1790, might be studied at the present day with advantage by the wilfully ignorant:—

“If in reality the tenets of my Church were such as prejudice and ignorance proclaim them—if they taught me that a Papal dispensation could

O'Connell declared again and again that the gross ignorance of English statesmen on Irish questions, whether real or assumed, was one of the strongest arguments for Repeal of the Union. A similar argument might be made in the present day with little less justice as a plea for Home Rule.*

But O'Connell's philanthropy was neither sectarian nor national; all men were his brothers; and he pleaded alike for all. His liberality was seen again and again in his defence of the consciences of Dissenters, whose religious liberty he would guard with a sacredness which they had not always extended to others.

On the subject of Reform, Parliamentary and Social, he was greatly in advance of the most advanced minds of his age; and could he enter once more the Opposition benches in the House of Commons, we cannot doubt that he would defend the English rough from the debasing punishment of the lash, which there is

sanctify guilt, sanction conspiracies, murders, the extirpation of my fellow-creatures on account of difference of religious opinions, perjury to promote the Catholic cause, by pious breaches of allegiance to Protestant kings, or rebellion against their government—if it were an article of my belief that a priestly absolution without sorrow for my sins, or a resolution of amendment, had the power of a charm to reclaim me to the state of unoffending infancy, and enable me, like Milton's devil, to leap from the gulf of sin into Paradise without purifying my heart or changing my affections—if it were an article of my faith that the grace of an indulgence could give me the extraordinary privilege of sinning without guilt or offending without punishment—if it inculcated any maxim evasive of moral rectitude—in a word, if the features of my religion corresponded with the pictures drawn of it in flying pamphlets and anniversary declamations, I would consider myself and the rest of my fraternity as downright idiots, wretchedly stupid, to remain one hour in a state which deprives us of our rights as citizens, whereas such an accommodating scheme would render them not only attainable but certain."

* See Speeches *passim*.

no longer even the shadow of an excuse for administering to the Irish peasant. O'Connell was no sentimental advocate for the remission of the just penalty of crime; but it is one thing to punish and another to revenge. Because men are brutal, they are not to be flogged like beasts into deeper depths of moral degradation. If the state of society in England has come to such a pass that physical force is to be the only deterrent from crime, it is time for statesmen to inquire a little more into the causes of crime, and to make some larger and more effective efforts for its prevention.

Brutes are apt to be revengeful even for just punishment, and a time may come when the human brute may have the power as he most certainly will have the desire of revenge. Well might O'Connell exclaim that "it was lamentable to see a country increasing everywhere in science and art, and so backward in the progress towards civilization in her criminal laws."*

O'Connell's power of adaptation was singularly developed. He could win the Irish heart with a smile and racy anecdote, yet he did not forget in addressing an Irish audience that he spoke to men the very poorest of whom were as thoroughly *au courant* of the political questions of the day as himself, and almost as capable of giving an opinion on them. His humour was infectious. An eminent prelate of the Catholic Church in Ireland said one day to the present writer, "he laughed in every inch of his body," and in Ireland he could laugh as he pleased.

As a parliamentary orator, his forte was quickness of retort and a power of scathing sarcasm which told on its victims, who, while they would fain deny the ability of the "Broguing Irish-

* July 3, 1834. See also his observations on the brutalizing influence of prize fights.

man* writhed, not always in silence under the lightning shafts of his ire.*

There is yet one other of many subjects on which O'Connell spoke out plainly and sternly, in somewhat of anger and yet not without a shade of sorrowful regret. English Catholics, who owed all their civil and all their public religious advantages to the courage and fidelity of the Irish people, were cold in their recognition, and not unfrequently contemptuous even in their faint praise.

This was no new feeling, but it did not enhance itself by age. When England was as Catholic and as devoted to the Chair of Peter as Ireland, there was little reciprocity of sentiment. It was in the ages of faith that the word "Irish dogge" was applied. But times were changed. The "dogge" had proved faithful. The Saxon consulted his worldly interests and sacrificed his eternal hopes. The Celt, through ages of no common persecution, of no common temptation, endured the loss of all things, endured worse than loss. It might have been supposed that those who professed the same faith would have honoured him for his constancy, would have taken a very pride in his virtue.

But it was not so. Honourable exceptions there were, no doubt. But O'Connell was obliged to declare that "English Catholics had forgotten who emancipated them," when, as he expressively termed it, "they were afraid of their own shadows."†

* Sir Robert Peel was thoroughly conscious of O'Connell's ability as a debater. His name was one day mentioned at Lady Beauchamp's as a "broguing Irish fellow." Lord Westmoreland asked Peel's opinion, and he replied, "If I wanted an efficient and eloquent advocate, I would readily give up all those of whom we have been speaking, provided I had with me this same 'broguing Irish fellow.'"

† June 13, 1832.

It is a subject which merits a special consideration at the present day.

It is somewhat startling to find a statesman of singular ability, and who was once, at least, supposed to be of enlarged mind, seconding the Falck Laws, and openly avowing his entire concurrence in the Bismarckian persecutions.

It is not unfair to argue that he needs not the will but the power to persecute. How soon a man may be found who shall have both qualifications who may dare predict. Both friend and foe admit that this malignant paper attack upon Popery and Rome has had its origin in the biting humiliation of a disappointed ambition. Irish prelates and Irish people would not bow to the parliamentary ukase of the Prime Minister. Catholics must be made to suffer, with the pen at least; how long the sword of individual and general persecution may be withheld is another matter.

Some Catholics, not Irish, have been ungenerously taunted with an over zeal for the Papal power, and with having set their house on fire thereby. If the house is set on fire, not metaphorically but really, it will be by deeds not by words, and it is quite possible that the Celt will have the principal share in extinguishing the conflagration. A period must come from time to time in the world's history when the Church and the world will come into collision. No prudence of speech, no wisdom of action can avoid the shock. The two powers are antagonistic; they are intended to be antagonistic. If this great truth were more generally admitted by the children of the Church much unnecessary verbal controversy would be saved.

Fencing, and hedging, and considering, and explaining is simply waste of time. The world knows too well what the Church's principles are to accept explanations from her disciples.

Better at once to say the naked truth, even should it be met by the naked sword. The world would shut up religion into a fenced garden of its own. There it will sometimes permit its free exercise, so long as it is pliant and passive, and altogether submissive to the behests of human rulers.

To-day the *Times* may courteously admit the letters of the Archbishop of Westminster to its columns; to-day it may report his speeches with sedulous attention and respect; to-morrow it would triumphantly exult in his incarceration, could a statesman be found to suppress Catholicity in England on any, or on no pretence.

With the recollection of Communism in France, and the condition of Italy—*pace* Gladstone—before us, we cannot fling the state of England into the face of Protestantism; but no man with ordinary perception can fail to see that we stand on the brink of a social volcano, and English Catholics would do well to remember how they are likely to fare when the passions of a deeply debased and cruelly brutalized class are let loose against them.

The social amenities and the literary connections of which they are so self-gratulatory will not avail them much. When the vaunted liberality of Protestantism and rationalism exhibits itself in the cruel persecution of men who only wish to serve God according to their conscience and the faith of their fathers, the real value of sentiments and professions of friendship will be seen.

It was no wonder that O'Connell spoke in indignant tones of men who, letting I dare not wait upon I will—reaped the fruit of long centuries of Celtic tears and blood without one word of gratitude, with, it must be said, something like con-

tempt for those whose life-blood has procured their social and religious gain.

O'Connell's intellect was too keen not to see this in all its bearings; his sense of justice was too noble not to feel it. He might be himself received with courteous respect and treated with cordial equality, but Ireland was shrined in his heart, and personal advantages were worthless to him while they were not shared with the whole nation.

Yet it is but fair to say that the fault has not been altogether with the Saxon. Long centuries of slavery, however nobly resisted, leave their inevitable trace on the disabled limbs and the somewhat enfeebled frame. The manhood is there, but the power of asserting the manhood has been held in abeyance. Irishmen have needed lessons of self-reliance and self-respect, and O'Connell was the first to teach them. We need another O'Connell to renew the lesson. We may blame the Englishman who scorns Ireland either socially or politically, but are there no Irishmen who are more culpable? Are there no Irish nobles or landed gentry who are quite willing to give their money or their eloquence to Irish Catholic universities or schools, but who are equally unwilling to give their sons? They, for some special reason, must have the "advantages" of an English education, as if to be educated in Ireland should not be the highest ambition of every Irishman. No Government dare resist an united people, and when Irishmen unite in asking for what is yet needed to make Ireland prosperous and free, they will most assuredly obtain what they want.

A certain class of Irishmen do incalculable harm to their country. In their intercourse with English statesmen, gentlemen, and especially literary men, they profess a certain quali-

fied love for Ireland, and an unqualified knowledge of her condition. They patronize Ireland because they cannot altogether deny their parentage, and their vanity is gratified by having their information accepted at the value which they place upon it themselves.

Englishmen are by no means unwilling as a nation to do justice to Ireland, and if the Irish had not been Catholic as a nation they would have received a full measure of justice long since. The editors of English serials and English papers not unnaturally look to some of these self-sufficient and pretentious writers for their reviews and leaders on Irish subjects. The result is deplorable. Men who are ashamed of their country are not capable of writing truthfully about it. Men whose poor idea of social superiority is to be as English as possible are very unfit to estimate, to legislate for, or to review a condition of things which they are too prejudiced to understand fairly, and too self-interested to explain with common justice.

There can be no question that O'Connell's peculiar rhetoric was more suited to the Irish people than to the House of Commons; but a great deal of sheer nonsense has been written about the vulgarity of his style. We do not quote Mr. Lecky as by any means anxious to defame him, but he has been somewhat led away by groundless general defamation, and yet he can only find such expressions as "scorpion" applied to one gentleman, and "descendant of the impenitent thief" to another, with "contumacious ass" and "indescribable wretches;" but vituperation, if it was unparliamentary, was certainly used very freely in Parliament as well as out of it by O'Connell's opponents. Anyone who takes the trouble of studying "Hansard" would find there less stinging but quite as vulgar invective.

O'Connell was no talker for talk sake. He had too great a work for to study the fashion in which he did it. His opponents might round their periods more elegantly, or adorn them with classical quotations; but O'Connell was a man, and his work was for men, and how well he accomplished it is best proved by the malignity of his opponents.

The motto on our title page was the Life Work of O'Connell. He struggled for *Happy homes and altars free*. The most beneficent of mortal men has never had a higher aim. To see Ireland free from the slavery that enchained her was the life work of the illustrious Liberator. In his first parliamentary speech he tells of the Erin so dear to his heart, and demands justice for her. In his last broken utterance he asked for bread—only for bread for his starving people; and then, true to the instincts of his life, Irish and Catholic, he goes to the Father of the Faithful, fain, if possible, to leave his heart to Rome, determined at least that his body shall be enshrined with his memory in Ireland.

O'Connell's Parliamentary Speeches are well worth careful consideration. They may not be cited as models of rhetoric, but unquestionably they are full of the stern logic of fact. Indeed his statistics were never denied, and his statements were rarely controverted, and when controverted it was evident that the political or religious opinions of his opponents led, as too frequently happens, to a denial of what scarcely admitted of doubt.

A careful perusal of his speeches will throw considerable light on contemporary opinion, and we may hope will remove the too frequently iterated assertion that his language was coarse. That he used coarse or rather indecent epithets occasionally is not to be denied, but such expressions were the exception.

O'Connell's horror of bloodshed, his dread of violence, the one only phase of his character which has been objected to by some of his own countrymen, should at least command the gratitude, if not the respect, of the English nation.

It is not a little curious that every Irish patriot who has appealed to the sword, or promoted rebellion, has been Protestant.* No Catholic ever threatened the sword as it was threatened by John Mitchel; and even his peaceful and pale reflex, John Martin, did not escape the contagion.

The one remarkable sentence in which O'Connell expresses his sentiments will be found in this work. It is an axiom from which we differ, and indeed there are few general propositions which can be propounded without some qualifying clause.

O'Connell knew his countrymen, and his fears may have given a shape to his words other than his actual meaning. We can scarcely suppose it possible that he disavowed an appeal to the sword under any circumstances—that he would not have admitted that there were times when to shrink from such an appeal would be to stand coward before heaven and earth.

But the justifying circumstances of what is called actual rebellion if it fails, and revolution if it succeeds, should be first a moral certainty that no other means would obtain such rights as all men who are not slaves in soul may and must claim, and an equal moral certainty of success.

* It is observable also that when a Scotch publishing house wished to puff an American life of O'Connell, they took care to put it forward as being written [by a man who differed from O'Connell on this subject, evidently hoping that its revolutionary tendencies would promote its circulation. An Irish Catholic publisher would scarcely have dared to offer such an inducement.

It has been said by the advocates of the sword that if O'Connell had fought at Clontarf instead of submitting,* Ireland would have been freed from British rule. But O'Connell had already obtained so much by peaceful means that he could not have been justified in plunging the country into all the horrors of revolution. How far an appeal to the sword might have succeeded is a purely speculative question. A momentary triumph might have been gained certainly, but at what a cost! The best, the noblest, the purest of Ireland's patriots and sons would have lain weltering in their gore, or at best for long years wasted out their lives in a relentless incarceration.

The hand of might would have triumphed after a little, and deliverance from real evils would have been further than ever from realization. O'Connell knew the deep, bitter, ingrained, inborn hatred which the Celt bore the Saxon. He knew that there were many men so thirsty for even a temporary revenge that they would purchase it even at the expense of failure; he warned his own people of the terrible consequences of failure; he warned their rulers of the ever-impending danger of rebellion. The one he warned in love, the other he warned as a grim caution to men whom he believed would be moved to equity rather by fear than justice.

There were men even in the late troubles in Ireland who had the same opinion—who did not join in open insurrection from foreseeing its inevitable failure—but who, nevertheless, sympathised with those who rebelled.

At a certain point the success of revolt depends on

* A personal friend of the present writer, who was with O'Connell at that momentous time, says the mental anguish he endured was something frightful until he was assured that there would be no bloodshed.

the sympathy of those who have hitherto taken no active part.

English statesmen who deal with Irish affairs should make this fact a large element in their calculations. It will be said, it has been said, that the Irish are a discontented and dissatisfied race. It is asked, and sometimes in no querulous spirit, what more can be done for them?

Even the *Times*, which makes such odd blunders about Irish affairs,* has some misgivings as to the Celtic nation across the Atlantic, and the English politician of the future may have to make the same nation a very important element in his calculations. Every emigrant who leaves the Irish shore takes with him a force that will one day prove that the "Celt has gone with a vengeance." Few of us will care to see the day when he comes back with it.

The element of disaffection in Ireland has ceased to be active, but it is none the less strong.†

A correspondence of some years with the Irish-Americans of all classes has given us evidence that no lapse of time and no prosperity in their new homes will ever eradicate their hatred of those who were once believed to have been their oppressors.‡

* *e. g.* Confounding Cardinal Cullen and the Archbishop of Tuam. How can writers who make such mistakes have any real idea of popular feeling in Ireland?

† A gentleman in business in a large town in Great Britain has informed us lately that secret societies are rife there notwithstanding the efforts and prohibitions of the Catholic clergy, with details which we could not doubt.

‡ It is too freely believed that the emigrant will forget his ancient animosities when he has settled in another land—that at least they will fade from remembrance in the second and third generation. Mistakes on this subject, whether from ignorance or a desire to question unpleasant truths, may be very dangerous. The Irish-American press has become a power in the land.

But it may be said let the dead past bury its dead. What and wherein are the present "grievances" of Ireland?

The subject is a wide one, and of that grave importance which all that concerns the well-being of a people must ever be.

We can but lightly touch it here, and only in so far as the topics illustrated the subjects on which O'Connell spoke and wrote.

It is not creditable to English Government of Ireland that Coercion Acts should continue. The irritation, the annoyance, which this unnecessary restraint causes is a continual source of bitterness, and tends to perpetuate feelings and recollections which a wiser policy would allow to fade away.

When the history of this nineteenth century comes to be written, it will tell badly for English statesmanship when it is recorded that one of the best Protestant landlords in Kerry* complained that Irish farmers were not allowed to kill their rooks; that another member of Parliament† declared that he was refused a license for his own gamekeeper; that another member of the House‡ announced that he had given up sporting sooner than subject himself to the indignity of asking for a license; while yet another§ grimly asked the Chief Secretary

One paper which openly advocates the sword has a circulation of 100,000; and its columns are constantly filled with letters which breathe anything but a spirit of peace.

Notwithstanding many failures and gigantic frauds, money is still being collected in the United States, and laid by for "the time of need." The *Clan-na-Gael* Rifle Association has been formed with all the advantage of not being a secret society, and with the plainly avowed declaration that "deeds not words" will be the order of the day when any movement is brought forward to free Ireland. Irish associations, and they are numerous, will tend to keep up the feeling to future generations, which is too generally supposed to have died out with American prosperity.

* Mr. H. A. Herbert.

† Sir P. O'Brien.

‡ Mr. Ronayne.

§ Mr. A. M. Sullivan.

for Ireland "could he point out one murder that had not been committed for want of a gun," and asked why the wearers of clogs should not be "coerced" in Lincolnshire. Coercion Acts may be very consoling to elderly gentlemen of nervous habits, and of the class of one of whom the story is told that he declared no one ever frightened him by shooting his agent, for he would at once replace him; but it is infinitely degrading to those who persevere in such enactments.

The inequality of the franchise is another subject demanding rectification. It is a subject on which O'Connell spoke again and again; yet we find that Dublin, with a population of 265,668 has only 13,562 voters; while Bradford, with a population of 145,830 has 23,451; and Cork, with a population of 97,887, numbers but 4,347; while Dudley, with a population of 82,249, has 14,210.*

* The English Reform Act of 1867, 30 and 31 Vic., cap. 102, by the third section, gives the borough franchise to every inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling-house within the borough who has been rated for poor rate. The corresponding Irish Reform Act, 1868, 31 and 32 Vic., c. 49, gives the borough franchise to every owner of a house within the borough who is rated as occupier at a net annual value of more than £4. In other words, the English borough franchise is household suffrage, no matter what the rating may be, while in Ireland it is a rating franchise of more than £4. By the English Rates Act of 1869, 32 and 33 Vic., cap. 41, it is provided that the owners of premises which are rated at small sums, i. e. from £20 downwards, may pay the poor rates instead of the occupier, and shall get a discount of 25 per cent. off for so doing, and that all such payments by the owners shall be deemed as full payments by the occupiers, so far as the franchise is concerned; that the owners so paying the rates shall deliver to the overseers of taxes a list containing the names of all the actual occupiers, and that the overseers shall under severe penalties enter in the occupiers' column of the rate book the name of every such occupier, and that such occupier shall be deemed as duly rated for the purposes of the franchise; and this, be it recollected, no matter how small the valuation may be. This Act has never been extended to Ireland.

The landlord and tenant question may be difficult of adjustment, involving as it does complicated and opposing interests, but it should certainly not be impossible to foster and promote Irish industries.

He would be a bold man who denied that England has ruined Irish trade. A perusal of O'Connell's Speeches and Letters, a brief glance at any Irish History, will show an array of facts that are simply undeniable.

As a matter of simple justice England is bound to make the most ample reparation. Has this subject ever been considered from this point of view? To deprive a nation of its trade deliberately, we will not say of *malice prepense*, is to rob so many men of their tools. Does it need to be said that restitution alone can repair so grievous a wrong?

As a matter of policy England is bound to foster and restore Irish trade. It is infinitely to be regretted that English statesmen do not see this. England is at the zenith of her power. How long will she remain so? Her navy is not what it was. Her officers admit that her army has lost much of its ancient prestige; it is now more difficult to fill the ranks, and the raw material when obtained is often scarcely worth training. Foreign countries are taking away no small share of her manufactures. Every strike is cutting slowly but surely at the root of her prosperity. Men who are not content with wages which would amply supply the wants of the country curate or the banker's clerk, are doing injustice to others rather than to themselves.

The supply not being forthcoming in the usual quarter, it will cease to be sought there, or, if it returns to the old channel, the merchant will have learned that there are other sources

open to him where he may obtain what he needs at less cost, and with a certainty that there will be no interruption in the supply.

The whole moral tone of men who are on strike must necessarily become demoralized. Is this for the national prosperity? Feelings of dislike, of distrust, if not of hatred, and of overt hostility, are being intensified between employers and employed, and such feelings have been the ground-swell of very nearly every bloody revolution—justly or unjustly, rightly or wrongly. Let a people once become thoroughly discontented with those above them, and we have the beginning of an end too frequently accomplished not to be feared exceedingly, and to be arrested by all possible efforts. The tocsin of war hangs trembling, and ready to peal its loud alarm at a touch. Will England altogether escape when the dire conflict comes? Will she have a prosperous, contented Ireland to help her, or a discontented revengeful people to hang on her skirts and harass her at every turn?

The sooner it is well understood that commercial prosperity is the one thing which Ireland wants, and that commercial prosperity in Ireland means commercial stability in England, the better.

The statesman who will lay down for himself a steady course of fostering encouragement to Irish trade will benefit his own nation even more than ours.

It is true that there will be many difficulties to encounter, but the work of resuscitation is not easy. It is easy to destroy, it is very difficult to restore, but the difficulty does not excuse from the duty.

Let England do her part—it is for her to commence—and let Ireland do hers.

It cannot be denied that long centuries of oppression have

disqualified the Irish people in many respects for commercial success. All the more reason why the disqualifications should be removed.

Nor can the Irish, as a nation, be charged with indifference to this subject. If countless acres of waste land remain unreclaimed, it is because the poor peasant has not the necessary capital to bring them into cultivation. Yet in how many places has he done his best, and that at an expenditure of personal labour and weary toil which should redeem his character from the often iterated reproach of indolence.

He has carried soil and sea-weed with patient industry day after day long distances, and up mountain slopes. He is fed on what an English prisoner would reject, and for his reward he has not unfrequently had his rent raised, and when unable to meet the demand has been flung out on the roadside like a dog.

A recent Irish election has given ample evidence that the Irish people will make almost any sacrifice to secure the return of a gentleman whom they hope will assist them in their industrial pursuits. The successful candidate was, to say the least, shaky on the subject of Home Rule—he was, however, very prominent indeed on the subject of Home Trade, and was known to have the ability to make good his promises. He had even sat on a jury which brought in true bills against Fenians, but his promises to increase the bills of his constituents outweighed the balance against him. Moreover, this gentleman was a Protestant, and appealing to an eminently Catholic constituency. His religious opinions, however, would not in any case be considered a disqualification, as Ireland has advanced far beyond England in practical questions of toleration.

We have already alluded to a class of Irishmen who take a singular pleasure, and imagine it to their own honour, to misrepresent public affairs. By such persons the great cry of Irish prosperity is being perpetually raised. As we said, they are unfortunately believed in good faith by some, and in selfish indifference by others.

Ireland can never be prosperous in the source in which England is prosperous until her resources are cultivated and her trade developed. There are, certainly, some rich and prosperous farmers, and this fact will only help to encourage the cry of Irish prosperity and to deceive those who are really anxious to understand the true state of the country. But, the rich farmers are little better off than the large body of English yeomen. Their capital is spent timidly on their land, or locked up carefully in the county bank. Their wealth does not enrich the country, and is of little benefit to themselves.

Sometimes an enterprising son emigrates to America, but capital is rarely invested in trade—and so little interest is there in any trade that the father, who makes a moderate fortune, retires early to enjoy it, and the sons become gentlemen at large. Hence the colossal fortunes of English merchants are unknown in Ireland.

As the subject is important to all thinking men, we give a few evidences gathered almost to hand of the general state of trade in Ireland.

Wexford is not the least prosperous of Irish counties, and yet the *People*, a well printed and ably edited paper, says:—

“Not even the most enthusiastic optimist but must see ruin extending its dark wings all over the country. That which in an eminent degree constitutes the wealth and power of a nation, that is its population, is daily and hourly growing less. Once populous districts scarcely now rejoice in the

sound of the human voice. It is only in the vicinity of towns that signs of life are visible; and even here evidences of decay are manifesting themselves so unmistakably that even the most solvent in the community cannot ignore them. Prosperity cannot exist without industry, and industry is cramped and crippled. Our only industry is the cultivation of the soil; and for this the law affords not that security which should stimulate the honest and vigorous endeavour of the farmer. There is no sign of healthy progress in the country, and the few who do prosper are only an evidence of the ruin of the many. Our struggle with our rulers has now become a struggle for existence, and the patriotic spirit of the country must soon become its salvation from ruin. Patriotic action must now of necessity arise from the spirit of self-preservation; and he who lacks heart in the struggle is but a poltroon whose cowardice and want of faith in patriotic action will bring down upon his head the condemnation and contempt of his country.*

A commercial traveller in preceding issues of this paper complains bitterly of his inability to get orders, and a farmer answers him:—

“Your correspondent’s ‘experience’ ought to show him that that which he complains of, like all evils which oppress Ireland, can be traced to misgovernment. If we had a Parliament of our own, our noble rivers would no longer run idly to the sea, but would float large ships. The commercial resources of our country would be developed. The mining resources of our country would also be developed. The mineral treasures that now lie hid deep beneath the emerald sod of old Ireland would be brought to the surface, and our factories would flourish, and would rival those of England as they did in the days when we had a Parliament of our own in College-green. Then there would be no stagnation of trade. Then emigration would soon be checked, for Ireland could pay for labour wages as good as any other country. Home government, too, would immeasurably benefit the farmers. Alongside our flourishing mining districts and manufacturing towns, we would be able to realise a far better price for our cattle and saleable commodities than we do at present, as they have to go across the water, to England, to the markets. If ‘A Commercial Traveller’ has the welfare of Ireland really at heart, let him become a Home Rule propagandist, let him do all in his power to forward a movement, which is the real panacea for poor coerced and persecuted Ireland.”

And in truth the neglect of Irish industries is the main

* *The People*, May 29, 1875.

support of the agitation for Home Rule in more senses than one.

Even the *Times* has given glimpses of a dim consciousness that the Irish in leaving Ireland do not forget England, and with suddenly awakened perspicuity warns her that the "Nemesis of seven centuries of misgovernment will come," a Nemesis which the writer appears to believe in thoroughly and to fear exceedingly.

It is an age of spirit manifestations; and so unlike is this article to its fellows, that one could imagine the spirit of John Mitchel had passed into the editorial room whilst the thunderer slept, and penned the lines with more humour, better grammar, and more sense than the mysterious beings who are so admired and believed in, not by the ignorant and superstitious Celt, but by the very enlightened and rational Saxon.

The *Dublin Evening Post*, which certainly does not deal in sensational articles, and which circulates we believe principally among the upper classes of Irish country gentlemen, had a very short but very pithy article on "Irish prosperity" lately, which we give in its entirety:—

"The Legal Diary of this date contains one hundred and twelve cases entered for hearing to-day before the two Judges of the Bankruptcy Court. The Judges of this Court have no sinecure post of it just now. Three heavy failures in the city this week have to be added to the list. And yet, trade is said to be 'flourishing' in Ireland!"

The provisions made in the Dublin Bankruptcy Court have proved insufficient for over-prosperous and Protestant Belfast; and the *Kilkenny Journal* asserts that the electors of that city did not care "two rows of pins" about the principles of their new member "provided he established any branch of trade in the city, and afforded employment to the people."

Indeed, the great mass of the Irish people are, by no means, indifferent on this subject; and even some of the Home Rule members have been asked why they did not patronize Home Trade when publishing works on Irish subjects.*

* The Irish have been frequently accused of indifference to their own literature. Certainly the printing and publishing trade does not flourish in Dublin. In a recent appeal made by the Dublin Typographical Fund they say:—

“With all the fanfaronade about Irish genius, Irish generosity, and Irish national spirit, will it be credited that the greater part of the annual income of the Dublin Printers’ Benevolent Fund is derived from sources altogether outside Ireland? It is painful to record such a state of facts, but the committee believe they would be evading their duty did they shrink from making known how little has been done in the metropolis of Ireland to aid the only institution associated with the literature and the Press of the country.”

The editor of the *Nation*, in a reply to correspondents, says: “One of the faults of our countrymen is the scanty support they give to our native literature.” A glance at the advertisements of the two principal Dublin publishers, Catholic and Protestant, will show that the announcement of an Irish book is the rare exception.

It is time that Catholics were aroused to some sense of the importance of supporting their own literature, and by literature we mean not merely religious publications, but historical and philosophical writings. The active propagation not merely of the infidel literature which O’Connell so vehemently denounced, but of the highest class of infidel and anti-Catholic literature, is met with a stoic and stupid indifference. Not long since we saw an advertisement of a “History of Protestantism” by one of the first London publishing houses. The advertisement was prefaced by the following sensational observations:—

“The time has come when Protestants must look back to the history of the great conflict between Protestantism and Romanism, to learn the real issues which are at stake. See speech of the Prime Minister of England, who says, ‘There are agencies at this moment which are preparing a period of great disturbances.’”

“Mr. Gladstone writes: ‘No one can become Rome’s convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty at the mercy of another.’”

Are Catholics going to leave this kind of work entirely to Protestants? are they going to leave the mass of the people with no reading but such as is supplied to them by the active exertions of those who have the double interest

The important subject of education has made rapid advance since O'Connell's day. Still there is much yet to be done. A system of education which teaches Latin and Greek roots to girls who, when they go to their homes, will, or ought to be, occupied in digging potatoes, or at best in milking cows, is an anomaly which one ought have supposed a little common sense would have worsted. To require not merely parsing, but analysis and mathematics from those whose station in life is certain never to rise beyond a decent competency, if it even attain the same, is not indicative of real political foresight.

To rush children in three or four years through a course of mutilated history, physical and mathematical geography, geology, anatomy, physical science, elaborate and totally useless penmanship, music and drawing, is not education.

Happily for themselves the Irish are a light-hearted race—they are quick to imbibe any amount of mental pabulum, but imbibing is not assimilating. The child can be crammed with considerable labour to the much over-tasked and under-paid teacher. She “passes” the inspector, goes back to her mud cabin, or her little hut, or perhaps the poor room in some unwholesome dwelling where her life will be spent, and unless she in her turn is selected to cram another race, she forgets, or finds that all she has been taught is nearly useless to her.

The cramming system is given up in the navy, its utility is

of making money and disseminating their own views. The masses of the people will read, and do read. Circumstances have afforded the Irish people a facility for learning of which they have carefully availed themselves, but have Catholics supplied any literature to take the place of what is so freely offered them. I could give a list, were it advisable, of bitterly anti-Catholic literature at present in active and increasing circulation amongst the middle and lower classes in England and Ireland.

questioned in the Indian Civil Service, and the sooner it is entirely abolished the sooner shall we have a class of really educated men and women in the middle and lower classes.

The cry for the education of the people has been so strong of late years that a man would need a considerable amount of moral courage who should attempt to discourage such education. He would be the victim of general reprobation. He would have his ears assailed with the cry that the poor had just as good a right to be educated as the rich. His assertion that he desired more education, and to have it of a better kind, would be scouted by the millions of exceedingly sapient people who know a great deal better than himself what he thought and intended. If he happened to be a Catholic, he would be peremptorily silenced with the assertion that his Church hated education, and wanted to keep the masses in ignorance, the fact of his Church having kept all that was valuable in literature for centuries notwithstanding.* Let the education that is given be of the highest order, but let it be suitable in kind to the class for whom it is intended.

For boys in an agricultural country such knowledge of chemistry as would be of use in farming operations should be an important element in their instruction. And the know-

* A return just laid before Parliament exhibits some remarkable results as to the comparative efficiency of the different classes of public elementary schools. We find that in the year ended last August the per centage of the average attendance of children at public elementary schools was—At board schools, 62·8; at Catholic and British schools, 70·6 and 70·5 respectively; and at Church of England schools, 70·1. The highest results in passing the several standards were achieved at the Catholic schools, the Board schools coming last. Under this head the averages of grant earned upon these results are per head—British, 5s. 6½d.; Church of England, 4s. 11¾d.; Catholic, 4s. 7¼d.; and Board, 3s. 8¾d.

ledge imparted should be practical, and thoroughly freed from useless technicalities—which however brilliant they may be on an examination paper, are of no utility in after-life. Art schools should be encouraged, not on the principle that every student is an artist, but on the broad practical common sense principle that some art knowledge will certainly be useful, and with a careful eye to the special training of talent when it appears.

Above all, education should be religious; and it is difficult to understand how men who have even the faintest belief in a higher power can wish it otherwise. If there is to be such a thing as freedom of human thought, those who do believe at least should be allowed to educate their children in their faith.

Even Mr. Matthew Arnold has spoken out* pretty plainly on this subject. Commenting on Mr. Gladstone's University Bill, he says:—

“Religion, moral philosophy, and modern history are probably the three matters of instruction in which the bulk of mankind take most interest, and this precious university was to give no instruction in any one of them! The Irish have a right to a university with a Catholic faculty of theology, and with Catholic professors of philosophy and history. By refusing them to Ireland our fanaticism does not tend to make one Catholic the less—it only tends to make Irish Catholicism unprogressive. So long as we refuse them, sir, I persist, instead of congratulating myself with the *Times* on our admirably fair and wise treatment of Catholicism—I persist in thinking that, where we are put to the test, our treatment of Catholicism is dictated solely by that old friend of ours—strong, steady, honest, well-disposed, but withal somewhat narrow-minded and hard-natured—the British Philistine.”

If for Philistine you read prejudice we are agreed.

The *Times* in one of its moments of weakness said:—

“It is precisely because we dissent so strongly from all that is especially

* Letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

characteristic of Rome that we would be careful to allow to Roman Catholics the same measures of freedom that we should claim for ourselves if they were masters of a national government to which we were subject."

This in regard to education is giving all that Catholics ask, yet this is precisely what a very large majority of Protestants are altogether unprepared to grant.*

It has been said, not by monks in the cloister, or what some are pleased to call fanatical Ultramontanes, that "our times are sliding backward," and we fear the assertion is not altogether untrue.

The war of religious opinion which begins with words is not unlikely to end with blows; and it is pitiful to find in a modern statesman, and in modern writers, all the acrimony, and not a little of the vituperation which O'Connell so vehemently denounced in his letter to Dr. Daly.†

* A writer in the *Standard* says:—"For downright intolerance of free thought it is difficult to find the match of your professed Freethinker, and for good round bigotry of opinion commend us to those who think it a sign of feebleness to hold any opinion at all. Even science has rushed into the fray, and we hear from its lips, once conceived to be so sedate, the most virulent denunciations of faith; whilst the heavenly maid, Divine Philosophy, has taken upon herself a quite terrestrial temper, and scolds like any virago. Statesmen of the highest rank and of the most unquestionable powers have caught the infection, and seem to think that the first duty of statescraft is to fan the flames of sectarian animosity by acrimonious language and pointed persecution. Half the world seems anxiously to desire the extermination of the other half, and if the fires of former times are not lighted anew it is because the two sides are too evenly matched to make the operation feasible; or because the doctrines of toleration, slowly matured during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, have yet too strong a hold upon the consciences of outsiders."

† In an article on Primary Education in Ireland (*Frazer*, June, 1875) we find the most miserable anti-Catholic bigotry. With an appearance of fairness, the one object of the writer is to press the point that the Irish people should not be educated in the religion of the people, and that it is an injustice

His letter to Lord Shrewsbury will not escape criticism. We have 'already alluded to the feelings which some English Catholics entertain towards those of their own faith in Ireland. It is not creditable—and it is not wise. Those who have a

to allow Catholics any active part in the management of the Board. We recommend the opinion of the *Times* to this gentleman's private consideration. What would an English School Board say if English Protestant education was to be placed under the control of a majority of Catholics? Once again we ask, as we have asked often before: Does Protestant liberty of conscience mean liberty to believe only as Protestants do? If it does not, then Catholics should have equal rights, social, political, and religious. If it does, then political liberty of conscience means tyranny. If Catholics denied liberty of conscience to others, they might justify themselves on the principle that they were right, and all the world besides were wrong. But Protestants who claim that every difference of opinion is allowable should not exact submission to opinions of the most contradictory character.

The writer in *Fraser* wishes Irish education to be "untrammelled by the fear of any priesthood." It is time for Irish Catholics to be on the alert. Each generation finds a new method of tempting Ireland to betray her faith, and this effort will be made through her education and her teaching.

In a recent memorandum, addressed to his clergy by the Right Rev. Dr. Moran, Bishop of Ossory, he says he saw a letter, written by one of the most active agents of the Teachers' Association, in which he said that he "would not give up the agitation until every teacher in Ireland was free from the degrading tyranny of the priests." We happen to know of some similar efforts, and that very large sums of money have been expended for this express object. It is time that our Catholic members of Parliament were thoroughly roused to action on this subject.

In a most important letter dealing with the whole education question, the Right Rev. Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, says:—

"I think I may venture to offer a few words of warning to the National teachers of Ireland in the great effort which now engages their attention. Mr. Butt's work has undoubtedly suggested these warnings; but I myself am solely responsible for their appropriateness and justice. No man sympathises more keenly than I do with the grievances of the National teachers, and I admire the courage, the earnestness, and the perseverance with which they have at last forced the public mind to take their wrongs into consideration. Patrons, managers, local influence, and local authority exhibited cruel indifference—I will not say to their decent requirements, but to their very privations. Confronted with this criminal apathy they would be false to the

common interest above all nationalities, in the great struggle which is coming, surely and perhaps more rapidly than we think, should be united, and the union will be none the less secure for having been firmly cemented before the hour of danger.

A Prime Minister has done more than hint that the Jesuits are living on sufferance in these countries. It does not need much wisdom to perceive that when the first stone is pulled out of their houses there will be little safety for others. The events of the day succeed each other rapidly, and, with the example of Germany before our eyes, we see how little security there may be even for toleration of Catholic practices when once Catholic institutions have been attacked.

instincts of self-preservation if they had not made a great effort to right themselves. No man can doubt their claim to the increased remuneration they demand—the only question is the source whence it is to be derived. But it is impossible for any one who loves his country not to feel a deeper interest in the principles and feelings of the teachers themselves than even in the improvement of their material condition; for the youth of Ireland is in their hands, and the character of the rising generation will be substantially such as they shall have formed it. Hitherto the National teachers have been, as a body, above reproach: they have been independent and patriotic; and I think it would be easy to show that the traditional teaching of the old persecuted hedge schoolmasters contributed largely to make them what they are.

“I may, perhaps, be pardoned if I make one passing allusion to the religious aspect of their position. Secular and religious instruction can never be disunited in Ireland. The National teachers must, therefore, be always under the guidance of the clergy, the religious instructors of our youth. As Catholics, then, it is impossible not to feel a deep interest in all that concerns them; and it is pardonable if we are sensitively jealous of everything that might compromise their freedom.”



ADVERTISEMENT.

ALTHOUGH Ireland is now celebrating the O'Connell Centenary, no attempt has been made to publish O'Connell's Speeches until the present series was commenced. Two volumes of "Select Speeches" were published nearly fifty years ago, and can scarcely claim to be an exception or an honor to Irish literary enterprise, though they have been put forward from time to time as something new. As the latest speech in this collection dates as far back as 1825, no further comment need be made.

The value of the collection of "Speeches and Letters" in the present work will speak for itself; and we can only hope that a national appreciation of O'Connell's legacy to Ireland will enable us to continue and complete the series.

It must be said with regret, that Ireland has not

been forward in rewarding her literary men. Such memoirs and collections as have been published hitherto, have been due to English enterprise; and English works are too frequently, and exclusively preferred in Irish schools and colleges both as class-books and premiums.

The materials in our possession for the second and third volumes of this series will be found of considerable importance; and, like that which forms the present series, it has been hitherto unpublished. Besides a valuable collection of private letters, for which I am indebted to many friends, all the papers, letters, and documents relating to the Repeal Association have been placed in my hands: no words are needed to enhance their value and importance. For years they have lain mouldering in cases and unopened. A few years more, and many of the most valuable contents of these cases would have been undecipherable. I purpose to dedicate the volumes which will contain the most important of these, to T. M. Ray, Esq. To do so is the only return I can make for his years of indefatigable labour for Ireland, and the admirable manner in which he kept every record of public and

* We know at least one instance in which an Irish publisher refused to sell the works of an Irish author for reasons too contemptible to be credited. Irish trade is not altogether blameless in the matter of Irish prosperity. We want a good deal more generous cordial co-operation with each other.

Advertisement.

iii

private business in connection with the Repeal Association.

In conclusion, I would request any of the clergy or laity, still living, who were in any way connected with the Repeal Association, to communicate with me with as little delay as possible.



THE UNPUBLISHED SPEECHES

OF

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

FIRST PART.

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.

Subject, CLARE ELECTION; Date, MAY 18, 1829.



IN the year 1813 Mr. Grattan made his final effort to effect the Emancipation of Catholics. His Bill simply provided that Catholics should sit in Parliament. The Bill was lost. The *retro* question then came up, and men who would not believe Catholic gentlemen on their oaths, while they trusted Catholic soldiers and sailors with their lives and liberties, puzzled their curiously perverted intellects for new and more binding restrictions. Either Catholics were perjurers and liars or they were not. If the former, no oath, however cunningly devised, could bind them; if the latter, special restrictions were at once unnecessary and insulting.

O'Connell from the commencement of his career saw the necessity for and the value of persistent agitation. He stirred up the scum of prejudice and would not allow the lees to settle.

In May, 1828, Sir F. Burdett carried a motion for Emancipation in the House of Commons by a majority of 13. On the 10th June, 1829, Mr. Plunkett made one of his most brilliant speeches, and on the same subject.

Parliament met in February, 1829, and Peel, in the king's speech, recommended the consideration of Catholic disabilities. O'Connell was returned for Clare, but as he could not take a blasphemous oath he could not take his seat. He was heard at the bar of the House—a new writ was issued for Clare—he was re-elected—and took that place in Parliament which he filled for so many years to the incalculable benefit of both English and Irish Catholics.

SPEECH AT THE BAR OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. O'Connell then proceeded to address the House. He said he thought he could not be accused of affectation when he stated that he was very ignorant of the forms of that House, and therefore he required the kind indulgence of the House if he should happen to violate them. He said he was there to claim his right to sit and vote in the House as the representative of the county of Clare, without taking the Oath of Supremacy. He was ready to take the Oath of Allegiance provided by the recent statute, entitled "An Act for the Relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects." He was desirous to have that oath administered to him, and of course must be prepared to verify his qualification in point of property; and whether the House should be of opinion that he ought to be permitted to take the new oath or not, he respectfully required to be allowed to take the qualification oath. If he was allowed to take that oath, he it then at his own hazard to sit and vote in the House. If he were allowed only to take that oath, he was content to run the risk of sitting in the House. His right to sit and vote in that House was in its nature perfectly plain. He had been returned duly elected by the proper officer. It appeared by that return, that he had had a great majority of the legal voters of the county

of Clare, who voted for his return; and that return had since been confirmed by the unanimous decision of a committee of the House. He therefore had as good a right to sit and vote in the House, according to the principles of the constitution, as any of the right hon. or hon. gentlemen by whom he was surrounded. The voice of the people had sent him there. He was a representative of the people. The question, as it affected his right to sit and vote in the House, could not, he said, arise at common law, but only on statute law. It was a question of statute law, whether a representative of the people was bound, before he entered on the execution of his duty to his constituents, to take oaths of any description. He was correct in saying, that up to the reign of Elizabeth no such oaths were required. Up to the reign of Charles II. there were no oaths to be taken in the House itself; and the 30th of Charles II. was the first act which required them. The first oath required to be taken by that statute was the Oath of Allegiance; and no man in the House was more ready to take that oath than he was. The next was the Oath of Supremacy; and there were, he was sure, many in that House who would not take the then Oath of Supremacy. That statute not only ordained that those oaths should be taken, but it provided remedies and penalties against those who should neglect or refuse to take them. Those remedies were of an exceedingly extensive, he might almost say, awful nature. One penalty, amongst others, was the infliction of a fine of £500, which he mentioned now, because he should have occasion to call the attention of the House to it before he closed his address. It was necessary to consider what was the object of the statute. It was declared to be a statute "for the more effectual preservation of the king's person and government." That was the object of the statute; and the mode of effecting that object was, by disabling Papists from sitting and voting in either House of Parliament. He was one of those persons whom the discourteous language of the statute called Papists. He came under the description of the statute. He could not take the oaths therein provided by

it, and if the declaration were now in force, he would shrink from signing it. The object of the statute was manifest from its title, and the construction of the law followed from the title itself. It was therefore perfectly plain, that, so long as that continued in force, it would have been vain for the people of Ireland to have elected him for any other county. He would not then have exercised the right he was now using; because the law expressly provided that the refusal to take the oaths should be followed by the vacating of the seat, and the issuing of a new writ. Up to the period of the legislative union with Ireland, the statute was, by means of other acts, continued in force—that was to say, partly in force; the Declaration was in force; but he found, by reference to statute, in the library belonging to the House, that the oaths were repealed by the 1st of William and Mary, section I., chapter I. That statute altered the form of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy. By the statute of Charles the Oath of Supremacy was affirmative of the king's supremacy in spiritual matters; by the other, the oath only negatived foreign supremacy and spiritual jurisdiction.

This was the state of the statute law up to the period of the legislative union with Ireland. At that period, in his humble opinion, an alteration took place in the effect of the statute law. He most respectfully submitted that the alteration which took place at the period of the legislative union in the statute law, as established by the 1st of William and Mary, which was one of pains, penalties, and disabilities against any person who sat and voted without taking the prescribed oaths, was, that there was still a direction to take the oaths, but no pains, penalties, and disabilities consequent upon the not taking them. He submitted that the statute of Charles II. did not operate on the present Parliament. It was a statute made in the English Parliament. No statute of the Parliament of Great Britain, after the union with Scotland, could operate. Nothing could operate in this case but the Act of Union with Ireland, or some act passed subsequently to the Union. That was a position which, as it appeared to him, no lawyer could con-

trovert, and no judge possibly overrule. He now claimed, therefore, firstly, to sit and vote without taking the oaths, by virtue of the Act of Union with Ireland; secondly, he claimed to sit and vote under the Relief Bill, without taking the Declaration; thirdly, he claimed, according to the effect of the Relief Bill, to sit and vote without taking the Oath of Supremacy; and, fourthly, he claimed under the positive enactments of the Relief Bill, to sit and vote without taking any other oath than that mentioned in the Relief Bill itself.

He would endeavour to go over these four points as briefly as possible. The Act of Union with Ireland certainly directed the oaths to be taken, and it was equally certain that it did not enact any pains and penalties for not doing so. The act did, however, direct the oaths to be taken; and it might be considered that the legislature having directed them to be taken, the House had authority to prevent any man from exercising the right of representation who refused to take them. He would not concede that point, but he would admit, that after the Union an act was brought in for the relief of persons who had neglected to qualify. He would, however, put it to the House in its judicial capacity, and would leave it to its decision, whether the Act of Union not having given the House authority by express enactment to deprive representatives of their rights, and the people of their representatives, the House could do so of its own authority. He could not avoid reminding the House, that the oaths had at all times operated as a hardship only on those persons who entertained a conscientious respect for the sacred obligation of an oath. Parliament had been asked to exclude a most meritorious class of persons; whereas those who might choose to neglect the obligation of an oath were admitted to the privilege of sitting in Parliament. This legislation was founded on a bad principle. It excluded a meritorious class, and admitted all who neglected or disregarded the sanction to which he had referred. It called upon the people to elect the careless, the fearless, the mendacious; and it proceeded upon the bad principle of making selection of the vicious

to the exclusion of the conscientious. That being the spirit and principle of the law, he humbly submitted to the House whether it would carry that spirit and principle into specific execution. He thought, if he stood on the Act of Union alone, he should stand firmly in that assembly of Christians and of gentlemen, in calling upon them not to give effect to that vicious principle—not to promote the choice of such as were hostile to those who revered the sacred obligation of an oath, but to throw the doors open as wide as possible to all who would illustrate that assembly by their virtues and their talents.

He quitted that point, and came to the next, to which he adverted with pleasure. He founded it upon the Relief Bill. He insisted that the effect of the Relief Bill was, to do away with the obligations directed by the Union Act, as far as it related to oaths. The Union Act directed, that the oaths should be taken for a particular period, and for a particular period only. The words of the Act of Union were—"That every member of the House of Commons in the first and all succeeding Parliaments shall, until the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall otherwise provide, take the oaths, and make and subscribe the Declaration, and take and subscribe the oath now by law enjoined to be taken, made, and subscribed by the Lords and Commons of the Parliament of Great Britain." He could not now do that, for the direction was at an end. On that direction depended the Oath of Supremacy. If, under that direction, the Oath of Supremacy could not be required, then he succeeded at once. He contended that the period had arrived when that direction was no longer in force. The period of the existence of the direction was limited by the adverb of time "until." The oaths were directed to be taken until something should happen. Had that something happened? That was the only question. Let him see whether he could answer it. He said that something had happened. And how did he prove it? He took up the Act of Relief passed this session, and he found the Declaration totally abolished. Had not Parliament now "otherwise provided?" The former statute was a penal act

on popular rights—a restriction for a given period, “until Parliament should otherwise provide.” He took up the statute, and he found that Parliament had otherwise provided—not for Catholics alone, not for Dissenters of any particular class, but for Protestants, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics—all—all. He had distinct evidence of that fact when he appeared at the table of the House. The oath was different from that which would have been tendered to him before the 13th of April. It was a new document, produced fresh for the occasion, by reason of the recent Act of Parliament. On one side were the oaths for Protestants, and on the other the oath for Catholics. And why was this? Because the legislature had “otherwise provided” than at the period of the Union. As a representative of the people, he claimed the benefit of the limitation contained in the Act of Union. He required not to come within the terms of any of the oaths. All he said was, that the period of limitation contemplated by the Act of Union had expired. If the provisions of the new act did not embrace every case, that was either the wisdom or the defect of the statute; but in either case, the time had found its limit, and the Union statute was at an end. He now claimed to take his seat just as if that statute had not existed. But suppose that what he had said did not satisfy the House. Let him call its attention to the Relief Bill, and to point out to it that, in considering that measure, there were general principles of common sense that would enable the House to decide upon the construction of the act, as well as any bench of judges, however familiar with legal topics, could possibly decide the most intricate points of law. Previously to the Union, or he might say, down to the passing of the Relief Bill from the time of the 30th of Charles II., the object of Parliament had been to exclude Papists from sitting and voting in either House. The decisions of the House upon that would be decisions auxiliary to that object. Here was a new statute, the object of which was to throw open the doors of Parliament equally wide to Roman Catholics and Protestants—to annihilate the bar which had opposed the entrance of Catholics; and he respectfully

submitted that the construction of the statute ought to be such as would forward its object, by facilitating the admission of Catholics into Parliament. The new statute, like many other Acts of Parliament, sometimes took up the subject in the middle, afterwards proceeded to the commencement, and then travelled back again. Its arrangement, therefore, was not so methodical as to enable him to give an analysis of it at once. The second clause of the act enabled all Roman Catholics, being peers, to sit and vote in Parliament, by taking the new oath. It would be necessary to ascertain whether any Catholic peers had been created between the period of the 30th of Charles II. and the present time. There were two; he might say three, for Parliament had declared that the attainder passed against the third was unjust. He would, however, confine himself to two. The Earl of Kenmare and Baron French had been created peers during a period when it was impossible they could exercise the right of the peerage to sit in Parliament. The new act admitted those individuals to the full rights of the peerage. He asked, then, whether, as the king's prerogative was to have full effect under this statute, the privileges of the people should not also have effect? The privileges of the people ought to be equally potential with the prerogative of the Crown. The second section of the clause to which he had referred declared, that any Catholic "returned as a member of Parliament after the commencement of the act," should be entitled to sit and vote. Under the second section of this clause, therefore, it was clear, that any Catholic returned as member of Parliament subsequently to the passing of the act, was clearly entitled to the benefit of the act. And here he would make one observation. If he was included in the second section of the clause, he certainly was not excluded by anything in it; if it did not contain the affirmative of the right for which he contended, it did not negative it by any legal declaration or enactment. There was one point of view only in which the clause could be considered. It was a point of legal subtlety. It depended on the authority of the House to give him the benefit of the act upon the construction of that clause. He

would abstain from entering into merely technical arguments, which he considered unfitted for the popular assembly he was addressing. He would, however, just observe, that an important decision had lately been come to, with respect to the construction of wills; namely, that property given to children to be born might be shared by children born long before the making of the will. Whilst he pointed out this technical distinction to hon. members, he really hoped they would never understand it at their own expense. The second section of the clause applied, he considered, to a person claiming, like the Earl of Surrey; but it did not contain one negative word to exclude him; and he claimed the assistance of legal gentlemen in the House to put it beyond doubt, that if the words of the clause did not aid his case, they at least did not injure his right to sit and vote without taking the oaths.

He would now come at once to the clauses of the act; and he implored the House to forgive him for having trespassed so long on other matters when he had the tenth clause of the act to refer to, which in his humble judgment rendered doubt impossible. The tenth clause was as follows:—"And be it enacted that it shall be lawful for any of his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion to hold, exercise, and enjoy all civil and military offices, and places of trust or profit under his Majesty, his heirs, or successors, and to exercise any other franchise or civil rights, except as hereinafter excepted, upon taking and subscribing, at the times and in the manner hereinafter mentioned, the oath hereinbefore appointed and set forth, instead of the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, and instead of such other oath or oaths as are or may be now by law required to be taken, for the purpose aforesaid, by any of his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion." He claimed the benefit of that clause. Its meaning was plain and distinct. It required no technical subtlety to discover its meaning. It was impossible for technical subtlety to throw a cloud over that meaning. He would stand on the evident meaning of that clause alone: but not having the right of reply

he felt bound to anticipate the objections which might be urged against it. If, in doing so, he adduced arguments which gentlemen would disclaim, let it be ascribed solely to his anxiety to meet every possible objection, and not to any intention to undervalue the understandings of those whom he was addressing. The word "franchise" was introduced into the fifth clause, which provided that Roman Catholics should vote at all elections for cities, counties, and towns, upon taking the oath provided by the act. Again, "franchise," as relating to corporations, was mentioned in the fourteenth clause as relating to boroughs; and yet in the tenth clause, for fear any franchise had been omitted—for fear this statute should not be as beneficial in practice as it was intended, and as he hoped it would be—Parliament had wisely introduced the word "franchise" again. The clause then went on to give to Catholics all civil rights, "except as hereinafter excepted." The exceptions were contained in the twelfth clause, and were, the offices of Regent, Lord Chancellor of either kingdom, justices or guardians of the kingdom, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, or High Commissioner of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. And in the fifteenth clause, again, Catholic members of corporations were excepted from voting as to the disposal of Church livings in the gift of corporations. Those were the exceptions mentioned in the bill; but they did not include the right for which he contended.

He would not detain the House by going minutely through the Act. He would rest his claim upon the tenth clause, which conferred the right of exercising every civil right upon Catholics. If he should be asked, whether the right of sitting and voting in Parliament were a civil right, he would reply, if it might be permitted, by asking another question—namely, "If it be not a civil right, what is it?" He had looked through the law books, and he found that Blackstone divided the entire law into rights and wrongs, and amongst the civil rights he classed the privileges of sitting and voting in Parliament. But he would appeal to the common sense and understanding of men. Was it not a civil right? Must it not be a civil right? In

this very statute itself civil and military rights were contradistinguished. Thus there was in the act itself a clue to the meaning of the act. If he went out of the act, and referred to those authorities which decided the meaning of words in the English language, he found that the words "civil rights" included every right of the description for which he was now contending. "Civil," according to Dr. Johnson, was an adjective which meant "relating to the community; political; relating to the city or government." Now, political and civil were just the same thing, only that one was derived from the Latin, and the other from the Greek. What he claimed was a political right. No man could deny that it was a political right to sit and vote in Parliament. One of the examples which Dr. Johnson gave showed that "civil" and "political" bore the same meaning. The example was—"But there is another unity which would be most advantageous to our country, and that is your endeavour after a civil, a political union in the whole nation." This definition proved that the tenth clause necessarily included such a right as that which he claimed. He now came to the definition of the word "right." Dr. Johnson said it was a noun substantive, meaning, first, a "just claim;" next, "that which justly belonged to one;" next, "property, interest;" next, "power, prerogative;" next, "immunity, privilege." In short, there was not one of those significations which was not more comprehensive than he desired it to be. In reference to the signification of "just claim," Dr. Johnson gave this definition: "The Roman citizens were by the sword taught to acknowledge the Pope their Lord, though they knew not by what right." There was a plain definition of the meaning of the language of the tenth clause where it spoke of "civil right." It could not mean "franchise;" for that was already included. It could not mean "property," for that was already included under the twenty-third clause, which provided, "that from and after the passing of this act, no oath or oaths shall be tendered to, or required to be taken by, his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, for enabling them to hold or enjoy

any real or personal property, other than such as may by law be tendered to and required to be taken by his Majesty's other subjects." It was evident, therefore, that the words of the tenth clause did not mean franchise or property, but a just claim to protection, privilege, and immunity of any kind whatever. Thus, then, common sense showed what the law sanctioned, that the phrase "civil rights" must necessarily include the right to speak and vote in that House.

Another observation (continued the hon. and learned gentleman) is, that this section relates to the time and manner of taking the oaths; but suppose I were to concede that no time and manner are expressed, yet the civil right being granted under the oaths directed, and the time and manner being the only condition, necessarily would supply the condition. We have in the nineteenth section the mode of taking the oaths for corporate offices, and in the twentieth, the time and manner of taking the oaths for other offices; but I will not detain the House upon that point, because in the twenty-third section the legislature has wisely provided for the case; it declares, "that the oath herein appointed and set forth, being taken and subscribed in any of the courts, or before any of the persons above-mentioned, shall be of the same force and effect, to all intents and purposes, as, and shall stand in the place of, all oaths and declarations, required or prescribed by any law now in force for the relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects from any disabilities, incapacities, or penalties." That is the second portion of the twenty-third section, and in one mode of punctuation it will bear the meaning I attribute to it. However, as there is no punctuation in acts of parliament, I shall not trouble the House with any special pleading on particular words; but come to the remaining and distinct portion of the section: "And the proper officer of any of the courts above-mentioned, in which any person professing the Roman Catholic religion shall demand to take and subscribe the oath herein appointed and set forth, is hereby authorised and required to administer the said oath to such person; and such officer shall make, sign, and de-

liver a certificate of such oath having been duly taken and subscribed." There is the time, and that time is when it is demanded. The courts are also specified—viz. the King's Bench, Common Pleas, Exchequer, and Chancery. The time is as universal as the benefit of the statute was intended to be, and everything is complete for my purpose. The objection vanishes, because the time is as extensive as can be demanded. I have taken that oath in one of the courts named. I am ready to prove it. I produced the certificate at the table, and have taken that oath, and produced that certificate. I now turn round and respectfully ask, why I am not to be allowed to exercise my rights? Let it be remembered that my case cannot be drawn into precedent: it can never occur again; and I ask the House, in construing the act, whether it intends to make it an outlawry against a single individual? (*Hear, hear.*) If the act were meant to meet my case, why was not my case specified in it? It existed when the act was passed; it was upon the records of the house, for a committee had sat while the bill was pending, and had given in its report upon oath. Why, I ask again, was not my case specified? Simply, because it was not intended to be included. Where, then, is the individual who would think it ought to be included? Let me call the attention of the House to the recital of the statute: "Whereas, by various Acts of Parliament certain restraints and disabilities affecting Roman Catholics;" and proceeds—"And whereas it is expedient that such restraints and disabilities shall be henceforth discontinued: and whereas by various acts certain oaths and certain declarations, &c., are or may be required to be taken, made, and subscribed by the subjects of his Majesty as qualifications for sitting and voting in Parliament, and for the enjoyment of certain offices, franchises, and civil rights: Be it enacted, &c., that such restraints and disabilities shall be from henceforth discontinued." All are to be discontinued. What do I claim? That they shall be discontinued. It is a maxim of law that the recital of a statute shall not control the enactments; but with this qualification, that, although a particular

recital cannot control a general enactment, there is no rule of law that a general recital shall not explain a particular enactment. But I have a general recital, and a general enactment, too, in my favour. If to sit and vote be not a civil right, what civil right was intended by the word; for every other is provided for? Why should this be excluded? Look at the recital and look at the intention of the statute, and shall I then be told that a doubt can arise as to the right to sit and vote? If I have not that right, what is to be done? Is the statute of Charles II., enabling the house to exclude me, still in force? What is to become of me? Am I to remain the representative for Clare? Will the House not let me in, and is it not able to turn me out? What, I ask again, is to become of me? I call the attention of the house to that—what is to become of me? (*Hear, and a laugh*). The statute of Charles II. imposed penalties for not taking the oaths and signing the declaration; among others there was a pecuniary penalty, and it continued in force until the Union with Ireland. The first question I would ask the lawyers of the House, then, is this—did the Union Act continue those penalties? I take upon me to say it did not. Then, I ask, can any penalty or punishment be continued on a free-born British subject, when an Act of Parliament, like that of the Union, is silent, and contains no enactment as to penalty? That is a question of constitutional law; and if I were sued to-morrow for the penalty of £500 in a court of justice, I should, of course, instantly demur. If I am right in that position—if the penalty of £500 could not be recovered, shall the greater infiction remain? When courts of justice would refuse to enforce the fine, shall this House take the law into its own hands, and deprive me of what ought to be infinitely more precious—the right to sit and vote as the representative of a divided, a disinterested, and, I had almost said, a martyred people? The Union statute, I apprehend, would alone be sufficient, but I do not stand on that merely. This Relief Bill has abolished the oaths and declaration, and abolished with it the punishment for not taking the one and

subscribing the other. If the declaration be abolished, does the pecuniary penalty remain? I answer, no; and if the pecuniary penalty do not remain, does the heavier penalty of exclusion continue? Certainly not; and I respectfully submit to the House that it has not now jurisdiction to prevent the exercise of my civil right of sitting and voting here. I acknowledge that I should take the oath prescribed by the Relief Bill; and, then, let any individual, by favour of justice, bring an action against me, and if the court should determine that I ought to pay the penalty of £500, my exclusion follows as a matter of course. The House should consider that this is a large and comprehensive enactment; and I ask why this House should interfere in my case, and not leave it to the courts of justice? I do not want this House to submit its privileges to the decision of any court or tribunal in existence; but I wish to show that the House, by deciding with me, could not preclude anybody from trying the question legally. It is to put my case into that transfer of decision that I am arguing here; that is the utmost I struggle for. The question is: is it not my right, on this return, to take the seat to which I have been duly elected? Is the question free from doubt? If there be a doubt, I am entitled to the benefit of that doubt. I maintain that I have a constitutional right, founded on the return of the sheriff and the voice of the people; and if there be a doubt on the subject, it should be removed. The statute comes before us to be construed from the first clause. I did—and I am not ashamed to own it—I did defer to the opinion of others, and was averse from calling for that construction; and if it had not been for the interests of those who sent me here, my own right should have been buried in oblivion. But now I require the House to consider it. Will you decide that a civil right does not mean a civil right? And if this case of mine be not excepted, will you add it as an additional exception? It might have been said by some of those who supported the bill, that it was intended by that measure to compensate a nation for by-gone wrongs, and to form the foundation stone of a solid and sub-

stantial building, to be consecrated to the unity and peace of the empire. But if what is certain may be disturbed; if what words express may be erased; if civil rights may be determined not to be civil rights; if we are to be told that, by some excuse or by some pretext, what is not uncertain may be made so, we shall be put under an impossibility to know what construction we must hereafter place on the statutes. I have endeavoured to treat this House with respect. My title to sit in it is clear and plain; and I contend that the statute is all-comprehensive in its intention, in its recital, and in its enactments. It comprehends every principle and measure of relief, with such exceptions as are thereinafter excepted. But while I show my respect for this House, I stand here on my right, and claim the benefit of it.

The hon. and learned gentleman then bowed to the house and withdrew, amidst loud and general cheering.

Subject, ADDRESS ON THE KING'S SPEECH;

Date, FEBRUARY 4, 1830.

In O'Connell's first speech in Parliament he distinctly avers that he is sent there by and for the people of Ireland, but, while pleading specially for them, and watching their interests jealously, he touches with a master hand on all subjects of political interest.

Mr. O'Connell said, he did not presume to think that either redress to the people or instruction to the House could follow from the few observations which he should trespass on the House on the present occasion. The people had sent him there to do their business, and in the discharge of his duty he felt that he was authorised to express his humble opinion as to the state of the country. In the discharge of that duty also he might have to address them oftener than he could wish; and the only compensation that he could make was, to promise to be as brief as he possibly could. He had now to address himself to the speech from the throne, of which he felt himself bound to speak in as harsh terms as he might consistently with the respect to which it was entitled. It was entitled to respect as emanating

from the king, and the king's name was a tower of strength; it was entitled to courtesy, as proceeding from the noble duke at the head of State affairs and of the Government; and on these accounts he should treat it with respect and courtesy, but when he looked at what the document was in itself, he felt warranted in saying that anything so unsatisfactory in its propositions, and so meagre in its details, could scarcely have been concocted or conceived (*hear*). The seconder of the Address, in his observations, had alluded to France and America. Did he think that in France, with his few instructions, such a speech would have been endured by the real representatives of that people? (*hear*). Or did he think that a message from the chief magistrate of the Americans containing such jejune and empty statements, would have been tolerated for a moment? (*hear*). Let the House contrast it with the message that had lately been sent by the President of the United States. Let them look at the minuteness of detail, let them look at the wise suggestions which that message contained, and then compare it with the speech which they then had before them. Would any one pretend to tell him that if that House really represented the people at large, such a speech would ever have been offered to their consideration? (*hear*). What did it contain? The first point was, that foreign nations continued to speak in terms of peace; but did they ever do otherwise when a war was on the point of breaking out, or even when the war itself had actually commenced? The next information was, that the Russian war was at an end. That was an important discovery, indeed; and, of course, none of them knew that before (*a laugh*). They were then told that nothing was determined as to Portugal. And why? Ah! they were not told that (*hear*). Was the character of Don Miguel then doubtful? Did any one doubt that he had usurped the throne of another, and endeavoured to cement his seat by the spilling of innocent blood? (*hear*). If so, why did the Government of England shrink from the decision to which it ought to come? They were next told of the partial distress of the country. But was that a fact? He thought that the ex-

pressions which had fallen from the three hon. members on the other side who had supported the Address were—the one, that the distress was general; the second, that the distress was extraordinary; and the third, that the distress was overwhelming (*laughter and cries of “hear, hear”*). The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, had made one happy discovery; he had found an “oasis in a desert”—a country where no distress at all existed; and, who would have thought it? that country was Ireland (*laughter*). He had lately been in Ireland, but anything more astonishing he certainly had never heard in his life. Was it then not true, that there were seven thousand registered persons in Dublin alone actually living on three-halfpence a day, and that even that miserable pittance was almost exhausted—the first subscription (with the Lord Lieutenant at the head), amounting to £3,500, and the second to no more than £300? Why, if this were true, what very cruel landlords, what very stingy agriculturists must Ireland contain that they should be in such a state of prosperity, and not even contribute a farthing to such miserable objects of pity (*hear*). He did not like to pledge himself to any statement of facts as to every part of the country, but he pretty well knew three provinces in Ireland—the provinces of Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, and he knew that the agriculturists in those three provinces were suffering the greatest distress. In many parts of those provinces the rents were paid, not out of the profits of the land, but out of the capital of the farmer. There had been various instances in which the rents had been obtained only by levying an execution, and by the sale even of the very blankets with which the unfortunate tenant had been covered. In the production of that distress, as far as the information went, many causes concurred, but unquestionably the state of the currency was one of those causes. He felt that he had a right to complain of the omission of all allusions to these circumstances in the speech; and he felt that he had a right to complain that all allusion to the state of Ireland was omitted in that speech, and that it was alluded to only in a kind of parenthesis in the

speech of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. gentleman had given a pledge on the part of his Majesty's Government that they would not propose any measure of interference with the currency. He (Mr. O'Connell) was convinced that they could not adhere to the pledge without diminishing the taxation of the country, and reducing it not by candle-ends and cheese-parings, but by millions upon millions (*hear, hear*). Instead of keeping up a taxation of sixty millions, if we preserved a gold currency, we must cut that taxation to fifteen or twenty millions (*hear*). Let that be done; and then the currency might be maintained in its present state. Among the great causes it did not contain so accurate an estimate of the actual state of the country as was to be found in the amendment. He thought it a material circumstance in the present state of universal disquietude and dissatisfaction that prevailed, not to provoke a hostile discussion between the representatives of the people and the people themselves, and not to call down on the House of Commons reproach by understanding the distress and difficulty of the time. The best course to be adopted in order to meet and overcome these difficulties was to look at and avow them fairly. He was not one of those who thought them so great as they had been represented in many quarters—he did not despair of seeing the country restored to a situation of prosperity; but from all the information he possessed, he felt satisfied that there now existed that degree of pressure on the productive classes generally, which, were it to be permanent or long continued, would be incompatible with their continuous existence (*hear*). He was of opinion that the country, as far as the productive classes were concerned, was in an unsatisfactory and suffering, but he trusted and believed not in decaying and falling state. If Parliament looked at the subject properly, and acted, it was no part of the intention of the hon. baronet, or of any other gentleman, to propose an amendment; but an amendment having been moved, and a debate having arisen upon it, he felt called upon, without reference to the possibility of prospective arrangements, which might be for consideration hereafter, to express his opinion on

the subject with reference to the simple matter of fact as to the state of the country, which was the real question at issue. If the question were as to any particular mode of relief, it would be equally unwise and unbecoming to go into it when assembled to thank his Majesty for his gracious speech; accordingly, from anything of that sort he should cautiously abstain. But after what he had heard from the noble mover and hon. seconder of the proposed Address, after all that had fallen from those who had subsequently addressed the House, and from his own knowledge of facts, he felt bound to state his opinion that the real facts of the case, as regarded the public distress, were more correctly stated in the amendment moved by the hon. baronet than in the Address proposed by the noble lord (*hear*). Entertaining that opinion, whatever might be his wish to abstain from anything upon this occasion, he was no longer at liberty to support an Address which should be satisfied. He looked forward to the existing distress with satisfaction in one point of view—it would cause the people to raise their voice aloud, and demand a radical and complete reform. He had now made some confession of his political faith. From the people he came; they had sent him thither to do the work of the people. He should support the amendment proposed by the hon. baronet the member for Kent; and if that were lost, he wished to propose a resolution to the effect that the existence of distress being admitted, and that this distress not being caused by any fault of the people, it was the first duty of the House to inquire into its causes, with a view to affording radical and satisfactory relief of all parties.

He would then move (supposing his resolution to be adopted) that the House do sit from day to day until it had ascertained the causes of the public distress (*cheers and laughter*). Mr. Huskisson said, there had been already one amendment proposed, and notice given of no fewer than three others. He was far from censuring the practice of proposing amendments on such occasions as the present. He came down to the House altogether ignorant of the contents of his Majesty's Speech, and

equally ignorant of the economy, or perseverance in the people? Certainly not; the people of England were possessed of all these qualities in an eminent degree, and yet they were distressed. What was the cause of this? It was to be found not in the people, but in the misgovernment to which they had been subjected. One salutary effect to the existing distress would probably be, that it would deprive the administration of the confidence of the people. If they met in their cities and counties, and made use of a gentle and constitutional compulsion towards ministers, ministers would yield, and a salutary reform would be the consequence. As he had before stated, we should have a thorough reform of the law. Talk not of modifying the game laws, for instance, but abolish that cruel code altogether which now filled our prisons. There should be an investigation of the state of the representation, with a view to render it satisfactory to the people, who if properly represented could not complain with justice of the measures adopted by Parliament. If the people, instead of being properly or even partially represented, were left unrepresented—if there was a traffic in boroughs to fill up the ranks of the ministerial legions, it could not be expected that the distress of the people were the abuses existing in the courts of law. Those abuses ought to be corrected equally in the courts of common law, in the courts of equity, in the courts of admiralty, and in the ecclesiastical courts. He, therefore, warmly approved of that passage in the speech in which his Majesty stated that “his attention had been of late earnestly directed to various important considerations connected with improvements in the general administration of the law.” That was the solitary passage in the whole of the speech which met with his cordial approbation. There must be reforms in the law, the present piebald system of equity, common law, of the ecclesiastical and admiralty courts (different in each) must be simplified and assimilated. He offered his humble meed of sincere thanks to the right hon. secretary (Mr. Peel) for his successful attempts to break down some of the legal defects which deformed the system. But we should proceed further; banish the barbarities of the special

pleadings, and cause all our courts to act upon one consistent and defined principle. That distress existed in many places must be admitted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted its existence in England. What was the cause of this? Was it owing to want of industry, intelligence? The speech recommended they would find themselves fully competent to cope with the existing difficulties and to overcome them. But it was by studying to benefit to the utmost the industrious classes that we could alone lay any solid foundation of public happiness or revive prosperity. There were many things difficult to be accounted for in our present condition, but which Parliament would do well to attend to. Some gentlemen attributed the distress to a supposed deficiency in the currency, a proposition which he thought it would be difficult to maintain, for we now saw money more abundant in this metropolis than at any former period; we saw Exchequer bills, producing two-and-a-quarter per cent. interest, selling at a premium of £75, and we saw the low rate at which money was every day borrowed. The fact was, there was a stagnation in several parts of our productive industry, and an overflow of capital in others. It was a cause of satisfaction to observe that the produce of our exports last year exceeded the exports of any preceding year; but at the same time we knew that the capital and property so employed had in many instances been unproductive. It would be difficult to reconcile the two facts of a deficient currency and a low rate of profit. In almost all branches of productive industry the profits were so small as not to compensate for the amount of capital employed, or afford sufficient support to the individuals whose labour was required. There must be some irregularity of action in our condition. Circumstanced as we were, to propose to increase the currency would be similar to recommending an individual, subject to too great and rapid an action of the blood, to drink a quantity of brandy. He would not support the hon. baronet's motion, if by so doing he should be thought to imply an assent to some of the doctrines urged by its supporters. So far was he from concurring in those doctrines, that he had heard with satisfaction what fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer

in answer to them. He was satisfied that among the causes of disquietude and dissatisfaction that existed, were the delusive hopes, the unfounded apprehensions, and general anxiety, that must prevail in a country, so long as that which formed the measure of value with respect to property was subject to doubt and change. If, then, we had even been in error (which he was far from admitting, but maintained the contrary) in 1819, 1825, or 1826, it would be better to persevere than to unsettle the state of the country by again tampering with the currency. It was to other means that the country must look for relief. An unsettled state of the public mind was one of the greatest evils that could befall a country. He did not collect from the speech of the hon. baronet that any member was required to commit himself to particular measures if he supported the amendment. His right hon. friend hinted that distress was not so general as the amendment would make it appear; but all his ingenuity could not prove that the distress was confined to some particular parts of the country, as the Address stated. The productive classes generally were in a state of distress. He believed that this was owing to causes, to many of which it was beyond the power of Parliament to apply a remedy; but it was in their power to satisfy the country as to what the causes were, and to afford partial relief by giving a better direction to the capital of the country; upon that point he differed materially from the hon. seconder to the Address. The hon. member seemed to hint that the reduction of the rate of interest in some of the higher denominations of the public securities would operate favourably, but it appeared to him that even that reduction was far from being an unmixed good. The amendment had been described to be a "milk-and-water amendment," but that rather recommended it to his support (*hear and laughter*). He did not wish to enter into the large field of foreign politics, but he might observe, in passing, that his Majesty's Speech merely stated that the war between Russia and Turkey had terminated. This was the statement of a fact, it had been said, before known; but such statements were not

uncommon in speeches from the throne. For his part, he was glad that it was stated simply that the war had terminated, without any explanation of the mode by which that termination had been effected (*hear and applause*). It was a received principle, that the independence of Turkey was necessary to the maintenance of a just balance of power in Europe, and that circumstance did throw upon Government the *onus* of showing that there was nothing in the treaty between Turkey and Russia contrary to this principle.

However, when the documents were before the House, it would be time enough for them to discuss how far the spirit of the treaty of the 16th of July had been preserved. Up to the arrival of the Russians in Adrianople, no great progress appeared to have been made in the cause of the Greeks. With respect to Portugal, whatever disposition there had been, during the two last sessions, to abstain from looking into the question of our foreign relations, he hoped that we should no longer avoid an inquiry which it was necessary for the character of the country to make (*hear*). A recognition of Don Miguel had been hinted at, but if it was carried into effect we ought to receive more information on the subject than we had obtained last session. Till we had obtained further information, we were not in a situation to investigate whether (not merely in reference to the question of legal right, but with regard to the honour of the country, and our ancient alliance with Portugal) we had properly discharged all our obligations.

He had witnessed with great regret in his Majesty's Speech, which ought to advert to all matters of general interest, an omission of all reference to war waging in another hemisphere.

There was a treaty of peace and amity between this country and Mexico, and he should have thought that the efforts made to prevent the industry of that country from taking a natural direction, that the attempts at a predatory warfare, inconsistent with the revival of industry in Mexico, and other states of the New Continent, inconsistent with the interests of commerce and navigation, hostile to the proper management of the mines of

South America, which it was our interest to have as productive as possible,—he thought that these were matters which required some notice, and he should have been glad to hear that his Majesty continued to use endeavours for the restoration of peace, tranquillity, and security in the new states, in the prosperity of which this country had the greatest possible interest.

It was not the interest of trade and commerce that were alone concerned; the matter did not relate to this country only. Europe had the greatest possible interest that South America should be in a state of tranquillity and independence, and that those states should be made valuable and useful civilized societies. There was a time when these states looked up to this country as a power ready to rescue them from impending dangers—not by military demonstrations, but by its good offices, of which they were worthy as far as they could be exerted, if not in reference to their peace and tranquillity, yet with reference to our own interest.

The omission of the speech had been complained of;—it did not advert to Ireland. He did not pretend to know with any degree of accuracy the state of Ireland.

He should have thought that after the great act of justice of last session, we might have been told whether that measure had produced all the good which he for one had anticipated. He believed it had produced great benefits; he believed that such had been the effect of that great measure of justice, conciliation, and relief, which was so strongly recommended in the Royal Speech of last session. It was not matter of surprise with him, therefore, that Ireland did not hold so prominent a position as some gentlemen appeared to suppose it ought; but it was a matter of surprise to him that the effect of this measure had not been mentioned. He concluded by declaring that he felt himself bound in justice to support the amendment, because it expressed the facts of the case with more justice to the feelings of the House, and to the duty which the throne and the country had a right to expect from them, than the original Address.

Subject, THE ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS; *Date*, FEBRUARY 8, 1830.

The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell said the hon. member for Surrey had proposed the abolishment of the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. To this he (Mr. O'Connell) objected. There were seven thousand persons in Dublin living on the charity of three halfpence a day; and if the Duke of Northumberland did not spend his thirty thousand pounds a year (which he drew from this country) among them, there would be many more in the same condition, or those seven thousand would be still worse off. If the hon. gentleman wanted reduction, let him begin with the Lords of the Bedchamber, the Lords of the Admiralty, or the Lords of the Treasury, and he should have his most cordial assistance.

Subject, IRISH NEWSPAPERS; *Date*, FEBRUARY 11, 1830.

Mr. O'Connell moved for "Returns of the number of stamps issued to each newspaper in Ireland for one year, ending 5th January, 1830; and of the sums paid to newspapers in Ireland from 5th January, 1829, to 5th January, 1830, for printing proclamations; distinguishing the sums paid to each newspaper by title, and place of publication."—Ordered.

Subject, SUB-LETTING ACT; *Date*, FEBRUARY 18, 1830.

The population of Ireland not demoralized.

Mr. O'Connell, in presenting a petition from several parishes in Dublin against the Sub-letting Act, said that the population of Ireland was not a demoralized population. On the contrary, it was the most moral population in Europe. He instanced the last Commission for the city and county of Dublin, when only eleven persons were tried for felony, and the last Quarter Sessions for the county of Dublin, when not one person was so tried.

Subject, PARLIAMENTARY REFORM; *Date*, FEBRUARY 18, 1830.

State of the House of Commons—Disfranchisement of old Boroughs.

This subject did not attract much attention in Ireland, as the national representation had been settled at the Union, but it caused the highest excitement in England. O'Connell came forward prominently on all subjects of Reform.

On the 22nd February O'Connell spoke in the debate on the Army Estimates. He said "the presence of the army in Ireland was wanted for no other object than to protect the people from the outrages of the yeomanry."

Same date.—He proposed abolishing the Game Laws entirely.

On the 5th March he made a telling speech on the Ballot.

Mr. O'Connell said, he certainly should not have risen at that late hour, had he not been pointedly alluded to by his hon. friend, the member for Westminster (Mr. Hobhouse). On a former occasion he did most cheerfully join in hunting down the mangy wolf, and now he would as readily join in the pursuit of the remaining portion of the flock. [This allusion of the hon. and learned gentleman was to the conclusion of a speech of his own in the discussion some days before, on a motion respecting the Borough of East Retford.] If they had scotched one wolf, they certainly ought not to let the others escape. As for the committee of twenty-one, he was as little disposed to support it as the right hon. secretary. He was decidedly of opinion that no authority short of the Legislature itself should possess the power of disfranchising boroughs or cities—but these details were matters of secondary importance—he looked to the principle of the measure; it was a Bill to secure the popular representation of the people, and beyond that it was a Bill to exclude placemen and pensioners from Parliament; as such he would support it, though he confessed that the plan for paying the representatives of the people did not meet his approbation. He neither wished for wages from the people, nor for salaries from the crown. But when the right hon. secretary talked of the wages as so likely to alienate the confidence of the people, he should have remembered that seventy-eight members

of that House received £180,000 of the public money. No doubt all these were right honourable men, and conscientious men; and yet, when all of them gave a conscientious vote, they felt heavy consequences; witness the fate of the hon. and gallant member for Sligo. Whether a Groom of the Bedchamber, or holding a higher or a lower office, the moment he presumed to give a conscientious vote, that moment the hand of the king himself struck his name out from amongst the household. Within a short space he was in and out of office; he voted for his conscience and against his interest; and immediately thereupon a new writ is moved for the place represented by his successor in office, who, no doubt, was also a conscientious man; but let him beware how he yielded to the dictates of his conscience. If he dared to oppose the minister he must resign office instantly. As a representative of the people he must denounce—his sense of duty called upon him to denounce—any man who, for his services in that House, took money either from the crown or from any other quarter; but though opposed to the principle of payment, he would call upon the House, in the name of the country, to accede to the great principle of popular representation. It was a matter of the most complete notoriety that two hundred and forty-three members of that House were nominated by Peers, one hundred and fifty-nine by Commoners, and that twenty-two sat for Treasury boroughs; thus there were four hundred and twenty-four with seats in that House who were anything but the representatives of the people;—one hundred and thirty-four were all who really represented the people.

This statement he made from information obtained so far back as the year 1793; humble and insignificant an individual as he was in himself, he would challenge any man to meet him on that ground, and he would pledge himself to prove the accuracy of his statement. Since the period to which he referred there had been an accession to the House of one hundred members, and certainly that circumstance did not tend to augment the proportion of representatives of the people. Among

the Irish members he could find only twenty-one who were popularly elected, or rather, he should say, who were not nominated by individuals. Now the question which the House would decide by its vote that night was, whether or not that state of the representation was constitutional or otherwise. He would say, that all who paid taxes directly or indirectly were entitled to a vote in the election of the representatives who were to dispose of those taxes. As a radical reformer he would always maintain that principle. He would, as a reformer, appeal in support of it to the great principle of democratic liberty, which made England the great and productive country which she had been for centuries. France and Spain were broader, and not less fertile, but it was the great spirit of democracy which made the land of smaller dimensions overtop those which possessed the blessings of nature and all physical advantages, without the moral benefit of free institutions. Yes, he would repeat, it was that democratic spirit which had imparted to her all of national glory that she ever possessed. He would not refer to ancient states—those would be mere schoolboys' recollections; but he would ask, what gave to Venice eight hundred years of glory abroad and happiness at home but the same democratic spirit? What but the same spirit gave four hundred years of freedom to the wild mountains of Switzerland, and enabled her sons by their irresistible valour to bear down the iron chivalry of Europe? What gave the States of Northern America the prosperity, the wealth, and the solid glory which were raising them to an elevated station among the nations of the earth? what but the spirit of democratic freedom! That spirit, then, he would invoke for the resuscitation of England, for giving security to the throne, and placing the national prosperity upon a permanent basis. What was the result of the present system? They had £800,000,000 of debt—and then to meet that, they had a pleasant speech from the right hon. secretary, and a stale jest from the hon. member for Wootton Bassett (Mr. Twiss), towards whom he meant no personal disrespect: that was all the public would have in the newspapers to-morrow. Of the

great principles of Reform, he had that night heard nothing which could induce him to alter his views. He never could be brought to believe that two hundred individuals were better judges of the interests of the people than the people themselves. He hoped that as the French Budget had been rejected, so would the supplies be refused by that House till the prospects of a liberal system were held out. Every day he lived he was the more and more convinced that nothing could be more debasing than the present system of representation. When he saw gentlemen, otherwise of the highest honour, from the mere contact and association corrupted to the purposes of an oligarchical tyranny, he could not bring himself to speak of the system but with abhorrence and disgust. He raised his voice on behalf of the people; he called upon the House, which had shorn the talons of the monarchy, to use its power to cut short the fell fangs of the oligarchical faction which lorded it over the land. Let the House but do that, and it would have little difficulty in giving to the Constitution its pristine and genuine form.

Subject, DISTRESS IN THE IRON TRADE; Date, MARCH 9, 1830.

One of O'Connell's most telling speeches on the vagrants.

Mr. O'Connell thought that, if Irish vagrants were to be driven from this country, their deportation should be provided for at the expense, not of the country to which they were going, but of that in which they had spent their life and enriched by their labour. It would be cruel on those men, after having spent their youth in the service of England, to send them back in their old age to starve in Ireland, or be a burthen on a land they had voluntarily quitted. There was another class of vagrants he should like to see transported to Ireland. He meant the rich vagrants, who collected their rents in that country, to spend them in foreign lands.

Subject, THE POOR OF IRELAND; Date, MARCH 11, 1830.

The moral tone of the Irish peasantry suspicious. General Gascoigne had proposed to imprison Irish immigrants. Mr. Brownlow complained of the "frightful reckless manner in which the Irish increased the population."

Mr. O'Connell begged to notice an expression which had fallen from the hon. member for Shrewsbury. The expression was calumnious; and although he was sure the hon. member had not so intended it, yet he felt it necessary to notice and to correct the expression. The hon. member had talked about raising the moral character of the Irish peasantry. Now he begged leave to tell the hon. member, that, by the example of England, this could not be done. On the contrary, while crime was rapidly increasing in England, it was on the decrease in Ireland. With respect to the subject before the House, he would not detain it by any observations of his upon it. He would only remind the House that the distress, which was on all hands admitted to exist in Ireland, prevailed among an industrious and numerous population, who were blest with a most fertile soil. Would it be said that no remedy could be applied to distress in such a country as that?

Subject, COALS AND TAXATION; Date, MARCH 17, 1830.

Ireland taxed in her poverty.

Mr. O'Connell said the hon. member forgot one material circumstance, which made a great difference between the two countries. Ireland paid from £4,000,000 to £7,000,000 in rents, which were spent out of Ireland and principally in England. If that sum were spent in Ireland, it would increase her capital, encourage her manufactures, and call forth some of those natural advantages which she possessed. Ireland could then be taxed in her own wealth, and the Irish would not object

to that, but now she was taxed in her poverty, and to that she had many objections. England, possessing immense resources, had obtained a remission of taxation to the amount of £3,400,000; while Ireland, poor and harassed, instead of any relief, except the small relief derived from the repeal of the leathern tax—and owing to the poverty of her children, that will not be much—Ireland is to have an additional burthen of £150,000; He hoped, however, that the relative situation of Ireland to England would not long remain as at present.

Colonel Davies said, he, like the right hon. baronet (Sir John Newport), would not assimilate the taxes of the two countries, by raising those of Ireland, but by lowering the taxes of England. If there was a large portion of rent from Ireland spent in this country, let it also be recollected that England afforded at all times, a ready market for the produce of Ireland. If it were possible that the ports of the two countries should be hermetically sealed against each other, Ireland would be a great deal worse off than at present.

Motion agreed to.

Subject, A PETITION FOR REPEAL OF THE UNION;

Date, MARCH 22, 1830. -

O'Connell denied that the petition was sectarian. One of the signatures was that of a Protestant. As to the question respecting the Repeal of the Union, he was not aware that any expressions had fallen from him on the subject which could be construed into a disposition that he sought illegally to effect that object. It would, indeed, be unbecoming in him, to use any other than constitutional language on such a subject; but nothing under heaven should deter him from looking forward to what would be at once highly useful and beneficial to Ireland, and not at all injurious to this country.

Subject, DISTRESS OF THE COUNTRY ; *Date*, MARCH 23, 1830.

The distress of Ireland no subject for Parliamentary amusement.—Cause of the distress in Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell said he felt that some apology was due from him to the House for having been one of the persons who protracted this debate beyond the third evening ; but he had an apology, and a strong one, in the sense of the duty he owed his constituents, and in the conviction that the subject ought not to be disposed of without the House being made acquainted with the great and unusual distress of the people of Ireland. The members of that kingdom constituted more than one-seventh of the whole House of Commons, but yet, with the exception of the hon. member for Louth (Mr. L. Foster), not one of them had said a word on the question. He avowed that, as he felt it his duty, so he should make it his object to support one or other of the motions for inquiry. A plain case had been made out for inquiry, which was all he demanded. Although he thought that the original motion was the more dignified and useful, yet, if any good reason appeared for preferring the amendment, he was prepared to vote for that. His reasons for supporting inquiry were these : It was generally admitted that there was very great distress in England. That fact had been admitted by the right hon. Secretary of State ; and it was impossible to controvert it, unless it could be proved that the petitions, greater in number than had ever before been presented to the House, were a mass of misrepresentation. It was also alleged that there was distress in Scotland ; not so great as in England, but still of awful magnitude. That there was distress in Ireland was equally indisputable. Early in the session he had made that statement. It had not since been contradicted ; but, on the contrary, had been confirmed. He had declared that there was great distress in Dublin, in Cork, and in Bandon, and to these, he was sorry to say, that he was now able to add, in Drogheda, in Newry, and in Kilkenny. He had previously declared, and the declaration had been subsequently but too

well established, that in Ireland hundreds and thousands of the people were in a state of starvation. The entire agricultural population of Ireland (and in Ireland the population was almost solely agricultural) was in the deepest distress; except in those spots in which the wheat farmers had more than usually good crops last year. The condition of the grazing counties of Ireland was such that cattle purchased a twelvemonth ago were sold for less than they cost, so that all the expense of their food for that period was sacrificed. The only Irish member who had spoken in this discussion was the right hon. member for Louth, who had been pleased to say that, although in particular instances he (Mr. O'Connell) was right in his statement of distress in Ireland, yet that the general rule was the other way. He had, however, waited in vain to hear some proofs of that assertion. The right hon. gentleman had been seeking for information with respect to the alleged distress in Ireland. Now, there were two classes of persons who sought for information—the one who sought where it was to be found, and the other who sought where it was not to be found. The right hon. gentleman ranked among the latter. He inquired respecting the condition of the people from the Receiver of the Court of Chancery. Now, it was well known that in the collection of rents those receivers received only one half year without the other. At the time, therefore, at which the right hon. gentleman made his inquiry they were only receiving the rents for May, and consequently could know nothing with respect to the ability of the tenants to pay the rent which had subsequently become due. They might fairly say, therefore, that there was then no arrear. But the inference which he drew from that circumstance was the reverse of that drawn from it by the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman then talked of something which he called prosperity at Belfast. It turned out, however, that this supposed prosperity was founded on the fact that some persons in the county of Louth were earning the enormous sum of 4s. a week by weaving for the Belfast manufacturers. What was the case, however, at Drogheda and at

Newry? From Drogheda he (Mr. O'Connell) had presented a petition, declaring that out of 16,000 persons, 8,000 were destitute of the means of subsistence. In Newry also the distress was, to his knowledge, extensive. It was thus clear that there was great distress in England, that there was great distress in Ireland, that there was great distress in Scotland. He called on the House to inquire into that distress. He must not be told that a committee had been already appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland. The committee appointed was only to inquire into the condition of the Irish paupers—not to investigate the general distress of the country—not to ascertain how the property of the industrious classes had been taken from them by an enhancement of the value of the currency, and by other causes. The pauper class, however, was not the only class which required relief; Ireland did not want hospitals and workhouses. The class that never begged was now demanding assistance. The industrious classes required to be relieved from the pressure that weighed them to the earth. The national energies wanted full play, and how were they to receive this—how were the burthens to be removed successfully if the House refused to inquire into their effects? The character of the present distress in Ireland was this:—On former occasions, when the artisans and manufacturers of that country were distressed, and especially when that sickly exotic, the silk manufacture, was distressed, abundant funds were collected by public benevolence for the purpose of affording relief. In the present year, however, instead of as formerly collecting £15,000, £16,000, or £20,000 in Dublin, the whole sum collected was £3,500, of which the Lord Lieutenant had contributed £500. This was a proof that the distress was of a character which stopped the sources of charity, and prevented the benevolent from rendering their benevolence available. This was a new feature in the state of Ireland. Under all these circumstances, the people had a right to ask the House to endeavour to relieve them. For what purpose were they sent there? Not merely to vote large sums of money for the maintenance of our army and navy.

If they were unable to inquire into the distresses of the people, why did they not abdicate a post to which they acknowledged themselves incompetent? It was a confession of their deficiency either in intellect or in honesty. Now, he by no means wished to calumniate the House. He was sure that no persons in that House would abstain from affording relief to the people if they knew how to afford it. He was sure that neither those who delighted in the name of Whigs, nor those who thought themselves honoured by the appellation of Tories, nor the small and sacred band of Radical Reformers to which he boasted of belonging, were deficient in inclination to relieve distress. But was it not proper that an inquiry should be entered into to ascertain how far that general inclination could be gratified? If it were impossible to relieve the people, at least let them not be disappointed of the hoped-for inquiry. The refusal to enter into an inquiry into the distresses of the people afforded a striking contrast to the manner in which the French Parliament had recently behaved under similar circumstances. In their answer to the speech with which the king opened the sessions, that illustrious assembly, which had since had the honour conferred on it of being prorogued because it had declared its determination to vindicate its independence, thus expressed itself: The reduction of the public revenue which your Majesty has announced is a symptom of an afflicting nature; we shall do all in our power to investigate the cause of the distress which it announces. This was a specimen of the real representation of the people which existed in France; a representation connected with oligarchy—with none of those higher, those towering stems which were secure from the storms that blew on the humble shrub, and withered it in its lowliness. But surely it ought not to be said that the gentlemen of England, of Ireland, and of Scotland were not equally willing to inquire what relief could be given to the distressed population of their own countries? Would they abstain from all efforts, and wait patiently on the strand until the tide should come in and float the grounded vessels? Would they leave that to chance which ought to be subjected

.to the dominion of an over-ruling intelligence? The proposition for inquiry had been resisted on various grounds. In the first place, the Vice-President of the Board of Trade said, that Government had already afforded the people relief by taking off taxation. He could not, however, concur in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman that that was a sufficient relief. Three millions of taxes were to be taken off the people of England; but then they were not to be taken off until October. It was an odd species of relief to tell the sufferers that if they survived until the month of October they should then drink beer cheap. So much for the people of England; but what was to be said to the people of Ireland? From the taxation of the people of Ireland the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken off £30,000 or £40,000 in the shape of leather duty. It was well done; and, as far as it went, he was grateful for it; but, then, the right hon. gentleman had added £110,000 on stamps, and £20,000 or £30,000 on spirits.

If, therefore, the Vice-President of the Board of Trade's principle, that to diminish the taxation of the people of England was to diminish their distress, was a good principle, it followed that to increase the taxation of the people of Ireland was to increase their distress. The people of Ireland found it impracticable to bear their present weight of distress; and to make them go more easy, it was proposed to make them carry double.

An admirable plan!

Let it be remembered, however, that it was not an Irish Parliament which had voted this kind of relief. His countrymen did not blunder practically in that way, nor fancy they relieved the people by increasing their burthens. They were said to be of such a happy temperament, that they laughed at distress; the right hon. gentleman seemed determined that they should have enough to laugh at. The hon. member for Newark whose talents he respected, and whom he was sorry to hear ridiculed by an hon. gentleman opposite, had denounced the opinions of the right hon. gentleman on that subject. He would not use so strong a word as denounce; but he would

proclaim that to diminish the distress of England by diminishing the taxation, while we increase the distress by increasing the taxation, was a measure by which the Irish people had just cause loudly to complain. It had been said in that House that Ireland was not taxed so much as she ought to be, in proportion to England. That he denied. Calculating the rental of both countries, he maintained that Ireland, even in paying the four millions which she did pay, was burthened with more than her proportion. Let it be recollected that from four to seven millions of her rental were spent out of the country.

Let it be recollected that she was taxed above a million annually by Grand Jury Presentments and Vestry Cesses.

Did he want to abolish taxation in Ireland? No. What he wanted was inquiry. And was that to be refused, lest its results might be unpleasant to this country, though it would be salutary to Ireland. The principal opposition which the motion had met with was from the Secretary of State for the Home Department. His speech was luminous—the talents of the right hon. gentleman of course rendered it so: but it was also humorous. If there were misery without, there was certainly merriment within doors; and sorry was he to say, that the misery of Ireland had been considered a fit subject for mirth in that House. The spectacle had been presented at one and the same time of perishing artisans and labourers, a facetious Privy Councillor and a laughing Legislature. For his own part, that which entertained others filled him with sorrow. He should have preferred hearing the people told that they should not receive relief, even that no inquiry should be made into the cause of their distress, in the sepulchral tones of the undertaker, rather than with a merriment of manner fit for another stage. After a triumphant reply on the part of the right hon. Secretary of State to the hon. member for Liverpool, he placed the objections to the motion on two grounds—grounds, indeed, which had been repeated over and over again in the course of the debate. The first was, the fear lest the inquiry might be suffered to unsettle the principles of free trade;

the second was the fear lest it should compromise the eternal fixity of the currency. For his part, he thought that we had not enough of either of these matters; that we had not enough of Free Trade, and that we had not enough of currency. The Vice-President of the Board of Trade, in advocating the principles of Free Trade, had said very justly that it was the interest of every country to buy wherever it could obtain a commodity at the cheapest rate. True. But why did the right hon. gentleman forget corn? What article was there which it was so desirable the people should buy cheaply as bread? To talk of the principles of Free Trade, and to maintain the Corn Laws, was absurd and inconsistent. What reason could the right hon. gentleman give for taxing the hon. member for Newark with inconsistency, when he himself advocated the principles of Free Trade; and yet, before he sat down, interposed his shield between the Corn Laws and abolition? Then came a gallant officer, who talked of the advantages of low wages and low prices. But to be advantageous they must be universal. Let the gallant officer repair to the levee-room of an illustrious Field Marshal in full pay, and talk to him of the advantages of low wages. It was a little too much to tell the poor of the advantages of low wages, when they were starving upon them. The gallant officer might find that the commendation of low wages was not always so safe a doctrine as it was in the House of Commons. When that gallant officer led his columns against the enemy, no man could do his duty more bravely or better. But if the gallant officer were to draw up his regiment in a hollow square, and talk to the soldiers of the advantages of low wages, it was not very likely that he would produce conviction, though he might mutiny. The people would feel deeply and long any haughty refusal to go into an inquiry with a view to ascertain how far it might be practicable to relieve them.

With respect to Free Trade, therefore, it appeared that if there was any difference between himself and the opponents of the motion, it was that they thought that those principles had

been carried far enough, and that he did not think so. He pressed those principles as a reason for inquiry. He wished it to be ascertained whether an extension of the principles of Free Trade might not alleviate the distress of the people. Then it was said that the currency was fixed and settled, and could not be altered. He utterly denied that the currency was settled. In fact, it was anything but settled. There was one kind of currency in England, another kind in Scotland, and a third kind in Ireland. With these three variations, to tell the people that the currency was fixed and settled, was to tell them that at which they would laugh. It might be right that the currency should be fixed, but in order to fix it they ought to go into an inquiry to ascertain which of the three systems was the best.

Let him not be accused of a disposition to run into a wilderness of worthless rags; he wished for no such thing; but he called on the House to deliberate on the present state of the currency. Some hon. gentlemen had talked of the spoliation which would ensue, if, after eleven years, an alteration were made in all the bargains concluded in that time, by introducing a change in the circulating medium. The reasoning of these hon. gentlemen was good, but their premises were false. With equal justice might it be asserted by other hon. gentlemen, with reference to England and Scotland, as he asserted with reference to Ireland, that the change of a paper currency into a gold currency had violated all the contracts which had been made since 1797, as all those contracts had been made in a paper currency. For want of such accurate solution of the important problems of the currency, many classes had already been deprived of their property—and in particular one class in Ireland, in behalf of which he desired to say a few words. Since he had been in that House he had several times heard the middle-men in Ireland traduced. He was quite prepared, however, to stand up in their defence.

They mitigated the evils of absenteeism; they gave employment to the labouring poor. In the year 1798, they formed the yeomanry cavalry of Ireland, and prevented the Revolution

of France from spreading to that country. If it had so spread, what, he would ask, would now have been the value of the English funds and of English property? What was the consequence to those individuals of the change which had taken place in the currency? That they, the most industrious members of the community, who had laid out their property in various ways for the improvement of the land, were robbed and deprived of the advantages to which they were entitled, which advantages were given to persons who were not entitled to them. By that change in the currency, the clergy (whose emoluments were settled by no fewer than five Tithe Composition Acts) were in many cases in Ireland receiving a fifth where they ought only to receive a tenth. The difficulties of what was called equitable adjustment had, he thought, been exaggerated; at least he denied that in Ireland the complication which was said to be a good reason for not attempting it was as great as had been supposed.

He was thoroughly convinced that much misery had been occasioned in Ireland by the change which had already taken place; and it was surely desirable to inquire whether that misery might not be alleviated by another change. Let the first instruction to the Committee be, to report upon the Banking System. The right hon. Secretary had gone back to 1793, to show that distress was not caused by his bill; but at that time and at other periods of distress, the people had been relieved by an issue of Exchequer Bills. Why, then, was not that done at present, or an inquiry instituted to prove that it was not necessary? The country was told, indeed, that the recent law on the currency would be useful to future generations, though it inflicted present evils; but for his part, he must confess that he disliked these experiments upon human nature. What was this but the Jacobinical arguments used in the French Revolution—what signified 20,000 heads, or making 20,000 widows and orphans, if the sacrifice had the prospect of making a millennium for the next generation? All he argued for was inquiry, and no changes that were not the result of mature deliberation. The people were not to be told that the legis-

lature had nothing to give them but speeches for three or four nights, the objects of which were to delude them. He entreated the House not to grope about like children in the dark, but to seize the torch of truth, and light it with the flame of patriotism, and he had no doubt that its blaze would direct attention to something advantageous to the country.

Subject, CONSCIENTIOUS SCRUPLES OF THE MILITARY ;

Date, APRIL 30, 1830.

Sir R. Inglis presented a petition to prevent the compulsory attendance of Protestant soldiers at Catholic places of worship. He said:—"He wished there should be no contest between a man's duty to his God and a soldier's duty to his commander"—an observation worth the attention of some modern statesmen. "When Protestantism was in question, it was seen very distinctly that there might be certain circumstances under which duty to Church and State might conflict, and when it did so conflict that conscience should be obeyed. There was just this all-important difference between the case of a Catholic compelled to attend Protestant worship and a Protestant compelled to attend Catholic worship. The Catholic was compelled to do so, as a distinct act of apostacy; his doing so was a sign of submission to a religion to which he had the strongest aversion; it was an act of apostacy, and required from him by the State *as an act of apostacy*. On the rare occasions on which a Protestant soldier attended any Catholic ceremony or service, it was done merely as a civil act of deference to the State or country where he was in service for the time being, and in no sense whatsoever was it either intended or accepted as an act of worship

Sir George Murray spoke on the subject with authority and personal knowledge. He said that when a Scotch regiment quartered in Belfast were prevented from attending the Presbyterian church, the Lord Lieutenant said, "the whole north of Ireland would be in a flame."

This, of course, could not be allowed for a moment. The north of Ireland had strong Orange allies in England—the south was another affair; the religion of the south and west was not popular, and had no powerful supporters; it could be treated with impunity.

In 1807 this officer said special orders had been given to treat the Mahometan religion and religious customs with the utmost respect; "it was for the honour and success of the army." O'Connell spoke briefly and with decision

as he always did for liberty of conscience, and for the respect of the consciences of others. He spoke also (May 4th) in favour of the emancipation of the Jews.

Mr. O'Connell thought the prayer of the petition a very reasonable one. Protestant soldiers ought not to have violence done to their consciences by being compelled to assist at the ceremonies of another religion. The Protestants had been called on by the law to swear that a ceremony was idolatrous, and they were compelled by the same law to fire salutes and do homage in honour of that very ceremony. Men would not be the worse soldiers for being good Christians, and therefore he should recommend the petition to the consideration of the Government.

Mr. O'Connell thought that, so far from an opposition to the bill being a compliment to the Catholics, the only compliment the gallant officer could make to them would be to vote for this bill, and for every measure of religious emancipation. The political reasons which operated with many persons to induce them to oppose the Catholics could have no influence in the case of the Jews, and any opposition to them must be founded on principles of religious intolerance, which the Catholics did not wish to see acted on.

Subject, IRISH CONSTABULARY FORCE ; Date, MAY 4, 1830.

The lives and liberties of Irish people should be respected.

Mr. O'Connell was surprised that the hon. and learned gentleman had expatiated so largely on the subject, as there was no opportunity at the present moment to go into the facts of the case. His (Mr. O'Connell's) only object in the motion which he had just made was, to elicit facts, and to ascertain how many lives of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland had been sacrificed by the employment of an armed police. When he spoke of the lives which had been lost in resistance to the police, he spoke of evil resistance; and he did not mean to say that

lives were lost on all occasions. If, however, a single life were lost in resistance to the police, he had no sympathy with those who did not contemplate with compassion the tears of the orphans and the widow thereby created. Whatever men high in office might think of such occurrences, by him they would always be deeply lamented. He did not know to what the hon. and learned gentleman alluded when he spoke of his (Mr. O'Connell's) assertions respecting him. What he had asserted was derived from persons who had put their assertions into the shape of petitions, and said they were ready to prove them. He had been prevented from bringing the subject forward, because it appeared that, as far as the hon. and learned gentleman was concerned, he had been guilty only of mismanagement, and if so that mismanagement had been favourable to the prisoners. If the hon. and learned gentleman had erred he had erred only in favour of the prisoners. After he had sent the petitions to the noble lord, a book was published which gave a different account of the affair from that which he had originally received, and that induced him to pause until he could ascertain which was the right view of the case. The hon. and learned gentleman courted investigation. He (Mr O'Connell) had not, however, made any declaration in which the hon. and learned gentleman was involved. As to the origin of an affray in which several lives were lost, he knew nothing of it, though he cared not who imputed to him an effort to induce the people to resist authority, for it was well known that he, and those who voted with him, had preached peace and submission to the people. The riot to which the hon. and learned gentleman alluded, commenced casually at a fair, and had no more connection with politics than it had with any of the abstract sciences. The only object of the motion which he had submitted to the House was to bring before it facts connected with the system of employing an armed police. He would, however, withdraw it for the purpose of altering its form; and he would take the present opportunity of giving notice that, on the 10th June, he would move for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Act by which vestries

in Ireland were empowered to levy a rate for the building of churches.—Motion withdrawn

Subject, POLICE TRIALS, IRELAND ; Date, MAY 11, 1830.

One of O'Connell's most important speeches. He began by "moving for a copy of the coroner's inquest on the body of Daniel Boylan, for whose alleged murder in Milltownmalbay, county of Clare, on the 29th June, 1829, a policeman named William Ferguson was tried and acquitted."

This brought up Doherty, the Irish Attorney-General, between whom and O'Connell there was permanent feud. Doherty did not measure his language, and accused O'Connell of "daily and ordinary slanders." The allusion made by O'Connell to his vow refers to his duel with D'Esterre, and his resolution not to fight again.

Mr. O'Connell said, the motion he brought forward referred to an occasion upon which one of the king's subjects lost his life; and, continued he, I should have been ready to explain all the circumstances connected with the case, as well as my object in submitting the motion to the House, if the hon. and learned gentleman had asked me a question on the subject, instead of indulging the House with a tragical display. If he had asked I would have told him that I wanted this document to throw light upon the Constabulary Bill; and I would have told him that, in this case, a policeman was allowed to remain in gaol for six weeks, and although it was known to his corps he was guilty, yet not one of them came forward to give evidence upon the coroner's inquest. Sir, I believe all the parties, thus guilty, remain unpunished up to this day. I do not impugn the verdict, for the man was rightly acquitted; but I object to the system under which such things can be; and I will not be deterred from doing my duty fearlessly by any man, however he may be supported. In saying fearlessly, I allude not to that species of courage which is recognized in a court of honour, and of which I know nothing. There is blood upon this hand—I regret it deeply—and he knows it. He knows that I have a vow in heaven, else he would not have ventured to address me in such language,

or to use those taunts, which in this House he has safely resorted to. He knows it, and there is not one man in the circle of our acquaintance but knows it also, and knows at the very same time that but for that vow he dare not address me as he has done (*cries of "Order" from all parts of the House*). I retract. He has attacked me for not being present at the time when the member for Mallow made his motion. The accident which prevented me from being present was, that the House had sat until four o'clock in the morning, and in consequence I was not here in time for the motion. Let the hon. member take advantage of that absence, and use it to enhance his triumph as much as he can—let him triumph in his declaration that he was anxious to meet me face to face; but the member for Mallow will support me in the statement, that his motion was not intended to be directed against the conduct of the hon. and learned member. The hon. and learned gentleman has made a speech in anticipation of the motion of to-morrow, and then he talks of a retreat. I should like to know who is retreating now—he who promises to bring forward his motion to-morrow, or he who wishes to anticipate it by a speech to-night? The hon. member says that a judge's notes have never been called for. I mean to call for them. They are not such sacred things as to be forbidden. The Chief Justice of the King's Bench sends his notes of a trial to the Barons of the Exchequer, when he tries a case out of their court, and the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas sends his notes in the same manner to any other court. They are, in fact, regular legal documents, fit for the inspection of any public assembly as much as any documents whatever. I know of no reason why they should be refused. I mean to apply for these notes, because it shall not be said I am looking for particular parts of the case, and that I do not look for authentic documents. I care not whether they are granted or not, as far as the case is concerned. If they are granted I shall get the most authentic documents; if not I must be content with getting as good information as I can. I have felt it to be my duty to arraign the proceedings in the Doneraile conspiracy, and if I had thought

that this House was at leisure to have before entertained the matter, I should have brought it forward at an earlier period. What should I have brought forward? That conduct which put the lives of fourteen farmers—every one of whom was innocent—into jeopardy. The hon. and learned gentleman is mistaken if he believes that I arraign his individual conduct at Cork, but I accuse him of such conduct here as appeared to be affording countenance and authority to the conduct of the magistrates there. The question I intend to bring before the House is, how far the counsel for the Crown have a right to be in possession of evidence which they know will tarnish the character of a witness for the Crown, and not to make the judge and jury acquainted with the fact. They ought to be permitted to have that information, for a conviction is not that which the Crown ought to go for, but the discovery of innocence or guilt. It is my intention therefore to raise an important legal question. If the magistrates were wrong, they should be warned not to repeat such conduct; if they were legally right, the practice ought to be altered, and such a plan put an end to. The hon. member then detailed some parts of the case, stating that the magistrates had spies in their pay, who knew of all the circumstances of the intended crime, and neither prevented its being committed nor warned the persons who were to be the victims, and yet these very magistrates were afterwards allowed to put the lives of these persons in jeopardy. He said that he only wanted to get a fair insight into the whole affair, and those who countenanced the magistrates would deserve censure, while those who had not done so would be exonerated. He then noticed the Borrisokane trials, and said that the conduct of the magistrates in that affair had been just the reverse of what it had been in the other instance. It was impossible they could be right in both. He was able to prove the facts at the Bar, and would do so if he were not prevented. This was the sixth or seventh time he had been taunted on this matter; he had submitted cheerfully and readily to the taunts, but he was not the less firm in his determination to bring the whole matter under the considera-

tion of the House. His object was, to bring before the House the evil of having a system of police, in which men were armed with deadly weapons, and where the least resistance to their authority, however capriciously exercised, must be attended with death. In this country the officers being only armed with staves, gave those who resisted them a beating, and they were afterwards punished for their resistance in a legal way. The hon. member, in conclusion, withdrew his motion.

Subject, THE DONERAILE CONSPIRACY—CONDUCT OF THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL; Date, MAY 12, 1830.

O'Connell did not spare Doherty. Doherty replied, and attacked O'Connell violently; a furious debate followed. Mr. North accused O'Connell of "uttering his accusations like the lofty monarch of the woods" in Ireland—it is not clear to what special tree he refers; and of changing his tune in the House, and "aggravating his voice so that he came around you as gently as any sucking dove." There is no doubt O'Connell was aggravating. He told the truth plainly, and he spoke plain language. Mr. Hume spoke for O'Connell warmly, and said, "his temper and moderation contrasted strongly with the pomposity and insolence of the hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. North) who had just spoken." He further proceeded to compare him to a "swelled up bull-frog in danger of bursting."

Mr. O'Connell spoke to the following effect. Before I proceed to bring forward the motion of which I have given notice, I wish to observe that the notice for this day which appears on the paper, relative to the homicide at Borriskane, must have got there by some mistake, for which I cannot account, as my notice relative to that affair was for Tuesday next. This I am at a loss to explain, as there was no mistake on the subject in the public papers. The notice which I gave for this day, and upon which I rise now to move, is one for the production of documents which I deem necessary in order to enable the House to judge correctly upon a matter of serious importance as connected with the administration of justice; and to make it as probable as possible that I may obtain them, I shall limit

the number as much as is consistent with the objects I have in view; and I will begin by stating that, although my notice is for the depositions of all the witnesses examined on the special commission at Cork, I shall now limit myself to moving in the first place, for the depositions of but one witness, Patrick Daly; and secondly, for the notes of the learned judges who presided at these trials. Each of these motions require a different consideration, but in both I shall lay grounds plainly and distinctly to entitle me to the information I require. Before moving for these documents I shall state the specific subjects of each, and then I shall show how they are to be applied. The object I have in view is, that of bringing before the House a complaint of the mode of preparing criminal cases for trial in Ireland, by magistrates taking depositions without the knowledge of the parties charged, which appears to me a bad, a dangerous, and an unjust practice. I shall, for this purpose, instance the particular case of the Doneraile conspiracy, and the mode in which information was taken in that case. That is my first object, and I shall bring it specifically before the House, that it either may be censured as inconsistent with law, or, if it shall be found sanctioned by usage, that it may be altered by the Legislature. My second object is, to complain of the mode in which the prosecutions under the special commission were, in one respect, conducted by the counsel for the Crown, in order, if it appear from the facts that my complaint is well founded, that I may take the opinion of the House as to the legality of this mode, or if the practice resorted to has been sanctioned by usage, then, I think, I shall easily obtain leave of the House to bring in a bill to alter that usage. Such are the objections I have in view, and I shall state the grounds of them distinctly and plainly, and without any irritation or angry feeling whatever, but, at the same time, as fully as ever I stated them anywhere, according to the best of my recollection. As far as I have been able I have looked to the reports of what I have said elsewhere; and although I know these reports to be somewhat stronger than the language I made use of, yet I shall not

question their accuracy, but shall abide by the statements that have, as far as I know, been imputed to me. It will be now necessary, before entering on the first question, to direct the attention of the House to the nature of the Doneraile conspiracy. About the year 1821 it is well known that the whole of the southern districts of Ireland were in a disturbed state. Political acrimony and agitation among the Catholics, which had ceased on the occasion of the king's visit to Ireland, had afterwards, when the hopes excited by that event had faded away, been revived with increased force, and the country became extremely discontented. In some parts of the south the discontent actually broke out into open rebellion, which was put down partly by force, partly by the arm of the law, and also, I will say, in a great degree by others whom, to avoid any cavil, I will distinguish merely as parties who were looking for constitutional relief. Several of the parties engaged in these disturbances were in a state of outlawry; and amongst the parts of Ireland so disturbed, and in which many of those outlaws were to be found, was the neighbourhood of Doneraile. Against many persons there informations had been sworn, and they were, I believe, capable of committing any crime whatever. There resided in that neighbourhood a magistrate, Mr. Bond Lowe, a courageous and an active justice of the peace, who, in the discharge of his duty, attempted to apprehend these bad characters. The consequence was, that conspiracies were formed against his life, and not only was he threatened, but actual attempts were more than once made to carry the threats into execution. Other parties were involved in these conspiracies, but I fear it will turn out that those who were thus involved became so through the means of persons whom the magistrates employed; for, after the year 1821, a certain Patrick Daly was taken into pay by certain magistrates in the neighbourhood of Doneraile, who thought it fair to keep him as a spy, and receive information by his means. I will now put it to the House, whether it were likely this man would continue to receive pay unless he made discoveries, and whether it were likely that he

would not make discoveries sooner than lose his situation. This is a man for whose deposition I am about to move. The House should be aware that on or about the 20th of January, 1829, when Dr. Norcott, a physician, was returning from a party with his daughter, the carriage in which he rode was fired at, and his coachman wounded in the shoulder. That attempt to murder was made on the 20th January. Another conspiracy having the same object—that is, murder—in view, was entered into on the 28th February. Mr. Bond Lowe, it was determined, should be murdered on the 2nd of March, and I wish the House to be made aware that Daly, the magistrates' hired spy, gave no information to any living person of this affair in time to prevent the fatal consequences which it threatened. The ruffians put this plan into execution at a place called John's Wood, and on that occasion, although Mr. Lowe escaped, his horse was severely wounded in the shoulder. The next date in the history of these black events is the conspiracy of the 27th April, when it was agreed to waylay and shoot Mr. Lowe on the 2nd or 3rd of May, and a place called Bathskreen was selected for the purpose of carrying the design into execution. The life of Mr. Bond Lowe was then again attempted, but the presence of his friend, Mr. Nagle, whom the conspirators were unwilling to injure, saved his life, and prevented them even from making the attempt. Unquestionably a conspiracy to murder certain persons existed, and it is no less true that spies were hired by the magistrates, but those spies, instead of denouncing, fomented the conspiracy. At length the informer took a high flight in the objects of his denunciation. Amongst other respectable individuals whom he sought to implicate in these designs, was Mr. Daniel Clancy, of the town of Charleville, a magistrate, and as respectable and amiable an individual as can be found in the community. Persons named Leary, Connors, Murphy, and Burke, small but respectable farmers, were also implicated. Of these Leary was convicted, Connors was acquitted, Burke was acquitted, and Murphy was not tried, but was discharged from the prosecution altogether. I implore

the attention of the House to the situation of these innocent persons (for of Leary's innocence I have no doubt) thus charged with these horrible offences, and involved in the guilt of those with whom they had no connection. I cannot conceive any men more worthy of the compassion and commiseration of the House. I beg to call the attention of the House to the characters of these individuals. They were small farmers—men of industrious habits—men of respectability, and the more deserving of admiration and sympathy, as they had raised themselves from a more humble lot by the exertions of their own hands. And let me tell this House, that it is most important that persons of that character should be protected in Ireland, because wherever they abound, Whiteboyism declines. Those farmers have something to lose, and are therefore the friends of good order; the Whiteboys consist of those who are utterly destitute. I was counsel for those men, and I am not ashamed to say that my heart's best feelings were warmly enlisted in their cause. And I was the more interested in their fate, because Leary was found guilty on the first day, when I was not present, and his conviction added greatly to the danger of the others. I wish to say that I do not mean to cast the slightest imputation upon the juries which tried those persons. The first was exclusively Protestant, and returned a verdict of guilty against Leary, rightly, considering the evidence before them, but perhaps too rapidly, considering the character of the informer. On the second jury there were five or six Catholics. The major part of these were for conviction, being more or less convinced of the guilt of the accused; one man, a Catholic, was for total acquittal; he was opposed by his brother Catholics, but he held out for two days, when one of the jurors became ill, and they were all dismissed. The third case came on, and Catholics were entirely excluded from that jury. It was exclusively Protestant, and almost instantaneously acquitted the prisoners. In consequence of this verdict, Leary, who had been convicted, was respited, although the judge had intimated to him that his case was hopeless; he was not executed, he was transported:

and it will be a subject worthy of future consideration whether that punishment might not be considered incommensurate with his ambiguous guilt. On the third trial I come to Patrick Daly, the principal witness for the Crown, and I shall state how the acquittal on that trial was obtained. Patrick Daly had been for six or seven years a spy for the magistrates, and he swore that Leary, Connors, Murphy, and the other conspirators had determined to murder Bond Lowe on his return from the fair of Kildorrery, that the conspiracy was concocted in a tent, and that all these persons were present when a death-warrant for the murder was written out, and signed by them, the chief conspirators or committee-men. The murder was to be perpetrated by the Kildorrery men, because they were on the spot, and might get home undiscovered. This was not a very likely story, particularly as the witness had previously stated that the murder was to be committed in open day. Mr. Baron Pennefather, during the cross-examination of the witness, handed me the depositions of this same man, taken before the magistrates on the 29th April, 1829—that was in the interval between the conspiracy and its execution, but in the depositions not one word was said of the death-warrant being signed in the tent, or of the other facts to which he swore on his trial. I now put it to the consideration of every member of this House, could that individual have sworn the truth when giving his depositions and not have mentioned this fact of the death-warrant and of the fair of Kildorrery? If the evidence on this point were true, the depositions must have been false. But these depositions and informations are part of the secrets of the Crown in Ireland. In England, it is true, an accused individual is informed of the details of the charge against him; but in Ireland he seldom knows anything of the matter, unless by surmise, or except he be guilty. Sir, in this case the result of the production of these depositions was, that the accused man was at once acquitted. And here I complain that the leading counsel for the Crown held in his brief that very document, and at the very moment when he was seeking the capital conviction of the

men who were at once exculpated by its production. This is a question of propriety, but I cannot acquiesce in the justice or humanity of withholding a fair chance of exculpation from an unfortunate wretch when trembling on the very brink of eternity. On this principle I have acted in my own cases. I am not often the prosecutor, but where I am I repudiate such evidence as I have just noticed. I could not think myself justified in seeking a conviction where I did not feel perfectly satisfied as to the guilt of the accused. If this be the duty of a private professional individual, how much more imperatively is it the duty of the professional advisers of the Crown, whose object never ought to be the infliction of punishment, but a fair administration of justice? There were many discrepancies between the depositions and the evidence of Daly. In his depositions he stated that he went to the fair early in the morning; in his evidence he stated that he did not arrive there until nine o'clock. In the court he accused William Shine of being a partner in the crime; in the depositions this man's name never occurs. But, rejecting all these subordinate points, I say that the omission in the deposition of the tent scene, and the death-warrant, and all the circumstances that gave to the evidence the colouring of facts, was a fatal variance that should have led any man, seeking not blood but justice, to reject Patrick Daly's testimony. Again, sir, then I complain of the suppression on the part of the Crown counsel of that which the judge thought it his duty to produce. I will do him the justice, however, to admit that he had on that occasion the assistance of three learned gentlemen of the Irish bar, Mr. Sergeant Goold, Mr. Bennet, and Mr. Green, whom I take it for granted were aware of the contents of these depositions. To the characters of Mr. Bennet and Mr. Green I willingly bear my testimony; more humane and excellent gentlemen cannot exist. On the testimony of Mr. Sergeant Goold I will not rely, because he has been known to express opinions on this subject which went much further than suppressing such a document. But if gentlemen will maintain the legality at present of this method of looking at evidence and depositions, surely

they will concur with me in introducing a bill into this House, the object of which shall be to correct so objectionable a mode of proceeding. In the conduct of this trial the learned counsel said, that he could corroborate the testimony of Daly by the production of a boy of the most unbiassed feelings and unimpeachable veracity. What was the fact? This boy, it was said, had been actually introduced by Daly into the tent on the occasion of the alleged conspiracy at the fair, and had been directed by him to observe the writing and signing of the murder warrant. Yet, I ask, did Daly state this fact in his deposition? He alluded neither to the person nor the act. I call, then, for the papers containing the depositions of this Daly. I call on the House to support me in my demands by the claims of humanity—by the anxiety, the suffering, the agony which that unfortunate accused, but acquitted individual, endured in the dock, where he so long stood on trial for the life which a perjured miscreant was swearing away. I never quarrelled with Government for these prosecutions. If the commission was expensive, it had the effect of restoring to liberty, much sooner than they otherwise would have been, many innocent men. I only blame the conduct of the leading counsel respecting the deposition I have alluded to. Such is my case. All I ask for is these depositions and the notes of the learned judge who conducted this trial. Is it intended to produce these documents? I have been taunted on this subject. I now ask those who have taunted me, and those who have applauded them, whether they will meet the question fairly, and accede to my demand? I ask also for the notes of Baron Pennefather; and here I cannot avoid bearing testimony to the admirable demeanour of that excellent judge. I feel happy in paying a just tribute to the companion of my youth, but who has been raised by his merits to a station far above my humble walk; but never in any country or time has the bench been graced with a more admirable union of erudition and humanity. With his notes I should feel satisfied, but to avoid any invidious feeling, I extend my application to those of both judges who presided at the commission of Doneraile. Why do I ask for

these documents? Because I wish to have the best evidence to produce to the House in support of my statement. I wish to produce testimony, "omni exceptione major." I am to be told, perhaps, that an application for a judge's notes is novel. I know that I have high legal authority opposed to me on this point—the authority of a man whose independence and extensive acquirements in his profession I sincerely admire, though I differ from him in political feelings. But I beg the House to consider that in every case which occurs at the Old Bailey, or at the sessions throughout the country which is laid before the Privy Council, the judge's notes are called for and submitted without the slightest exception. If, then, these documents are at the command of the Executive, I ask can there be any difficulty in submitting them to this House? The judges themselves are constantly in the habit of calling for each other's notes. When the Lord Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls direct an issue, they familiarly call for the judge's notes. Why, then, should there be such difficulty when this House requires them? And am I not justified in calling for the highest evidence in this case? Is it fair to meet this case by merely canvassing Daly's evidence without the documents? I submit not. I say that every member of this House should have the details of that evidence in his hands. I have been reproached with not having introduced the subject sooner. I confess I feel regret that it should be necessary for me to introduce it at all. I did wish that the subject might have been buried in oblivion, with all the angry feelings to which it has given occasion; but, as far as regards delay on my part, I have only to say, that I could not bring the subject forward with propriety until after the late Cork assizes. One of the men involved in the Doneraile conspiracy was then tried, and it was not prudent to enter on this case until his fate was decided. If I felt impelled to agitate this matter at all, it was because I had occasion to observe and to regret that certain invidious distinctions had not as yet been suppressed—because I was impelled to witness political and religious differences perpetuated in some degree by those who ought to have been the first to stifle them for ever,

Thank God, however, those distinctions are now gradually and inevitably, and in spite of the exertions of the evil-minded, subsiding! Thank God, those differences which have separated man from man are fading away before the operations of that glorious measure to which I hope I may be considered to have contributed in some humble degree, even though it were through the means of excitement and agitation. I have indeed been taunted with agitation and exciting the peasantry to acts which would have risked their being put to death by the king's troops, but I will appeal to my acts to show that the whole endeavour of my life has been to impress upon the people the folly and the danger of any connection with Whiteboys, or any other illegal associations; that I have succeeded is proved by that powerful combination which became too strong for resistance, and I trust that there are none present who now regret the result. I have, moreover, submitted this motion to the House on public grounds, and on those only, and if in the course of what I have stated any word of acrimony has fallen from me, I regret it, for my wish is not to renew irritation, but to pour oil upon the wounds of my country. Mr. O'Connell then thanked the House for its great indulgence, for the silent attention and exceeding courtesy with which it had heard his observations, and concluded by moving—"That there be laid before the House copies of any depositions or informations sworn by Patrick Daly, the witness at the special commission held in Cork, in October last, relative to certain conspiracies to murder, wherewith Edmond Connors and others were charged on that occasion; and also copies of the notes of the judges who tried those cases."

Same Subject, Same Date ; O'CONNELL'S REPLY.

Mr. O'Connell—Sir, I avail myself of my right to reply, and I am able to subvert the sophistry by which the learned gentleman is sought to be protected. Let me set myself right as to some

of the assertions that have been made. In the first place the hon. and learned gentleman has stated my definition of perjury. My opinion is, and I so stated it on the trial, that the breaking of a lawful oath, or the taking of an unlawful oath, is perjury. I was talking to the witness of the nature of perjury, and I then said, that if he had broken a lawful oath, or taken an unlawful oath he was equally guilty of perjury. Secondly, the hon. and learned gentleman, by going through a speech of great length, and which was rendered sufficiently ludicrous, notwithstanding its unwieldy length, by the tragic tone in which it was delivered, has arrived at the Sub-letting Act. The Sub-letting Act in this discussion! cannot conceive how the Sub-letting Act can form a part of the Solicitor-General's defence of his conduct; but he has the happy talent of introducing matters quite irrelevant. Why, Sir, he might as well have introduced any other event that has taken place since the flood—nay, even the universal deluge itself. But that learned gentleman has been singularly unfortunate, for he has introduced the only speech of all those attributed to me which was so inaccurately reported that I cannot avow it. I avow all the rest. I admit every word he has read. I now re-assert again every word; and but that he shrinks from the proofs, I would prove to his condemnation the perfect accuracy of every accusation I ever made against him in this House or out of this House. It is true that I spoke of the Sub-letting Act. It is quite true that I condemned that law in the strongest, the harshest terms; but the concluding part of the report is quite inaccurate. I never said what is attributed there to me. Nay, so inaccurate is that passage that, having met the reporter in the hall of the Four Courts, on the morning after that report appeared, I reproached him with its inaccuracy. The reporter was, as most reporters are, sturdy upon the subject, and denied the inaccuracy of the report. I accordingly spoke to another reporter, with whom I am acquainted, and at my request he wrote out the notes he had taken, which clearly showed that I had not used the phrases attributed to me; or rather that they were spoken in so unqualified a way as to bear quite a dif-

ferent meaning. If I had used the expressions then, I would not deny them now. If I had now to speak of that Act, I would mention it in terms commensurate with my abhorrence of it—it is not possible to find language strong enough to express my detestation of that statute. Sir, I know of 194 families, aye, families that have been thrown out of their habitations recently under that law, and are now actually perishing in the ditches without covering—almost without clothing or food. Let those who have no wants to feel applaud that statute. I will begin with the learned Solicitor-General for England. He demands my first courtesy. I agree in his inferences; I only dispute his statement of facts. But I perceive the noble lord (Lord Leveson Gower) is about to leave the House; I beg of him to remain for one moment. I will despatch his lordship first, though out of order.

Subject, BILL FOR THE REMOVAL OF JEWISH DISABILITIES;

Date, MAY 17, 1830.

Lord John Russell spoke for and Peel against this bill; O'Connell spoke for liberty of conscience and enlightened legislation.

Mr. O'Connell said, he was proud of the opportunity of supporting the measure. He supported it both on principle and sympathy. The time had but recently gone by, when the Catholics were assailed by clamours which he would refute that very evening by his conduct. They had been assailed by a cry which might be very satisfactory to some Christians, who thought that no others were right in argument or good sense but themselves. The cry then raised was Protestant—now it was Christian. To persons who now raised that cry against this measure, he would say that they avoided or evaded the true principles of Christianity, which were liberality and charity. On the former occasion, these persons said that the Catholics were the advocates of bigotry. Who were the advocates of bigotry now? Christian charity, with such people, was a good thing to

talk of, but when they came to the point they refused to put it in practice. Who were before the House now in the character of claimants for rights? They were not foreigners—they were not Poles—nor Russians—nor Turks—nor Frenchmen. They were men born in England—men entitled to hold property in England—to inherit property from their ancestors in England—in short, they were Englishmen. They were debarred from some of the privileges of Englishmen because they refused to take an oath of a particular kind, and therefore they were shut out of that House. They were excluded, as it was said, because the safety of our institution demanded their exclusion. But the House might be asked whether it would admit the unbeliever? It did admit the Mahometan. The Mahometan might, perhaps, refuse the oath, “on the faith of a Christian.” Yes, that was true, the Mahometan might be considered excluded; but would they laugh at him now, when he asked them what sanction had they against the Atheist or the Deist? Against any man who did believe in a God, or professed a particular religion, they had a protection, but they had no check upon the man who had no religious faith. It was said that the Jews had sympathies elsewhere. In the same manner, it had been said, that the Catholics had sympathies elsewhere. He did not mean to disavow that he and they carried spiritual homage to another than the King of England; but his own Sovereign received his undivided political homage. So it was with the Jews; he might still remember the traditionary home of his fathers, but he was obedient to our laws. Let them not, therefore, talk of the name of Christianity, when it was used to do evil instead of good. In such a case he scorned the name; he desired the substance. Christianity was charitable; charity was the precept of Jesus Christ their Saviour himself. He was charitable to all men, even to his murderers; he prayed even for them, saying—“Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.” In France they had a Christian Legislature, and the Jews were ranked with the other citizens of the State. Perhaps it might be denied that the French Legislature was Christian; for one mark of a Christian

Legislature they had not—they had not a boroughmongering system—they had not one lord with ten retainers, who, after sitting with the Côte Gauche, went over just at the critical moment to the Côte Droite, carrying his ten retainers with him. Certainly that was not the case in France; and yet he imagined, notwithstanding its disadvantage in this respect, it might be said to have a Christian legislature. But both there and in the Netherlands, Jews were appointed judges, magistrates and legislators, and performed their duties in the most efficient and most honorable manner; and at the moment at which he was speaking, one of the secretaries of the Sorbonne was a converted Jew. Conversion was prevented in this country by our own system of laws.

Affect to scorn a man for his opinions, or to deprive him of civil power on their account, and he became wedded to them more firmly than ever. Such had been the case with the Catholics, and such would be the case with the Jews, and with all other people in similar circumstances. They had been told that the same reason did not hold for admitting the Jews as for admitting the Catholics. It was true, for there were more reasons against the admission of the Catholics than against that of the Jews. It was because the Catholics were so numerous that they ought not to have been admitted; for if their belief were dangerous to the State, their numbers only rendered it doubly dangerous. That was not the case with the Jews, whose numbers were insufficient to create the least degree of alarm. Then it was said the Catholics were a proselytising race; that made them more dangerous still, though, perhaps they could gain but few proselytes, for they could offer but few pecuniary advantages; and, as an hon. member had said the other night, if the road to heaven were not paved with gold, nobody would have taken the trouble to discover it. He should support the bill on the universal principle of toleration, if that were not an improper word to be used on such an occasion—perhaps he ought to have said the principle of right. That right was not to be infringed either by an inquisition which inflicted torture, as in Spain, or

by laws which, as in England, imposed privation. Man had a right to inflict neither the one nor the other; Christianity had spread itself—not by the force of temporal power, not by the efforts of Christians, nor by the labour of Christian legislatures, but by virtue of its own truth, and its mild and benevolent influence on the human heart. It had expanded itself, not only without the assistance of temporal power, but against the most formidable opposition; and where was the Christian that would tell him that the arm of God was short, and needed the aid of any of His creatures? He recognised them not—they belonged not to his communion, since their doctrines would deprive him of the consolation of his existence—the hope of eternity. Christianity bade him do as he would be done by, and he only fulfilled that duty when he gave this bill his most hearty support.

Subject, LAW OF DIVORCE; Date, JUNE 3, 1830.

It is noteworthy in this, as in all of O'Connell's speeches, where there was opportunity, how boldly and distinctly he taught Catholic doctrine. He remarked the extraordinary ignorance of Catholic history exhibited by Sir Charles Westend, who stated that the Pope had given a divorce to Henry VIII.

On the 15th June, 1830, petitions were signed and sent in to free Protestant soldiers from formal attendance at Catholic ceremonies. O'Connell spoke again in favour of the petition, but added "that it was uncharitable to impute idolatry to parties who were not guilty of it, and who detested it as strongly as the petitioners or any other men."

Mr. O'Connell said, he agreed with the hon. and learned gentleman who had just sat down, in opposing the motion, though he differed from him in the grounds of his opposition. He wished with the hon. mover that the poor should be placed upon the same footing with the rich in regard to divorce, but he would accomplish that, not by giving it to the poor, but by refusing it to the rich. He thought the better way would be to make the marriage tie perfectly indissoluble. It was so by the common law, for up to the time of the Reformation no

marriage could be dissolved. It was so by the rule of the Catholic Church and by that of the Protestant Church also. It was true that divorces had been granted in the Catholic Church, but not a *vinculo matrimonii*. They were only granted in such cases, for example, insanity, as rendered the marriage invalid *ab initio*. The Pope had no authority to divorce a marriage upon any other ground, for his authority did not exceed that of other bishops. But the hon. and learned gentleman had said that the Pope had granted a divorce to Henry VIII. In that the hon. and learned gentleman was mistaken. The Pope had, on the contrary, refused the divorce. If he had not refused it the hon. and learned gentleman might have gone to Mass last Sunday, as he had done, for the refusal had contributed much to hasten the Reformation. Again, his hon. and learned friend had said, that the Pope had dissolved the marriage of Bonaparte; but the principle on which that divorce rested was this, that the first marriage with Josephine was a mere republican marriage, having nothing sacramental or religious in its nature. It was another instance of marriage invalidated *ab initio*, so that there was no divorce in the case of Napoleon, who was himself a sort of honorary member of all religions. But if they regarded the subject merely as statesmen, he would ask, were the upper classes of society, who could obtain divorces, more virtuous than the lower who could not? No man would say that they were. And was not a divorce a temptation to adultery? Did it not give another argument to the seducer, when it enabled him to say, that he would restore the object of his passion to her rank again, or perhaps raise her to a higher rank than before? The Christian law, the Canon law, the Common law, and the law both of the Catholic and the Protestant Churches were all upon his side, and he therefore hoped that other members, more influential than himself, would assist in opposing the present motion.

Subject, CONDUCT OF MR. O'CONNELL; Date, JUNE 24, 1830.

The Rev. Sir Harcourt Lees was a most energetic and unscrupulous opponent of O'Connell's. He did not measure his language. A good deal has been said of O'Connell's vehement denunciations of persons and things, but his opponents being less noteworthy have escaped, though some of them used language with which he would never have polluted his lips. Sir Harcourt Lees began his attacks in 1822, and denounced "O'Connell, the Pope, and the Devil" in the Dublin newspapers. He was the real instigator of the famous "Bottle Riot." He now sent in a petition complaining of O'Connell's inflammatory speeches. It was presented by Mr. Trant, who read O'Connell a lecture on the following letter:—

"To the Editor of the Waterford and Weekly Waterford Chronicles.

"London, June 7th, 1830.

"MY DEAR SIR—You are quite right—the time is come when Ireland should, one and all, rouse itself to fling off the administration of the Duke of Wellington. He is in my judgment totally unfit for the office of Prime Minister. A portion of Ireland organized by the Catholic Association, of whom 1400 were Protestants, forced him to grant Emancipation; but he granted it with the worst grace possible. He added to it the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders, the suppression, or rather attempt at suppression, of the Monastic Orders, and the insult of our bishops; add to these that despotic law which has authorised the Lord Lieutenant to issue his late proclamation. In the annals of legislation there never was so unconstitutional a law. How he was compelled to emancipate is well known; he threw as much of bitterness into the cup as he possibly could. I really think that he hates or despises Ireland. His powers, too, of reasoning, appear to me of the lowest class. He is quite the Commander-in-Chief of the Ministry, and rules the men who have the littleness to act with him with a sway almost despotic. I think his foreign policy of the worst possible description, and that the tendency of his public measures is all towards arbitrary sway. It is, in short, essential to the peace

and prosperity of these countries that we should have another minister.

“As to Ireland, the insulting and insane attempts to increase the taxation, at such a period of deep distress as the present, is a proof of utter, total ignorance of our real situation, or total disregard of our wants. The hour, therefore, is come, when every effort should be made to press on the Administration of the Duke. This is the very time to attack his government in every legal and constitutional way. I very much approve of your plan of securing a gold currency for Ireland. If gold be good for England, as a medium of exchange, it ought to be equally good for the Irish. Indeed, it is a very formidable advantage that the English have over us in this, that their currency is of actual value as an article of commerce, being gold—and that we, Irish, should have no other currency than mere paper, in itself, as an article of commerce, of no kind of value whatsoever.

“It is too bad that the welfare of Ireland should be thus postponed, as it were, to serve England. It seems, therefore, a duty to rouse the people to effectuate a change, by calling for gold for every pound note. A man who has a pound note may surely as well have a sovereign. A thousand accidents may make the pound note not worth $1\frac{1}{2}d$. There is nothing which can possibly render the sovereign worth less than 20s.; and let me tell you that it may again become worth 30s. of the then currency. Call, therefore, on the people—the honest, unsophisticated people—to send in the bank-notes of every description, and to get gold. Take this as a measure of precaution everywhere—let it spread far and near, and then at least we will be so far on a par with England.—Believe me, most sincerely yours,

“DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

Mr. O'Connell felt some doubts whether or not he ought to offer an explanation of his conduct; and but for the kind manner in which he had been alluded to by his hon. friend the member for Dover, most assuredly he should not say one word

upon this petition. It was not due to the House that he should explain; he totally disclaimed the authority of the House over any acts of his that were done out of it; and least of all would he stoop to explain to the raving petitioner. In the House he always did and always would act in such a way as he thought due to the House and to himself, as an independent Member of Parliament; and while he did so, he must disclaim, in the most distinct and positive terms, the right of the House, or of any member of it, to call him to account for what he might think proper to do outside the doors. With regard to the question before the House he would say, that he had struggled for Ireland when she had been a prey to every needy adventurer in politics and religion, and when she had been betrayed alternately by the men who attempted to cajole and those who professed to befriend her. During the era of agitation, which was spoken of with terror by the petitioner, Whiteboy outrages ceased—riots became daily less frequent—massacres and midnight conflagrations disappeared—the people became reconciled to each other—old feuds were forgotten—new alliances sprung up—and peace and harmony succeeded to violence, outrage and civil war, until at length, pacified and combined, Ireland became too powerful for her enemies, and too big for her chains. And now that he was in the House, had he not a right on behalf of his country, to complain of the manner in which Irish business was neglected here? There was the Sub-letting Act, framed for the purpose of depriving the people of their tenements, in order to enlarge the domains and enhance the property of the rich; that Act which had already inflicted such frightful injury on Ireland, and made the poor die in hundreds by the ditches—was not that law still permitted to disgrace the statute book? It was true an amendment had been proposed, but it was still worse than the Act itself; for it legalised the disputed causes. There was the Vestry Act too—the most infamous that could be conceived.

Was it not monstrous that six millions of people should be taxed by 250,000 for the support of a Church from which they conscientiously differed?

I heard (said Mr. O'Connell) great cheering from the Treasury benches when it was thought that my hon. friend had made a hit at me. Well, did these retainers of the ministry—these unbought, unbiassed, but still hon. gentlemen—support me in any effort of mine to relieve the distresses of Ireland by removing existing and flagrant abuses? No, sir; I was met by a united phalanx; and this, sir, is the reason why I have acted out of doors; and this, sir, is the reason why I shall continue to act as I like out of this House. By agitation Ireland became strong; by agitation she put down her bitter enemies; by agitation has conscience been set free; by agitation Irish freedom has been purchased; and by agitation it shall be secured.

Liberty was never yet obtained by quiescence. The iron sceptre of despotism and bigotry was never yet broken by apathy. Sir—I ask, if agitation—constitutional agitation—prevailed in England should we not, before this time, have a reform in Parliament? If there were not in England an apathy which I hold in contempt, I ask, would a few lords return the members of this House?—or would an oligarchy presume to trample upon the rights of the people?—or would the minister be secure of a venal majority to carry every profligate job he might think proper to advocate? It is the absence of agitation that perpetuates abuse in England; the existence of it in Ireland would ultimately establish the people's rights. The speech of Mr. Sheil has been alluded to as against me. Now, I declaim my connection with the sentiment to which my hon. friend has referred. I despise the patronage of any Government—I condemn the name of office. This was always my feeling, and in that feeling I shall die. But I will say the Government have not treated the Catholics of Ireland well since the passing of the Relief Bill. Their conduct towards the Catholic Bar is disgraceful. I don't want the gew-gaw of a silk gown, and neither do I refer to my friend, Mr. Sheil, for we were fellow-agitators, and must be prepared to bear up against the hatred of those whom we succeeded in defeating. But why has not a

silk gown been given to Mr. O'Loghlin, or Mr. Farrell, or Mr. Cruise, or Mr. Ball? Sir, the reason is they are Catholics. Now, this is an injury to their clients, many of whom are Protestants. I tell my hon. friend that he is mistaken about the workings of the Relief Bill. It has done well in spite of his Majesty's Government. The people themselves have become reconciled; and now Protestants and Catholics see their own interests, and are resolved to be no longer the dupes of designing mercenaries. But if violence is kept up in some parts of the North, I see on the ministerial side of the House the men who are keeping party spirit alive for electioneering purposes. I have, sir, given my advice to my countrymen, and whenever I feel it necessary I shall continue to do so, careless whether it pleases or displeases this House, or any mad parson out of it. And will any hon. member tell me my advice is bad? What did I do—why, merely this?—I recommended the people to get gold, as in England, for useless paper. The members opposite would not go with Mr. Attwood in giving a silver currency to England, and am I to be questioned for recommending the discontinuance of a paper currency in Ireland? My advice has been followed, and this night's discussion will enforce it. I again disclaim having risen to defend myself, because, for my acts beyond these doors, I disclaim any responsibility to the House. I rose, sir, to express my determination to do my duty towards Ireland. My object is the good of Ireland first, and of the empire secondly.

A noisy scene ensued, and O'Connell spoke again.

Mr. O'Connell—I think it my duty, sir, to my constituents, my country, and myself, to offer a few remarks upon the discussion that has arisen; and in the very outset, I must again disclaim my submission to this House and its authority over me, for any act I have chosen to do outside of these walls. I cannot command language strong enough to disclaim any, the slightest, submission to this House generally, for any act done out of it; and therefore, sir, it will be at once seen how thoroughly I

repudiate the authority of any member of the House—but more especially of the hon. and very learned member for the city of Kilkenny. Sir, I should be exceedingly sorry not to enjoy the blessing of his censure, and on that day should I think myself unhappy and a traitor to my country when I had the misfortune to be praised by the very learned member. Sir, in a letter to which allusion has been made by the gallant general, I did speak of “war to the knife” against his Majesty’s present ministers, and that phrase I will now repeat for the satisfaction of the gallant member.

But, sir, this is not the letter to which my hon. friend the member for Dover alluded, when he opened this debate; and yet, the very learned gentleman, the Solicitor-General for Ireland, with that tact for which he is so eminent—that species of scenic display, and theatrical manœuvre, which so often supply the want of ability and talent—has confounded the two letters, and brought the sentiments contained in one to bear upon the opinions promulgated in the other. Now, sir, the letter in which the phrase which has so much excited the ire of the very learned member for Kilkenny was contained was a letter written by me upon the subject of the stamp and spirit duties, which the hon. gentleman dares not oppose; or if he do, I presume he will not long enjoy the confidence of the Administration—a commodity which the very learned member could not very easily dispense with; and if he do, I here tell him there is not a man, woman, or child in Ireland, from Kilkenny to Derry, that will not be in array against him. I did, sir, denounce the scheme of assimilation as mischievous and oppressive in its tendency. I now denounce it, in my place in this House, as outrageous and profligate in design. It is another proof—if any were still wanting—of the entire ignorance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the real condition of Ireland; and because I have exerted myself to prevent this unwarrantable plan from being carried into execution I am assailed by the very learned member, who professes so much affection for Ireland. I always called upon the people of that country to

petition against the contemplated measure; and I think my views right, exactly in proportion as they be arraigned by every hack of the minister, whether in or out of this House.

As to the currency question, I think it right that, as assimilation is the order of the day, we should have the benefit of it in every respect in Ireland. Will the very learned member tell me that his motion of "assimilation" is not "taxation?" If not, why should not Ireland enjoy a gold currency as well as England? The majority of this House refused a silver currency to England, and the hon. gentleman would force paper down the throats of the Irish! Knowing, as I do, how the ministry can command venal majorities in this House, I did not go through the mockery of a motion upon the subject; but I adopted a more effectual course; and then I am met by the very learned member for Kilkenny with all his stage tricks, scenic skill, and forensic management—for which latter quality he has of late gained so much celebrity, and all of which qualities are so often found useful in the absence of ability, talents, legal knowledge, and research; and he gravely tells me that, instead of writing letters in newspapers, I ought to bring forward a motion in this House. Sir, not being so good an actor as the very learned gentleman, I do not choose to appear in a farce; I am not, unfortunately, frivolous and shallow enough to play a part in such mimicry. Nature did not cast me for the character of Justice Shallow. The very learned gentleman has alluded to the distress in 1821. What, sir, was the cause of this distress? Why, the insolvency of the country banks. This is the evil that I want to prevent a recurrence of, and by no other means will that end be attained so quickly as by the discussion of this night. The country will naturally take alarm at the panic which a member enjoying the confidence of his Majesty's Government is in, and it will see that the precautionary measures which have been resorted to in Waterford were suggested by well-grounded apprehension. If the branch banks have substance they can suffer no injury from the run

upon them for payment of their notes; and if they are insolvent the sooner the bubble bursts the better. My letter was addressed to a gentleman upon a local subject—the discussion of this night will make the opinion it contained current throughout the entire island. So that if the measure I have recommended be bad—and I am quite sure it is not—the hon. and learned gentleman will have to answer to his employers for making it universal. But, sir, I am accused of writing letters, and in the same breath it is stated by an officer of the Crown, that an Act, the most infamous and despotic that a government was empowered to wield—an Act at war with every notion of constitutional liberty, and fit only for the climate of Algiers; an Act which enables the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, by his mere *fiat*, to put to rout any meeting called for any purpose, or in any place, by a Lord Mayor, or sheriffs, or magistrates, or by the people themselves, still stains the statute-book. Would such an Act be submitted to by the people of England as was tamely borne in Ireland? How, I ask, are the people to be informed of what affects their interest, unless through the medium of the Press? The Press is now the only route of communication to the public; and that route I have entered into. I will continue in it; and, despite of the very learned member's taunts, I will go forward in the same course. If, in my communications to the Irish Press—ever faithful and independent—I shall write anything that is improper, I am sure the very learned Solicitor-General for Ireland will feel no repugnance at framing an *ex officio*. Sir, I have opposed the oligarchy and the ministry, because I consider both to be enemies to the welfare of the empire, and, of course, I could not have been silly enough to expect the cheers of either. I ever did and ever shall oppose the intrigues of every party in this House. I care not for names—Whigs and Tories I equally condemn if they do wrong. I sit here as an independent member of an independent county to do the work of the people, and to oppose the oppression of ministers and of the aristocracy. The influence of the one I never had, and ever shall despise; the frowns of the other I court, as

the best reward of my labours and exertions for the people. But, sir, I cannot restrain the expression of my indignation, when I see needy professional adventurers, empty jesters, silk-robed harlequins, without talent, without professional capacity or knowledge, known only as the parasites of the Minister and the panderers of power, devoid of every qualification for office, except adulation, subserviency, and tergiversation, ranters in the senate-house, but briefless in the court—I cannot, I say, sir, restrain my indignation, when I see such characters as I have described, rising from nothingness and penury to situation and wealth, filling judicial situations, and if not wearing the ermine at least aspiring to that elevation, whilst their superiors in intellect, in worth, in integrity and information, are kept in the background, because they are too sincere to conform, and too independent to fawn. I again, sir, disclaim an intention of apologizing or explaining to this House. In this House I have been, and will continue to be, decorous, and out of it I will do everything that, in my opinion, may serve Ireland.

Subject, ARMS [IRELAND] BILL; Date, JULY 3, 1830.

A short and sharp debate, in which Mr. Doherty calumniated his country vehemently, and the member for Montrose (Mr. Hume) defended the “honour and honesty” of the Irish, insinuating that they might be safely allowed to have arms, “if they were not provoked to use them.”

On the 7th June, O’Connell spoke briefly on Irish absentees; “the absence of landed proprietors,” he said, “was the curse of Ireland.”

On the 3rd June, O’Connell called attention to the fearful distress in some parts of Ireland, and read letters to prove it; “the people,” he said, “in some places were living on nettles and weeds.”

Mr. O’Connell maintained that there was not a people in Europe naturally less disposed to insubordination and outrages than the Irish. He perfectly agreed with his hon. friend the member for Montrose, that on the treatment of human beings depended their conduct.

Subject, ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH ;

Date, NOVEMBER 2ND, 1830.

A masterly speech. Mr. Brougham followed; he admitted that Ireland "was agitated and discontented," and kept "in a state of alarm." He said he "prized O'Connell's services," though he could not agree with him as to Repeal of the Union. O'Connell's power and influence was eminently necessary to the Whigs at that time, and he was respected accordingly.

Mr. O'Connell said—The duty that I have to perform to-night is to me extremely pleasing, as it affords me some opportunity of repelling calumny, and of vindicating my own motives. I do not stand forward to claim the favour of a hearing. Assailed as I have been I should be entitled to it anywhere; but here I appear as the representative of the people, with almost as many constituents as any Member who hears me, and with more than those of all the Ministry combined. The members of Government have carefully slunk from all populous places—scarcely one has been returned for more than a rotten borough; but I am sent here by a large body of the people, and I claim to speak as their representative. First, I appeal to every man whether the speech put into the mouth of the Sovereign is not one of the most unsatisfactory discourses ever pronounced by the chief of a great nation? I speak of it both as it relates to foreign and to domestic concerns. I did not hear in it one word about the poverty and distress of the people in any part of the kingdom—not one word regarding relief. The rotten borough system, the oligarchical mode of returning members to this House is, I know, reckoned among the blessings of our condition; and for this reason not a syllable is said respecting that distress which the right hon. gentleman was unable to deny. If there be no distress, why is night made horrible by fires, the blaze of which may be seen from the metropolis? Why are the people in a state of disturbance and insubordination within a

short distance of the very seat of Government? Is there no cause for this, and is the calumny to be pronounced upon the people of England, that they break out into acts of open violence without the pretence of suffering? Nothing is said about the alleviation of distress; and, above all, nothing about the alleviation of the distress of Ireland. But I arraign the speech for what it says or omits on our foreign as well as our domestic policy. We have had excuses for not rejoicing in the success of the French people, and we have been told that much is due out of courtesy to the exiled family of France. Courtesy, indeed, towards a sovereign who wished to cut down and massacre his unoffending people without pity or remorse. Regret ministers may feel—not at the unmerited sufferings of those people, but that the efforts of the king of France were not successful in riveting upon the French the chains of slavery. That king and his ministers attempted to take away almost altogether the elective franchise from the French people, and to put down the liberty of the Press. Who attempted to put down the liberty of the Press here, and to prevent the expression of the popular sentiments in Ireland? Why, our Attorney-General and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. In Belgium I can also find some happy coincidences with the conduct of our Government at home. In the proceedings against that illustrious man, De Potter, it would seem as if an English Attorney-General had been imported from this country to frame the indictment which was preferred against him. Let us refer next to Portugal. Don Miguel is to be recognised, and why? Because he has promised an amnesty to his subjects; that is to say, he who has been bound by no oaths is to be trusted on his honour. When will this amnesty arrive? When the dungeons have been cleared; when the scaffolds have ceased to stream with human blood. The right hon. gentleman tells us that Don Miguel is king with the approbation of the people, but let us remember that 4,000 or 5,000 British troops happened to be looking on at the time, and aided the tyrant in his usurpation of the sovereignty. There is this great difference between King Philip and King Miguel—King

Philip has separated Church from State; he has dissolved the adulterous connection that injures the cause of religion wherever it exists; but King Miguel has united Church and State, and while he rules the one he tramples on the other. The right hon. gentleman most pitifully implored the House to tell him why this country should not interfere in the affairs of Belgium, when a civil war was raging there. I deny the existence of a civil war. It is a war between nation and nation—the Belgic nation and the Dutch nation, and I do not think that, excepting the Union of Great Britain with Ireland, there is a fouler plot in the page of history than the annexation of Belgium to Holland. The people decided against it, yet it answered the purpose of the Holy Alliance to declare that 361 votes constituted a majority, and 700 votes a minority. The Government of the King of the Netherlands is called an enlightened administration; if so, the rebels are without excuse, and nothing can justify their acts. I assert that his administration, instead of being enlightened, was odious, tyrannous, and grinding—that it refused independence to the judges, and the trial by jury to the people. If any reforms were proposed they were as hypocritical as the right hon. gentleman's reforms of the law in this country, where great evils are perpetuated by the removal of insignificant abuses. Why am I listened to, as it were with suffering, when I ask whether such an administration is enlightened? The suppression of the liberty of the Press may, indeed, have its recommendations with his Majesty's ministers and with many gentlemen who hear me.

Was that an enlightened administration which decreed, that the language of courts of justice should not be the language of the country, and that the process should be Dutch, where Flemish only was spoken and understood? Was it a proof of an enlightened administration when the king abolished parochial schools and diocesan seminaries? Yet this is the man whom the right hon. gentleman has so warmly lauded—who is called enlightened while he is involved in the darkest ignorance, and who perseveres in these measures when the world is in a

state of transition, and when the blind systems by which men have been oppressed for ages are disappearing before the light of science and the heat of truth. Such is the foreign policy of the king's speech. Is there from beginning to end one particle of sympathy with the success of liberty—one spark of joy at the destruction of despotism? I look in vain for any recognition, however distant, of the great principle that the people have only to be united to be successful, and that when they are determined to struggle in a just cause the military power becomes powerless, and the arm of force is withered at the moment it is raised to strike. But if we are to interfere, in conjunction with whom are we to intermeddle with the affairs of Belgium? With the members of the Holy Alliance? No; they have too much to do at home. If violence have not yet displayed itself, it will break out, and *la guerre sourde* will, ere long, be converted into open and avowed hostility. Great Britain would herself be at war at this moment were she not bound in sureties of the peace to the extent of eight hundred millions sterling. I little thought I should ever have cause to bless the National Debt; I bless it now, since it incapacitates the British Government from interposing to crush the growing spirit of human freedom. This brings me to remark, that not a word is said in the speech regarding the reduction of taxation, the abolition of military institutions, or the destruction of the rotten-borough system. Old Sarum and Gatton are to be preserved; and, notwithstanding the formal resolution of this very day, that it is a high breach of privilege for a peer to interfere at an election, I do not want the aid of my glass to look round me and say—“You, and you, and you, have been sent here by members of the other branch of the Legislature.” If I have a wish to rescue my country from the fangs of an odious oligarchy, I must pursue that course which has been so loudly censured by the right hon. gentleman. He has talked of my conduct on a recent occasion; and held me up to be repudiated by the supporters of the king's speech. I am content. I am vindicated before my God; and I will not condescend to vindicate myself here (*hear, hear*). I

am much obliged by the sympathy that cheer implies: it shows that there is no necessity for a separation of the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. I thank you. You may triumph over my country—you have triumphed, but you never will again. It is easy to triumph over the individual, and I wish you joy of it. In the king's speech I read that his Majesty "cannot view without grief and indignation the efforts which are industriously made to excite among the people a spirit of discontent and disaffection." If it be meant to impute to those who take a constitutional and legal part in Ireland that they are ill-affected to the present king, I will assert that a grosser calumny was never uttered. They are convinced that there is not in the kingdom a better-intentioned man than its sovereign. Never did monarch receive more undivided allegiance than the present king from the men who in Ireland agitate the Repeal of the Union. Never, too, was there a grosser calumny than to assert that they wish to produce a separation between the two countries. Never was there a greater mistake than to suppose that we wish to dissolve the connection. No; but we want a connection of authority, not of subserviency—of equality, not of submission. Ireland must be equal, not inferior—she must be a kingdom, not a province; and I declare solemnly that I believe it would be more for the benefit of England than of Ireland that the Union should be dissolved, and that the Parliament should be restored to Ireland. It would lead me too far a-field to debate now the question of the Union; but let me ask any man what good did it ever do my unfortunate country? I have put this question a thousand times. You answer, it has accelerated Catholic Emancipation. I deny that; it postponed Emancipation. Five preparatory acts were passed in twelve years, and then came the Union in seven years afterwards, lest the measure should be ultimately carried. It was, indeed, tardily conceded by Great Britain, when those who long opposed it suddenly turned round, deserted their ancient adherents, and claimed the merit of liberality for what was extorted from their fears. Does any man who hears me know how the Union was

brought about? It was avowed in the Irish Parliament that a rebellion had been fostered for the purpose, and that it cost the Government £1,500,000 to buy over the Opposition. In short, it may be safely said, that all other corruptions were pure and honest compared with the gross, barefaced corruption which accomplished the Irish Union. Cavalry and infantry were employed to prevent public meetings; and if a design of the kind at Clonmel had been persevered in for one moment longer the streets would have flowed with the blood of the Protestant gentry. What advantage has Ireland derived from the Union? Nothing but disadvantage. The rental of Ireland ought to be twelve millions, and no less than five millions of that sum are remitted to absentees. The productive taxation of Ireland has been diminished since the Union to the extent of three millions; although the population has more than doubled, the consumption of tea, wine, and sugar has decreased. In short, there is not a single piece of evidence derived from the state of the revenue which does not prove that Ireland has been grievously injured by the Union. The Imperial Parliament has passed four acts out of five in favour of the landlords, those absentees who extort all its wealth from Ireland. By the Subletting Act the landlord has obtained unlimited power of the property of his tenants. By the Vestries Act these landlords tax the Catholic people for the support of the Protestant Church, the great revenues of which go into the pockets of their children and dependents. And what are the effects of all these oppressive laws? Look at the poverty of the people; look at the misery and distress which have been manifest at Naas, Newry, Cork, Dublin; look at the riots at Limerick, and the starvation under which the peasantry are dying. There is deep distress, and there is disaffection in Ireland—disaffection to the Government that has oppressed—and let me tell you that you would have disturbances too in Ireland but for the man who is looking for the Repeal of the Union, and who happily possesses so much of the confidence of the people as to be able to prevent them rising against the public authorities. Take away that influence, and what would be the

result? You may send over a military secretary to put down the public spirit by a military force, but in vain. Tell the people of Ireland that you have no sympathy with their sufferings—that their advocate is greeted with sneers and laughter—that he is an outlaw in the land—and that he is taunted for want of courage, because he is afraid of offending his God. Tell them this, and let them hear also in what language the Secretary of State, who issued the proclamation to prevent meetings in Ireland, has spoken of Polignac. If he be asked his reason for issuing that proclamation, he will answer, "My will," although, at the same moment, it would be easy to demonstrate its illegality. But I will not enter into this discussion now—I cannot trust myself—my feelings overpower me. Phrases have been attributed to me, which, if I had used, I should regret, but which I never did use; but I have no apology to make to the instruments of despotism anywhere. The right hon. gentleman has asserted that I said that Ireland was not yet strong enough to oppose force to force. I never said it; I never said anything like it. I am sure that he is incapable of inventing the expression, but those who have informed him have informed him falsely. I found my country agitated by poverty and distress from one end to the other, and it has been asserted that I therefore created the cry for the Repeal of the Union. How much men mistake. It would be cruel—too severe a punishment to ask hon. gentlemen to read all my speeches from the time I first entered upon political life; but if they did read them, they would find that the restoration of her domestic legislature to Ireland was my earliest thesis—my constant avowal. I would not revive the topic in the last session. I was prevented in part by the discussions on the cold-blooded additions to the taxation of Ireland, in the shape of an increased stamp duty, which would have the effect of crushing the Press. This fact shows the sympathy of the House for the sufferings of Ireland—sympathy of which it affords fresh evidence whenever I attempt to speak. The Irish people, seeing that they became poorer every day—that they declined from bad to worse—thought that

the only chance of prosperity was to be found in the Repeal of the Union. In looking for the accomplishment of that end who has talked of the employment of force? Nobody; but they all knew that to come to Parliament with one or two petitions was to have them neglected, and that nothing of this kind could be effectual but by the universal petitions of the people of Ireland claiming the Repeal of the Union. This is the only mode by which great measures of reform can be obtained. While only a few petitions came from small towns or villages the cause of reform in Parliament was ridiculed and scouted; but now it is supported by the universal population of England, the whisper flies from bench to bench that the time is approaching when it must be conceded. I think the people of Ireland aggrieved. How are they to procure relief? By petitions. How are petitions to be obtained? By magic? No; only by men meeting and associating together for one common object. Polignac never would have attempted in France what has been accomplished in Ireland; and even the king of Belgium would have refrained until by the importation of the law of conspiracy he had convicted De Potter. The modes we adopt, and which we wish to adopt, are legal and constitutional: we want no force but the force of reason, and we eschew all violence, even the violence of argument. Wherever we have influence there is no disturbances; where we have no influence, there Whiteboyism and Ribbonism prevail. Let me be shouted down—take away my influence—and how will you prevent confusion? The consequences will not rest upon me; for them you alone will be responsible. The hon. and learned gentleman, after adverting to the poverty, disease, and distress in Ireland, and to the manner in which money was exported to absentees, referring particularly to the counties of Wicklow and Westmeath, concluded thus:—So long as the people of Ireland proceed for the Repeal of the Union, legally and constitutionally, they shall have all the aid I can give them. Let ministers suspend the Habeas Corpus Act; it shall not deter me. Prepare your gaols and your dungeons; these are times when men must speak out, and I will do

lit. I will discharge my duty in spite of taunts of cowardice and threats of punishment; and I will proceed, be sure, not less firmly and resolutely because constitutionally. You may deprive Ireland of the poor wreck of her liberty, but you shall never make me your willing slave.

Subject, ABOLITION OF THE OATH OF ABJURATION;
Date, NOVEMBER 4, 1830.

Mr. O'Connell supported the motion, and recommended the abolition rather than the alteration of the oaths in question. There was no country in the world in which so many oaths were required; and it was unquestionably desirable to dispense with as many of them as possible. For every purpose, and for no purpose were oaths taken. In the universities the oaths taken were absolutely frightful. So, too, in the revenue, the customs, and excise. With respect to what had fallen from the hon. member for Kirkcubright, it should be considered that it was consistent with the belief of a Protestant member to swear that the Pope neither had nor ought to have any spiritual jurisdiction in this realm. But the Roman Catholic member could not be required to swear that, for he believed that the Pope had a spiritual jurisdiction over him. It was most desirable to adopt some means by which so solemn a sanction for the security of life and property as an oath should have the respect paid to it which was its due. If, however, the lower classes saw the subject treated with indifference by the higher, the effect would be most injurious. He would appeal to the moral and religious feeling of every man in the House if such were not the case.

Subject, ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN IRELAND;
Date, NOVEMBER 5, 1830.

How Irish Judges were appointed.

Mr. O'Connell did not rise to oppose the motion, but as the Act referred to had made no effectual reform in the adminis-

tration of justice in England, it must not be understood that the bill proposed to be introduced would effect any legal reform in Ireland. He would take this opportunity of noticing the manner of appointing judges in Ireland. None but a man who has been much employed in the Courts could make a good judge; but such offices had always been filled by political gentlemen—he would not call them political adventurers—who were thus rewarded for the services they had performed to Government in that House. This had been the case in the last appointment. The ministers did not inquire who bore the best character in the Hall, but they came to this House, and having found a gentleman who always voted for them, they gave him the appointment. This was the proof of a want of a resident legislature in Ireland. Such an occurrence could not take place in this country, nor ought it to take place in any part of the kingdom; for the judges made more law than the Parliament, and the appointment of such men should, therefore, be made with reference to their knowledge and ability only. He had no interest in speaking thus, for there was no appointment of the kind that he would accept if it were offered him now, and he had no hesitation in stating that he never would accept any such appointment at any time.

Leave given.

Subject, REPEAL OF THE UNION; Date, NOVEMBER 9, 1830.

Personalities were indulged in on all sides. Mr. G. Dawson gave O'Connell the lie direct. In a second speech he accused O'Connell of "vomiting calumnious falsehoods" against him, and amidst loud cheering taunted him with his vow against duelling being used as a cloak to cover his retreat.

Mr. O'Connell did not intend to bring forward a specific motion for the Repeal of the Union till the number of petitions in its favour should show that the measure was one not emanating from individuals, but from the majority of the people of Ireland. He would take the opportunity of assuring his excel-

lent friend, the member for Middlesex, that the Repeal of the Union was no mere whim of his, but the ardent desire of 99 persons out of every 100 in Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell had no other object in view in agitating the question of a local Parliament than to prevent the forcible separation of Ireland from England, and to add the benefits of their union. The Union had long been an object of hatred to the people of Ireland. The Chief Justice of the King's Bench in Ireland declared that the Act of the Union was a nullity, for the Parliament had no authority to pass it. The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in Ireland, Lord Plunkett, declared that, like Hannibal, he would bring his sons to the altar, and make them swear perpetual hostility to the measure. The great majority of the Irish people now called for its repeal, and he could assure his hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) that he was mistaken as to the opinions of his own constituents. The declaration against the Repeal got up in Dublin had not been signed by more than a score persons.

Mr. O'Connell, in moving that it be printed, said that he should not complain of the treatment which he had received from two persons; for in very truth he was proud of the attack which had been just made upon him by the present and ex-member for Londonderry. He would tell the hon. member for Londonderry (Sir R. Bateson) that he was signalized by one singularity—he was that hon. member's inferior when he was called to the Bar, now he was his equal. That equality he had extorted from those who were unwilling to concede it, and in the teeth of as foul a conspiracy as had ever been formed to crush the cause of civil and religious liberty. As to the ex-member for Londonderry (Mr. G. Dawson) he had little to say to him, except to ask him how much of the public money he had received in his time? Had he not put the public money into his pockets by shovelsful? The ex-member for Londonderry had shown the most lamentable ignorance upon two points. The ex-member for Londonderry had told the House that the subject of the Repeal of the Union had not been put

forward at all in the last elections. Now the fact was that he (Mr. O'Connell) had put it forward himself in the very first address which he had published to the electors of Waterford. The ex-member for Londonderry had also stated that, before the Union, we had in Ireland forty tax gatherers where we now had one. Even if it were so they were Irishmen; but he denied the fact. Did the ex-member for Londonderry know what the debt of Ireland was before the Union? It was only £16,000,000, whilst her revenue was £1,400,000. Did he know that up to that period there was no country in Europe so lightly taxed as Ireland? Was that the case at present? Here's a man who has been in the Treasury forty years, and is still ignorant of the taxation of Ireland. The House had heard the manner in which that man had addressed him. He knew the reason of it, and was glad that he had excited his hostility. He had mentioned the amount of money which that man had wrung from the public. Now, with all his money, what good had he ever done his country? Let him look at his entire life and say, what good had he ever done for either England, Scotland, or Ireland? Ay, he would throw him the Isle of Man into the bargain. Would the ex-member for Londonderry venture to ask the same question of him? The ex-member for Londonderry had then introduced the name of Earl Fitzwilliam into the discussion. Now he (Mr. O'Connell) had never said that Earl Fitzwilliam's agent had ejected 800 families. All that he said was that he had ejected 800 persons. And when the ex-member for Londonderry had read that pointed, but "exceedingly cautious"—in assertion—letter of Mr. Challoner—for Mr. Challoner only denied that ejections had been served upon 800 families, and did not state how many ejections he had served—he ought to have done him (Mr. O'Connell) the justice of reading his letter in answer to it. In his answer he stated, that he had never said 800 families—no newspaper even reported him to have said so—and he now repeated what he had formerly said—that there were 800 persons upon Earl Fitzwilliam's estate under notice to quit on the 1st

May. (*Cries of "No, no."*) He said that a farm of 800 acres was to go into lease on the 1st of May next; there were sixty families upon it, consisting of about 300 persons; these had all got notice to quit, as Mr. Challoner had disposed of the farm to a person of the name of Singe. He had now disposed of 300 out of the 800. He had got details from two clergymen as to the remaining cases, into which he should not enter at present. He begged leave also to remind the House that he was not imputing blame to Earl Fitzwilliam or his agent when he mentioned these cases (*cries of "Oh!"*), but was speaking of the consequences of the Sub-letting Act. Did hon. gentlemen think to put him down by assailing him with broad and unmannerly contradictions? If they did, they were utterly mistaken in their man. The sitting member for Londonderry had told the House, that his constituents were almost to a man opposed to Repeal of the Union. He (Mr. O'Connell) had never said that that question was popular in the North of Ireland. He knew, however, that the people of three provinces had declared themselves decidedly in its favour. He knew also that it was gaining ground in the North of Ireland, for a newspaper at Newry, which had originally been opposed to the Repeal of the Union, had recently changed its opinions, in deference to the popular sentiments prevailing in the neighbourhood. He was not acquainted with the hon. member's constituents, but he understood that they were a pugnacious race, who built—

“—— Their faith upon
The holy text of pike and gun.

He understood, that after some Roman Catholics had surrendered to them, and given up their arms, on the express condition that their lives should be saved, they had done what? given the Catholics protection? No; they had done this (*the hon. member drew his hand significantly across his throat*). But he would not pursue that feud further; he wished it to be forgotten. He had heard four or five gentlemen speak that evening in defence of the Union; but, strange to say, not one of them

had pointed out a single good which it had done. The ex-member for Londonderry had called the electors of Waterford a mob. He denied the truth of that assertion in the strongest terms that the decorum of Parliamentary language would permit him to use. There never was anything asserted—he would not say by the hon. gentlemen, but by the lowest person in the most degraded rank of society—more groundless and untrue. His constituents were, nine-tenths of them, equal to the ex-member for Londonderry in rank, and all vastly superior to him in intellect. He would not demean himself by entering into a comparison of his own merits with those of the ex-member for Londonderry. He (Mr. O'Connell) had had the honour of receiving an offer to return him to Parliament from three counties in Ireland—an offer made, too, by persons who could have performed it, as they proved by returning members who had pledged themselves to act upon his principles. He (Mr. O'Connell) had given up the representation of a fourth county; and a fifth county, as they all knew, had sent him to Parliament. No man in the House could pair with him in that respect, certainly not the ex-member for Londonderry, for he had been turned out of his county; he tried to take refuge in another and failed—tried again at Merchants' Hall, failed there too—and then left his country, and took refuge in an English rotten borough. And yet that man—that clerk in a public office, with an extravagantly large salary for doing nothing—came forward to calumniate him—him, disinterestedly and independently chosen by the people of Waterford; for who could expect to receive favours of patronage at his hand? The freeholders of Waterford selected him because they knew that he was an object of hostility to all who entertained views hostile to Ireland; because they knew that he was marked out for the rancour of every little mean and contemptible mind. He would take care not to disgrace their choice. He would never tire in doing his duty to his country. Ireland deserved well of all her sons. The curse had been on her long. In the words of the Chief Justice of the Irish Common Pleas, he would say that

Ireland had never wrung any boon from the grasp of England, which England had not parted with as reluctantly as if it had been her heart's blood. He would imitate the glorious example of the Brownlow of 1782—of that man, on whom was inscribed the proud epitaph, that he had found his country enslaved, and had left her free—of that man, whose name could not receive greater lustre, unless the Brownlow of 1830 should join with him and procure the Repeal of the Union. He had that evening been assailed by language that was as low, mean, and creeping as the source from which it came. He hailed it as his richest reward—as his highest encomium. “Ye placeholders, who revel on the hard earnings of the people,” said Mr. O’Connell, addressing the ministerial benches; “ye pensioners who subsist on the public money, ye tax-consumers and tax-devourers, assault me as you please. I am not to be intimidated by you. I shall continue to stand by Ireland; for I represent her wants, her wishes, and her grievances.” The hon. member concluded by expressing his hopes that, as he was born in an independent country, he should not die until he had left her in possession of an independent Legislature.

Subject, SUB-LETTING ACT; Date, NOVEMBER 11, 1830.

From the period of the Union until the present, all the statutes enacted by the Legislature had had for their object the oppression of the peasantry, and the giving advantages to the landlord. The statutes which enabled the landlord to distrain-growing crops, and which conferred upon him the power of ejecting a tenant at an extremely small expense, were of this description, and had been among the main causes of the evils of the poor in Ireland, and consequently of the disturbances which had unfortunately taken place in that country. The statutes first enabled the landlord to ruin his tenant, and then to turn him out cheaply. He might be told that this Act was made for the purpose of creating large farms, and then there

might be repeated to him long dissertations upon the beneficial effects of large farms. If to cause universal mendicity among the peasantry was to produce a beneficial effect, then, indeed, there would be some truth in these dissertations and some sense in the pages of evidence which unfeeling men had given in favour of cultivating sheep and cattle instead of human beings. While he was upon this subject, let him mention an act which it gave him the greatest satisfaction to record. So great had been the increase of beggars that the Mendicity Association of Dublin must have closed its doors if the Duke of Northumberland had not presented it with a donation of £1,000. He meant a donation not out of the public money, but out of his Grace's private purse. He could state further that after that sum of £1,000 was exhausted, the Association had been kept going by the private contributions of a member of his Grace's family—a female whose name he would not, of course, mention. He knew these facts to be as he had stated them. But to return to this statute, of which, he repeated, the effect had been to increase mendicity to an alarming extent, it was a political economy measure, not a Government Act. Its professed object was to create large farms. It prevented labourers being employed, for if the landlord gave the labourer a holding, the labourer might keep it. Unless, therefore, in the neighbourhood of the lands excepted from the operation of the Act, no large farms could exist, because the owner would not risk the employment of the number of labourers necessary to cultivate them. To the operation of this Act was to be traced the erroneous notion that there was a superabundance of labour in Ireland. There was no natural superabundance of labour in that country; the superabundance of labour was artificial, and caused by bad laws and bad government. If such a state of things were allowed to continue, he apprehended—however dangerous the admission might appear—a civil war in Ireland of the worst description. The hon. member concluded by moving for leave to bring in his Bill.

Subject, REPEAL OF THE UNION ; Date, DECEMBER 11, 1830

O'Connell complains of the indifference of the English Press to Irish interests. During this debate Sir Robert Wilson said that Ireland was anything but prosperous at the Union, and declared on his own personal knowledge that the rebellion of '98 was caused by the "indescribable wretchedness of the people ; it was not caused by religion, and the Catholic Church did not encourage it."

Mr. O'Connell, at the request of the petitioners, supported the petition. He had been accused of being the instigator of the petitions upon this subject, but he denied the charge, and appealed to the hon. member for Limerick for its fallacy. The petitions were, in fact, produced by great distress, which made men cast about for relief. He had announced last year that the distress was great, and it continued. It was impossible, indeed, to give an adequate idea of the distress and misery of Ireland. In Limerick it was frightful. He regretted that the hon. member for Limerick disagreed with the petition, for he thought that a Repeal of the Union was the only measure that could possibly relieve the distress. Hon. members could know nothing of the extent of this distress, as the London Press carefully avoided mentioning it. In fact, he wished for a Parliament in Ireland, because the Press of England, being governed by self-interest, had no motive to attend to the affairs of that country; and the conditions, opinions, and sentiments of the Irish people were, therefore, little known on this side of the Channel. Were the Union repealed Irish opinion would find its weight. He feared that the opinion delivered by the hon. member for Limerick would be the means of depriving the House of the talents of that hon. member.

SECOND SPEECH.—SAME DEBATE.

Mr. O'Connell regretted to hear much of what had fallen from hon. members. With regard to the observations of the

member for Abingdon, who had stated from his own peculiar sources of information that those persons who urged the Repeal of the Union appeared to him chargeable with sinister motives, he could not avoid complaining that the hon. member should so traduce those men. The hon. member should have made some inquiry before he ventured to make such a charge. The Irish people had much confidence in the new Administration, but their confidence would never induce them to give up the question of a Repeal of the Union. A noble lord (Lord William Powlett) had said that Ireland was not grievously taxed. The noble lord must have strange ideas of taxation. Ireland was taxed one million to grand juries, two millions for the support of the Church Establishment, and four millions were paid into the Treasury. Was this taxation not grievous? In addition—although to a certainty the tax was paid in England, the duties on tea were to be included. They were not to be considered as part of the Irish revenue, but they were substantially so. Since the war, thirty millions of taxation had been taken off England, while only £500,000 had been removed from Ireland. This showed the want of a resident Legislature. But since this sum was taken off, £300,000 had been added. It had been asked by the noble lord, why did not the Irish members propose some measures of relief for Ireland? Twice had he brought forward questions of great importance to Ireland, and on each occasion he was left in a minority. The two questions were, the Sub-letting and Vestry Acts; and on the occasion of both divisions, the noble lord voted against him. Could it be urged that Ireland had not the means of forming a local Legislature? Ireland had in former times flourished under her own Legislature, and why could she not do so now? From the year 1782 until the Union, Ireland was never in such a state of prosperity—far, far different from what she was now. The equalization of duties had ruined her manufactories. Until the Union should be repealed he despaired of seeing Ireland flourish, and he implored his Majesty's ministers to consider well the measure.

SAME DEBATE—SAME DATE.

In a speech on the Parliamentary Grants for Education (Ireland), O'Connell said:—

He would put it to any man whether the Catholics had not a right to educate their children in such religious tenets as they pleased. He would appeal to the hon. member for Londonderry himself, whether they had not an equal right with the Protestants so to do? He was ready to admit that the Presbyterians wished their children to be educated in the manner practised by the Society. Well, let the Presbyterians be educated as they chose, the Catholics as they chose—that was all the latter required. The hon. member had charged him with a species of inconsistency, and if he ever wished to interfere with the religious principles of any human being, he would allow that hon. member to charge him with anything. He had never so interfered, or uttered a sentiment that tended to interference. He entertained a firm conviction that religion was an affair between man and his God, and he who interfered on the subject might call himself a Christian, but other men would call him a blasphemer. He could bear, with the utmost complacency, the boasts of the Presbyterians, knowing that the world was greatly indebted to them for the liberties it possessed, and feeling, as he did, a high degree of respect for the independent members of that body. But let them be content to do by the Catholics as the Catholics would do by them—leave the latter to educate their children as they pleased.

Subject, MR. O'CONNELL AND THE IRISH GOVERNMENT;

Date, FEBRUARY 28, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell and the Irish Government were perpetually at issue. Mr. Hume, in a speech during the last session, had asked why the Government should mind the "paper bullets" of the right hon. gentleman; but the Government did mind them, and, in truth, they hit very hard, and left very sore wounds. O'Connell was at the zenith of his power; he was virtually king of Ireland; his versatile talents, his perfect fearlessness, the result of the

purest love of Ireland that ever thrilled the heart of any patriot, all combined to make his power a terrible reality. He would not be put down; he would not be bribed; the only resource left to his opponents, some of the ablest men of the day, was to calumniate him. If by fair means or foul the people could be brought to distrust the sincerity of their best friend, the battle was gained. No effort was spared to accomplish this end. O'Connell's life and death were his triumphant vindication.

Mr. O'Connell rose to present a petition from Leighlin-bridge for a Repeal of the Legislative Union. He would take advantage of that occasion to ask the right hon. Secretary for Ireland a question with reference to a declamation of his on a former occasion—namely, that he (Mr. O'Connell) had, through his friends, offered to enter into a compromise with the Irish Government, with a view to averting the penal results of a then pending prosecution. But before he formally asked the right hon. gentleman whether and on what grounds he had made this declamation, he begged leave to say, that he had authorised no person on his behalf to offer any terms of compromise, and that no such compromise was proffered to his knowledge. Some persons had told him, on the other hand, that they felt themselves authorised to say, that the Government would very gladly enter into such compromise with him; but, after the unqualified denial in that House of the right hon. gentleman, he believed that such was not the fact. Having made his preliminary declamation, in fairness to himself and the right hon. gentleman, he begged leave then to distinctly ask him, whether any persons had proffered such a compromise on his behalf; and if so, he asked him to state their names to the House? There could be no delicacy in disclosing their names, because, if they were accredited agents, he, on the supposition of the principal, asked for publicity; and, if they were not his agents, it was but common justice to hold them up as impostors.

SAME DEBATE.

Stanley, O'Connell's bitterest enemy, replied, and named Lord Glengall and Mr. Bennett. O'Connell replied.

Mr. O'Connell could not but admit that his question had been answered most satisfactorily by the right hon. gentleman. He was glad that the proposition of a compromise was thus traced to Mr. Bennett and the Earl of Glengall. With respect to that noble lord's interference, all he could say was, that it was without his knowledge, for he had had no communication with Lord Glengall on this subject whatever. With respect to Mr. Bennett the case stood thus :—That gentleman had written to him (Mr. O'Connell) from London three letters, stating that an individual, not an actual member of the Government, was authorised by certain persons in office to make propositions of great personal advantage to himself, with a view of bringing about a compromise between him and the Irish law authorities. His answer was, that he should first hear upon what terms the Government would dictate the compromise, so far as it referred to its intentions towards Ireland, and that for himself he would not enter into any compromise. He, moreover, desired that Mr. Bennett should not write to him again on this point of personal compromise. Mr. Bennett's last letter was written on the 6th of January, from which date till the 5th of February he had no communication, nor even then, but through his son, to whom Mr. Bennett addressed himself, stating as his reason—"Your father having refused to listen to any compromise, I address myself to you." On receipt of this letter he certainly, as the right hon. gentleman had stated, did dictate to his son-in-law the terms on which alone he would enter into a compromise, and the declaration, in his son-in-law's handwriting, was enclosed in a letter of his son to Mr. Bennett. But what did his son say in this note to Mr. Bennett? Why, "that my father has been so much deceived and deluded by the present Administration, that he will not enter into any negotiation with any of its members till it first consents to abandon the

prosecution against him without any equivocation." And his son added that, "as it may not be exactly conformable with the dignity of the Irish Government to formally abandon the prosecution, my father will not insist on a formal abandonment." His son then specified the terms on which alone he would consent to a compromise—namely, first, that the prosecution should be unequivocally withdrawn; and, secondly, that the Irish Government should state what measures of relief were intended towards Ireland. He added that, as the benefit and prosperity of Ireland was the end of all his (Mr. O'Connell's) endeavours in that House and elsewhere, and as the measure for a Repeal of the Union was regarded by him only as a means towards that end, he should consent to relinquish the agitation of that question if the measures of the Government tended to the benefit and prosperity of Ireland. This was all the compromise proffered on his part.

The hon. member proceeded to say, that he could not deny that the Government had entered into no compromise with him with respect to the prosecutions against him—none whatever; but neither had he entered into any with the Government. He was as free as ever to advocate those political opinions which rendered him obnoxious in the eyes of the present Administration. Therefore, as no compromise had originated from him or from the Irish law authorities, he was warranted to say that it must have sprung up between them both. Then, as to the prosecution still pending against him, the matter stood thus:—There were originally thirty-one counts in two indictments entered against him, seventeen under common law, charging him with "fraud, conspiracy, and sedition," and fourteen charging him with the violation of a statute (10th George IV.) which empowered the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland to suppress by proclamation meetings tending to a breach of the peace. The former—the seventeen—law counts had been, without solicitation on his part, abandoned by the Irish Government; and he was warranted to conclude, that they were so because they could not be maintained. With respect to the fourteen other counts—to those charging him with defying a proclamation of the

Lord Lieutenant—he had demurred; and he and seven other gentlemen, also charged with the same misdemeanour, having sworn that they had not committed the offence alleged against them, and by so doing could not plead guilty to the charge (as had been stated elsewhere), he had withdrawn his plea of demurrer; and there the matter at present rested. He would not say that the Attorney-General in Ireland might not, on the first day of next term, mark judgment against him, but he maintained that that judgment could not be declared against him till his writ of error had been argued first before the twelve judges in Ireland, and, if necessary, before the House of Lords here. And here he thought it right to state that, as the seven gentlemen associated with him in the indictment had acted on his suggestion as a lawyer, he, and he only, should be liable to all the legal consequences. It might be asked, why he had given up his chance of acquittal by a jury? His answer, he little expected, after the sneers and laughter with which his declarations were usually received in that House, would receive much credit or sympathy, but as it was the truth he would state it. It was because he dreaded the consequences to the peace of his country by the excitement which the trial would inevitably have produced that he waived his chance of acquittal. He knew that all business would be at a perfect stand-still in Dublin during the five or six days the trial would last; he knew that the trades of Dublin would have escorted him with craped banners to the number of 30,000; that, at least, 2,000 respectable inhabitants of the city would have attended him each day to the courts; and, above all, that processions, including thousands upon thousands of an excited multitude, from all the counties adjoining Dublin, and even extending to Wicklow, Meath, Kilkenny, Roscommon, and Cavan, would have filled the streets, anxious for the result; and because, knowing all this, and devoted as he was to the political regeneration of Ireland, he would not consent that that regeneration should be purchased even at the risk of shedding a single drop of human blood. [The hon. member was interrupted at this point of his speech by a voice

from the gallery pronouncing with great emphasis of tone, "That's a lie." The individual who gave utterance to it was immediately taken into custody.] The hon. member repeated that he had entered into no compromise with the Irish Government, nor had it entered into any compromise with him.

Stanley answered again, and O'Connell replied again.

Mr. O'Connell, in moving that this petition be read, observed that he wished to take notice of the speech of the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, which, though it was triumphant in manner and full of assertions of self-praise, appeared to him to be destitute of any rational foundation. He called the special attention of the House to this fact, that the right honourable Secretary had not contradicted any part of his statement about the legal arrangements.

The right honourable Secretary had said that the Government had given up nothing in giving up the indictment against him for conspiring to hold illegal meetings; inasmuch as it had gained a conviction against him upon the indictment for holding meetings in defiance of a proclamation sanctioned by an act of Parliament. Did the honourable Secretary when he made that assertion know, that that indictment was varied by charges of fraud, and by charges of sedition committed at meetings, and committed in speeches alleged to have been uttered with the express intent of bringing Government into contempt, and the Constitution into disregard? Had the right honourable Secretary even denied that there was moral guilt in that part of the indictment? So much for that part of the right hon. Secretary's speech.

Now for another. He had never uttered a wish that there should be no agitation in Ireland. He desired that there should be agitation in England for Parliamentary Reform, in Ireland for the Repeal of the Union. If there had been no agitation on the subject of Reform in England, would not the subject still have continued to slumber in that House with paltry minorities

of fourteen or fifteen members? It was agitation, constitutional agitation, which had produced such promising prospects of reform in England, and it was the same species of agitation which, he trusted, would convince the House of the necessity of repealing the Union, and of restoring to Ireland thereby the means of maintaining its inhabitants in peace and plenty. He had been denounced in the House that day; he had been denounced in it often before. Other Secretaries for Ireland had taunted him with being an agitator. The echoes of their words had reached him across the waters, even when they had taunted him with greater virulence—and he did not impute virulence to the right hon. Secretary opposite—than any which had been displayed on the present occasion; and yet he had lived to see the day when those very men had brought in with their own hands the very measure for which he had excited the agitation in Ireland, which they had so loudly and so indignantly condemned. The right hon. Secretary now stood up in the House with an air of innocence, and just as if he and the Government of Ireland had not created all the agitation of which he complained. He would take that opportunity of informing the country, that oppression more gross or more tyrannical had never been exercised in Ireland. The right hon. Secretary had professed his readiness to answer him upon that charge before a reformed Parliament. He took the right hon. Secretary at that pledge, and if he should ever see a reformed Parliament, which he was afraid he should not, he would, come what might of it, put the right hon. Secretary on his defence before it. If he should have the honour of a seat in that reformed Parliament—and in such a Parliament he should think it an honour to have a seat—he would bring under its notice the unconstitutional letter which the right hon. Secretary had written to the magistracy of Ireland. Even in the midst of all the misery by which they were surrounded, the people of Ireland had enjoyed many a long and loud laugh at the statesmanlike wisdom which had dictated, and the grammatical accuracy which pervaded, that extraordinary epistle. What did the House think that that epistle called upon

the magistracy to do? Nothing more than to disperse a meeting even before it had committed anything which could be construed into a crime. The right hon. Secretary accused him of creating excitement in Ireland. He, in return, accused the right hon. Secretary of creating it. He did not wish for that crisis which some of the Government papers were calling for.

He wished for no crisis. He knew well that if the people of Ireland avoided all appeals to force, to bloodshed, that democratic spirit, of which he had hailed with rapture the appearance in Belgium and Poland, and may to-morrow's sun bring us tidings of defeat to Russian despotism! which he adored in the mountains of Switzerland; which he trusted to see before long enlivening the green mountains of his own native land; which had produced, or speedily would produce Reform to England: he knew well, he said, that that democratic spirit which had produced such glorious effects in all other parts of Europe, would produce in Ireland equal rights and equal privileges with those enjoyed in England, if the people would only take his advice. He would repeat the words, "if the people would only take his advice"—that is, if they would only agitate constitutionally, and bring forward their claims firmly, manfully, and peacefully, untarnished by crime, and unaccompanied by outrage. On this point, then, he stood triumphant.

[*Peals of laughter for some minutes.*]

Laugh, gentlemen, laugh. (said Mr. O'Connell, with great vehemence of tone and gesture); but mind that your laughter be not mistaken. I say, then, that I stand on this point triumphant. Mark the right hon. Secretary. He has spoken, he has spoken out, he has shown no deficiency of zeal, no deficiency of spirit, and yet has he shown that in any of the many multitudes which have met on this subject in Ireland, there has been offered any particle of violence to any one individual? Has he shown that any assault has been committed on any magistrate, or any person in any part of Ireland? That they may have violated the law, in respect of its techni-

calities under the late Act, may be true; that they have been guilty of agitation, may be likewise true; but have the people of Ireland been guilty of any breach of the peace in their discussions on the Repeal of the Union?

Have they been guilty of any violation of the spirit of the law? I say, and I say boldly, that they have not; and so saying, have I not a right to say, that on this part of the case I stand triumphant. The honorable gentleman then proceeded to say, that when any person came to their meetings to discuss the question of the propriety of Repealing the Union, he was heard with patience; his argument was not interrupted: when it was concluded it was answered, and then the party found himself in a minority, generally of one, but sometimes of three or four. The right hon. Secretary had told the House of what he (Mr. O'Connell) had not done. He would beg leave to tell the right hon. Secretary of what he (Mr. Stanley) had done. The Marquis of Anglesey arrived in Ireland almost unnoticed; shortly afterwards he (Mr. O'Connell) went to Dublin. The people of Dublin thought proper to pay so humble an individual as himself a compliment on his arrival (*a laugh*). Gentlemen might taunt him there as they pleased; but did they think that any taunt which they could direct against him there would ever prevent him from discharging his duty to his warm-hearted countrymen? He could assure honourable gentlemen, that they could not do him a greater kindness with his countrymen than to receive with cheers, as they generally did, any point, however slight, that was made against him, and to receive anything which he said in reply to it with shouts, and taunts, and laughter, almost bordering on insult. Well, the Marquis of Anglesey went to Ireland. The people received him without the slightest compliment. They met him (Mr. O'Connell) otherwise. What was their return for it? A proclamation founded on that statute which enables a Lord Lieutenant to put an end to all discussion in Ireland—which enables him to substitute his own will for law—which enables him to suppress all associations—which enables him to put an end to

all societies for improvement, all societies for education, all societies for charity; which enables him, in a word, to say—*“Sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas.”*

That is a base Act of Parliament, and we are slaves who are obliged to obey it. It was an Act of Parliament which was given us in vile disport along with the Emancipation Act, as if the House had been determined to convince the people of Ireland, that it could not ever confer a benefit upon them without accompanying it by an insult and an injury. Yes, it acted as if it were throwing a bone to a dog, which it detested, but on which it was obliged to feed. The Lord Lieutenant issued his proclamation against the trades of Dublin, and prohibited them from meeting with their emblems and banners. What then? The trades gave up their intended meeting; and, though they were much irritated, went, 100,000 of them, to his house in Merrion-square, and then separated, after cheering him, with as much decorum as any assembly—aye, even as this House, ever separates. That was the first proclamation. It was an act of despotism. The right hon. Secretary had avowed himself the adviser of a proclamation founded on a law which all his party, when it was passed, stigmatized as a despotic law: “and if any man,” said the honorable gentleman, “had issued such a proclamation in England, I should despise you, gentlemen of England, if you did not immediately call for its repeal. Did you submit quietly to it, I should hold you base and degenerate, and unworthy of your sturdy forefathers, who knew what was due to themselves and were not afraid to die in maintaining it.”

What came next? Oh! that which convinced him that the late Administration was more benevolently disposed than the present to the people of Ireland. The late Administration issued proclamations against their associations; but did they in consequence cease to hold them? When they persisted in holding them, did the late Government come forward with prosecutions to destroy the Irish people? Oh! no; the late Government—anti-Irish, anti-Catholic, as it was—did no such thing; it was reserved for the Whigs, whose professions he had been

accustomed to scorn, even before he had become acquainted with their practice. But to return :

After the Duke of Northumberland had suppressed by his proclamation the first meetings which were held for the Repeal of the Union, a number of gentlemen determined to meet and discuss the subject at a public breakfast. They did so for weeks. A second proclamation was issued against them, but the breakfasts continued, and the Duke of Northumberland instituted no prosecutions. But as soon as the Whigs came into power, and the Marquis of Anglesey arrived in Ireland, he discharged another proclamation against the breakfasts. Now, he put it to the House, whether, if the Repeal of the Union were to be quietly and calmly discussed, it would be better to have the discussion after dinner, when anything that was impassioned was likely to be addressed with greater effect or excited feelings, or after tea and coffee in a morning, when the reason was cool, and the blood in a state of quiescence? To put down these breakfasts, out came the extraordinary proclamation, signed by the ex-member for Preston, who dared to call the people of Dublin a rabble. A rabble! Would he venture to call the people of Preston that name? Now, anyone that could pay 2s. had a right to attend these breakfasts. Davy MacLeary, who hated a Papist as he hated the devil, was a constant attendant at them; and along with him came many of those men whom the former dissensions of Ireland had separated from its best friends. The breakfasts, he repeated, went on; the cause which he had at heart was flourishing; and to put it down, out came another proclamation, founded on the most despotic Act that was ever registered in a statute book.

You talk to me here (said Mr. O'Connell), of the Constitution in Ireland. Where is it? You have put it down. Would you allow your Constitution to be put down here in the same way, gentlemen of England? We are dissatisfied with its being put down among us; and then comes forward the right hon. Secretary, and taunts me with being an agitator. Yes, he taunts me with being an agitator. He, by his oppres-

sion has caused all the agitation of Ireland. Though the people of Ireland are slaves, they are not yet such base and abject slaves as not to resist oppression by all the means which the law allows them. The right hon. Secretary issued a proclamation, I repeat, against us, and wrote at the same time a letter to the magistracy, as illegal as a letter could be, and on which I shall have occasion to say more on some future opportunity. In the meantime, the farmers of the county of Kilkenny, most of whom are respectable and substantial men, began to hold meetings. They took upon themselves the title of "Hurlers," and assembled in great numbers. Two or three gentlemen, who, like myself, are opposed to such unions, went to them, and prevailed upon them to disperse. Meetings for similar objects were spreading through the country; they had spread into the counties of Wexford and Carlow, and even further. I then wrote a letter to them, advising the discontinuance of such meetings. I told them that their meetings in themselves were not illegal; but that they would become illegal as soon as they were held in such numbers as would excite fear that a breach of the peace was likely to take place. I said to them that I would not have a Repeal of the Union unless it could be effected by peaceable means; and I told them that I would give up my advocacy of that great question unless they gave up their meetings. How it was, I know not; but this I do know, that my name was used by a gentleman who addressed the people on behalf of the Government, to prevail on them to disperse. I admit that other measures were also employed; but my name was certainly used as a means to keep the people quiet. And now one of the right hon. Secretary's accusations against me is, that I have addressed these same people in this language: "I advised you to desist, when I thought that you were going to break the law. Now that you have a constitutional meeting, at which you can agitate, I advise you who have votes to give your votes to my friend, Colonel Butler, who is a friend to Ireland, and an advocate for a Repeal of the Union; and you, who have not votes, to use your influence

over those who have." Is there anything morally wrong in asking these men to exercise their influence over their friends and relations who are in possession of votes? Sure I am that the right hon. Secretary would not be loth nor sorry to exercise his influence over any lord who happened to be master of a number of votes in that country, to employ them all in behalf of Colonel Butler's opponent. I said to the "Hurlers": "Let the expenses of Colonel Butler be paid," and I said thus, because I knew that every one of these Hurlers was able to contribute something to defray them. Thus much in reply to the observations of the right hon. Secretary on my letter to the Hurlers of Kilkenny. The moment these meetings took place, we determined to found another association. Before we had done anything at this association, out came another proclamation against us. Again, I repeat it, the proclamation was an act of despotism.

Is not the Seditious Law in existence? Is not the Libel Law still in operation? Are not these sufficient to check our proceedings, if we act illegally? Is not the House aware that at all our meetings two Government reporters were always present? Did not I take care that they should always have the best places to hear us speak, and room enough to write down, without interruption, anything and everything that we said? If we were seditious, why did not the Government produce the evidence which was in its power, to convict us of sedition? Why did it not recur to the ordinary law of the country, instead of recurring to this despotic Act. But out came, after all this, a third proclamation, and then I am told that I excite agitation. I say to the right hon. Secretary—
"De te fabula narratur."

You, who have turned your will into law—you, who have shut the door against discussion; you impute to me the effects of your own excitement. I shall have another opportunity of speaking upon this subject, and therefore I shall not say a word more upon it at present. The right hon. Secretary has quoted extracts from two speeches of mine. I don't know whether

both are accurate ; one of them indeed, I know to be so, and I will, for the sake of argument, admit them both to be so. What have I said in them which any honest man can find fault with ? I spoke of the slavery of Ireland. I said her people were slaves. I ask whether that country is not in a state of slavery, in which the will of one man formed the law of all ? If I am mistaken in that point, then the people of Ireland are not slaves ; but if I am right in it, then they are slaves, and they would be base and degraded slaves indeed if they hugged their own chains in quiet, and did not sometimes dash them at their oppressors. I said in the course of one of these speeches that I rejoiced in the success of the Belgians. I repeat that sentiment here. Fraud and force were never employed to consummate a more heterogeneous union than that which existed between Holland and Belgium. I rejoice with my whole heart that the Poles have repudiated their forced union with Russia. I am glad, too, that in Switzerland the spirit of democracy has proved itself indomitable. But when I told the people of Ireland how I gloried in the triumphs of these different nations, I told them that the road through which those nations had achieved them was not the road which they ought to take. I told them that their case was different. I knew that I had a difficult task to perform ; for I had to teach Government its duty to the people, and I had to teach the people how to obtain its rights from Government. I wished to restore Ireland to her proper rank among the nations of the earth. Will any man tell me that there is any other country in the world of such exuberant fertility, in which there are so many starving individuals—that there is any other country in the world in which there is so rich a Church, and so little relief rendered by it to the poor ? I tell you that with Ireland you have not at present a union. You do not give her either the same laws or the same privileges, or the same advantages which you enjoy yourselves. Yes, your very laws for the two countries are not the same. You have not for England the same Bankrupt Laws which you imposed on Ireland ; you have not the same laws that we have for the security either of

person or property; and, above all, you have not the same Jury Law that we have.

And that, by-the-bye, brings me to the consideration of a point, a most important point, indeed, in my case against the Government, which I had almost forgotten. The right hon. Secretary had a jury struck against me and my confederates, as he is pleased to call my friends, by the deputy clerk of the Crown, who took the first hundred names which stood on the book. In that number were twenty-four aldermen, twenty-three sheriffs, several peers, one admiral, and several other persons of that description. One of the persons whom the Crown Solicitor struck off the panel was Mr. Alderman M'Kennie. Any person who knows anything of Ireland knows well the character of that gentleman. Another person who was struck off by the Crown Solicitor was Mr. Arthur Guinness, the Governor of the Bank of Ireland. Both these persons differed from me on the question of the Repeal of the Union, but they were men of known integrity and impartiality.

Would that have been done in England? No, for there the jury would have been drawn by the ballot. And here, again, I have to declare, that the late Administration, anti-Irish and anti-Catholic as it has been represented, was more kindly disposed to Ireland than the present. Had they remained in office, we too in Ireland should have had the advantage of forming our juries by ballot. I speak on that point advisedly, for I was consulted professionally as to the details of the measure. The hon. member then proceeded to say, that he had now followed the right hon. Secretary through every point of his speech. The hon. Secretary had, however, omitted to notice any of the questions which he (Mr. O'Connell) had originally put to him. Had he stated a single case of violence done either to person or property by the anti-Unionists? There had been some violence in talk, but the people of Ireland, slaves though they were, were not yet gagged; and all that their enemies could charge against them at present was that they had spoken.

Oppressed as they were, they were struggling peaceably and

constitutionally for their right to free and open discussion, and for the same constitutional liberty as the people of England enjoyed. He might not succeed in getting it from them, but he knew that he was in the situation of those who in former times had struggled for the liberties of their country; and his heart told him, and its decision was confirmed by the approbation of his countrymen, that he had struggled sincerely, and honestly, and earnestly, and he still hoped successfully, in that cause which he had deep in his heart—the cause of the people of Ireland. He yet trusted that their cause would finally triumph.

Subject, REPEAL OF THE UNION; Date, MARCH 4, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell was thoroughly convinced that if the Union was not repealed, Ireland would, indeed, soon cease to be a constituent part of the British Empire. It was necessary to the welfare and happiness of Ireland that she should have a separate Legislature. If anything could retard the Repeal of the Union, by remedying existing evils, it would be the beneficial measure of reform now under discussion. It was a calumny upon the friends of the Repeal of the Union to say that they wished for political separation.

Sir R. Bateson replied, and taunted O'Connell with drinking the health of the Orangemen.

Mr. O'Connell admitted that he had drunk the health of the Orangemen of Ireland, as he wished to bury in oblivion all animosity; but contended that the word "Popish," which the hon. baronet had used with reference to the conduct of the apprentices of Londonderry, ought not now to be introduced into debate. The Irish Roman Catholics had even resisted the bigotry of James II.

Subject, PETITIONS IN FAVOUR OF REFORM;

Date, MARCH 19, 1837.

O'Connell recommends Universal Suffrage.

Mr. O'Connell, in answer to the observations which had been made by Mr. G. Dawson, denied that he was, or ever had been, an advocate for annual Parliaments. He certainly approved of triennial Parliaments, as established at the Revolution, which the right hon. gentleman had so often denominated "glorious;" and, in his opinion, the right hon. gentleman should be the last man to object to the principles which triumphed at that period. He confessed that he was a friend to Universal Suffrage, but upon that point he gave way to the pending measure of Reform, because he thought that it was calculated to produce the self-same ends—namely, good government and cheap institutions. The right hon. gentleman had thought fit also to charge him with being an enemy to the Protestant Church, and as one who wished for its overthrow, but he denied his accusation in the most decided manner. He respected the hierarchy of the Church of England, as a faint image of that of his own Church, and he was only opposed to its enormous temporalities and overgrown wealth.

Mr. O'Connell rose, but was met by loud calls of "Order!" and "Question!" He had a right to oppose the motion if he pleased, and a right, therefore, to speak on it. He had been several times alluded to and made a topic of remark in the House, and he thought the House would not behave with its usual courtesy if it did not allow him to say a few words. He had heard the ex-Solicitor-General and the ex-Attorney-General last night and that night throw out insinuations in relation to him and the Government. Both those gentlemen belonged to the same profession as he did, but he was glad that they did not belong to the same Bar, for it was a rule of that Bar that no member of it should ever voluntarily engage in a criminal prosecution; but those two learned gentlemen seemed to volun-

teer to prosecute him. That was not creditable conduct. The hon. and learned ex-Solicitor-General had sneered at the cheers which had come from the opposite side of the House at some remarks that had been made by him (Mr. O'Connell), and the sarcastic allusion had been taken up and echoed by the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, with a strength of lungs that might have carried the echo to the borough for which he sat. He could not account for the sarcastic allusion. He had been accused, too, by the ex-Solicitor-General, of arrogance, in a tone which he would not call arrogant, but which, not to be arrogant, was the most like arrogance of anything he had ever heard. He had been accused of looking for the Repeal of the Union through the means of Reform, but he had looked at the Repeal of the Union only as a means of obtaining good government; and if he obtained that by other means, was he not bound to support those means? He had accordingly supported the measure of Reform without looking at its origin, though if he had consulted his feelings, if he had looked at what had passed with regard to himself, he should have taken a very different course, and not have supported the principle of the Bill. If under such a view he had chosen to object to the details, and particularly if he had distorted them, then he might have picked a hole in the measure as well as another. If he were a member remarkable for his extraordinary gesticulation—for a jumble of unmeaning words, enforced by violent thumps on the box on the table, as if the rumbling noise of that empty box could supply the place of common sense, he should have had those hon. and learned gentlemen's sympathy and support. If, instead of defending the Reform Bill on those great principles which it inculcated and supported, he had taken up the questions connected with it on paltry, pettyfogging grounds, and dealt with them according to the chicanery of the Equity Courts; if he had declared himself a foe to all improvement, and the friend of every abuse; if he had resisted every innovation—had defended the continuance of every wrong, and maintained the sacredness of every law, however barbarous or ill-adapted

to modern times; if he were one who stood on the shore of improvement, and said to the coming tide of amelioration, "So far thou shall go and no farther;" if he were the defender of every spoliation, supported and cheered by the spoliators; if he were one of this description he might have given ground for the sarcastic allusion to the cheers, and then, indeed, he should have been cheered by the hon. and learned members and their associates, and then, too, he might have hoped to mitigate their hostility, and even to secure their favour. He stood there, however, an independent member of that House—independent either of the Government or of the party opposed to them. He had entered into no compromise; he had received no promises of lenity; and he denied that he was influenced in his support of the Bill by any other motives than his conviction of its fitness for the ends it proposed.

Subject, IRISH REFORM BILL; Date, MARCH 22, 1831.

Sir C. Wetherall taunted O'Connell with "handing a begging-box round among his friends," and encouraging spoliation by taking the pence of the poor. The confusion was so great that the Speaker interfered, and O'Connell then continued.

Mr. O'Connell wished to make one observation, not on the subject of spoliation, but with respect to the personal charge against himself. He neither was now, nor had ever been at any time, a party to the applications for contributions which the hon. member referred to. He repeated he had not been a party to them; and he would add, that he had sacrificed larger sums to his country than the hon. and learned member had ever gained by his profession. He had a right to speak, and he would speak, in spite of this interruption (*confusion and cries of "Order"*).

The Speaker said, it was extremely desirable that the hon. member and others should know to what extent they were to be allowed to continue discussions of this description. When the character and conduct of the hon. member was alluded to in a

pointed manner by the hon. members, he was sure that the House would never look with too much strictness of order on the course of proceedings which might be adopted. But it was, at the same time, right it should be known, that observations which should go to the extent of increasing the debate, or throwing out new matter for discussion, could not be allowed:

Mr. O'Connell was obliged for this information, and hoped, in the few words he had to say, that the Speaker, if he was out of order, would correct him. He repeated that he had spent large sums in the service of his country, and abandoned for it a profession which every one connected with the Bar knew to be worth £7,000 a-year. For twenty-five years he had laid out a sum of £2,000 a-year—out of his own pocket—to promote the necessary agitation in Ireland in support of the cause of the Catholic Emancipation; and if his countrymen—his poor but generous countrymen—were anxious to make him a remuneration for his losses and his sacrifices, he thought that every reflecting mind would feel that the act placed them high among the nations which boasted of civilization.

Subject, THE REFORM BILL FOR IRELAND;

Date, MARCH 24, 1831.

The discussion which took place in connection with the Reform Bill, outside the House as well as within it, stirred society of all classes to the very centre. For half a century the old Tory power predominated, revolutions were shaking the world, and the echoes had reverberated across the Channel, and to the very core of English society. But there was an uncrowned monarch to be counted with by Lord John Russell and his supporters, and the violent hater of the Catholic faith and of Ireland had to rely on the word of one whose oath when it was convenient would be doubted.*

Nothing was at present more mischievous than the distinction between Catholics and Protestants. It produced a

* "The King in his speech announced the dissolution, and retired to Windsor. The scene that followed was one of great excitement and confusion. As I was standing at the bar, Lord Lyndhurst came up to me, and

great many of those mischievous apostates without conviction. In getting rid of one religion, they disregarded all religion. Talent was frequently driven to infidelity in order to secure the worldly advantages of a scholarship. He himself knew many frightful instances. A man was a good Protestant during the five years that he held a liberal situation; he then returned to his Catholicism, and advertised his shame. As for counties, he wished that the right of voting had been given to him who had a profitable interest in the ground to the value of £50, for freeholders might have large tracts of ground, nominally of much greater value, without its yielding them so much. He believed it would have been much better to give the vote to those who had been leaseholders. The owners of leaseholds, as he understood, might be non-residents, and the plan he suggested would have the effect of encouraging and increasing the middle classes. What was wanted in Ireland was a substantial body of yeomanry, and he had felt some consolation when he was called upon to sacrifice the 40s. freeholders, on reflecting that it would give the landlords a motive for making freeholders of £10, giving them a chattel interest. He wished that to be followed up, but he feared that this Bill would encourage the making of nominal freeholders. He feared that considerable facilities would be given by this Bill to the making of £10 freeholders. In Connemara one gentleman had made five hundred £10 freeholders in a year. This, he believed, could not occur in any other part of Ireland; but, certainly, it appeared to him that the Bill offered facilities in that respect, which it ought not to do. A man might make a lease for twenty-one years at £50 without any reference whatever to the value of the

said, 'Have you considered the state of Ireland? Do not you expect an insurrection?' or words to that effect. It so happened that in going into the House of Commons I had met O'Connell in the lobby. I asked him, 'Will Ireland be quiet during the general election?' and he answered me, 'Perfectly quiet.' He did not answer for more than he was able to perform."—*Russell's Recollections*, p. 76.

Lord Brougham in a speech in the same debate called O'Connell "the great chief of the Catholics."

property so leased. He therefore wished that the men who had a profitable interest of £10 in the land should be the voters rather than those whose freeholds were more a burthen than a profit to them. These, however, were details for the committee, and he would wait until the Bill got into the committee to state them. He had one other observation to make. In England there were seven counties, each of which had less than 200,000 inhabitants, which were to have two additional members each, or fourteen members in all; in Ireland, however, there were counties containing from 280,000 to 300,000 people, which were not to receive an additional member. One county in Ireland—that of Cork—had a population of nearly 600,000, but it had only two members. There was one county in England which had not above 72,000, which had two members, while Down and Tyrone, which had nearly 300,000 people each, had only two, and were not to get any more. An objection was taken the other evening by the hon. member for Bristol to the general plan, on the ground of the addition of four or five members for Ireland, because, as the hon. member stated, whenever he had an occasion to make any application to Government, where the interests of that place came in any degree in collision with those of Ireland, the minister declined to interfere, alleging that he was afraid of the opposition of the Irish members. The hon. member was therefore unwilling to add to the strength of the Irish interests. This was at least candid in the hon. member. It was natural that he should wish to do everything to promote the interests of Bristol, but at the same time it would be but fair that those of Ireland should not be neglected. It was on the representation of the inhabitants of Bristol that William III. deprived Ireland of one of the most important branches of trade she had ever enjoyed—that of the woollen manufacture. Had the interests of Ireland not been made to give way to those of England on that occasion she might now be in the enjoyment of the fruits of her industry in that important manufacture. Now, a century and a half after that event, the hon. member for Bristol objected to a measure lest it should

be advantageous for the interests of Ireland. He did not want that the interests of Ireland should be dominant. All he wanted was that she should have fair play. He hoped that when the Bill went into a committee that the difference in the representation of some of the populous counties, and that which was proposed for some of the large counties in England, would be considered. He asked if it were fair play that the counties of England should get several additional members and the counties of Ireland get none? He wished to see the franchise extended, and the distinction between Catholics and Protestants done away in all that concerned corporations and political rights. If that were done he had little doubt that this Bill would give, as he hoped it would, such general satisfaction that no man should any longer desire change, except those who asked for change for the sake of change itself. He did not think mere change desirable; and if the people had reason to be satisfied they would cease to wish for a separation. He should rejoice if that desire was superseded by a wish to engage in mutual good offices and show mutual kindness. He hoped that the propositions of the right hon. gentleman would be taken into consideration, and that the Bill when passed would contribute to make a perpetual and irreversible union of the two countries.

Subject, CIVIL LIST; Date, MARCH 28, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell said, it was not fair to reproach those who were advocates of economy with being the enemies of monarchy. The real friends of monarchy were those who made it popular, and not those who would increase the burthens of the people. The Irish Pension List was a part of the grant which required a revision. There was a Mr. Leonard M'Nally, a barrister, who had been always engaged against the Crown in defending persons charged with high treason and publishing libels, who had for a period of eighteen years received a pension of £300 a year from the Crown, and which was not discovered until he died,

when his widow applied to have his pension continued to her. There were other pensions or annual payments still paid to the persons who were connected with certain papers, such as the *Patriot* and *Correspondent*. Besides this a sum £200 had been paid yearly, since 1706, to two persons of the name of Hooper and Martin, until the sum of £2,060 was paid in full, which he believed had latterly been done. In looking over the Irish Pension List, he did not find the name of one person in it who had performed public services, except that of Lord Rodney. It was the practice, too, when Catholics became eminent at the Bar, to give them pensions, for fear, he supposed, of their turning agitators, till at last they became too numerous to be pensioned off in that way. But one gentleman had three pensions accumulated upon him; and he had his pension increased, because at a public meeting he voted in favour of placing the nomination of Catholic bishops in the hands of the Crown. He concluded by stating that he should support the report of the committee.

Subject, SUPPLY; Date, MARCH 28, 1831.

O'Connell objects to the erection of a fountain in Merrion-square, which was not to supply water to the poor.

Mr. O'Connell objected to several items in these estimates, which, he contended, savoured strongly of the nature of jobs; some of which were for the erection of fountains intended to supply with water the poor, who could not afford to pay water rates. In some instances these were erected to please individual proprietors of the neighbourhood, though at the public expense, in places where the gentry only resided. In one instance, though the Chief Justice, Lord Downes, endeavoured to open a costly fountain in Merrion-square, he was obliged to desist from attempting to secure to the poor that supply of water which they were entitled to, because it was said that at the time of the grant it was expressly stipulated by Lord Blaquiere, who solicited its erection on his property, that the fountain (strange

to say, though, perhaps, a perfectly consistent Irish stipulation) should never furnish one drop of water, lest the poorer class resorting to it should offend the eyes of the residents in that fashionable quarter of the city of Dublin. He did not know which to reprove most, the silliness or the corruptness of all this sort of jobbing, so frequent in the different departments of the Irish Government. He must also notice that £2,000 were annually given to the sufferers in the Irish rebellion, at the rate of £30 each. He considered that a very large sum, and he could not help thinking that many persons were receiving the benefit of the grant who had never suffered at all at the time of the rebellion. It was generally believed by the people that the money was voted to keep tip an establishment of spies and informers.

Subject, LAW REFORM BILL (IRELAND); *Date*, APRIL 12, 1831.

Gross partiality in the selection of jurors.—War of poverty against property.

Mr. O'Connell said that there was nothing of which the people of Ireland had so much right to complain as the gross partiality which was displayed in the selection of juries. It appeared from a report presented to that House, that the sheriffs in Dublin were elected for party purposes, and were obliged to give party pledges, previous to their election. [*"Order!" and a slight confusion in the House.*] Oh! (exclaimed the honourable and learned member) this is a subject of very little importance, it is only a matter relating to Ireland — nothing but a proposition to improve the administration of justice in Ireland, which is not worth listening to. He said that the lists of the special jurors were all made out by the deputy of Lord Seymour Conway, who also put in them members of the Corporation, mostly of little property and as little expectations. This deputy had the selection of all special jurors for the law courts of Dublin, including the Court of

King's Bench, which was considered an evil, as it was acknowledged to be unfair by the last Administration; and they therefore prepared a Bill for the purpose of putting an end to it. By a report made to that House, it appeared that any person, on giving twenty guineas to the sub-sheriff, might have whatever jury he pleased. The Bill which the last Government brought in to assimilate the Jury Laws of Ireland to those of England had been withdrawn on the understanding that it was to be re-introduced early this Session; but now the House was told that that Bill, relating as it did to a most important matter, might be brought in, perhaps. He could not be content with such vague promises; he did not ask for anything unreasonable; he asked for impartial juries, and he called upon the present Government to bring forward a measure to promote the attainment of so desirable an object. He believed the Irish Insolvent Act would shortly expire. He therefore thought that it would be best to leave all matters connected with that out of the present Bill, and have a particular Bill to regulate the Insolvent Court of Ireland. The manner in which the judges—one of them in particular—conducted the business of the Court, did not give satisfaction; and it would be his duty to present to the House a petition from a large body of mercantile persons, calling upon the House to consider the state of the Insolvent Law. He implored the hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Crampton) to leave out of the Bill any alteration of the Ejectment Law. There were at present facilities enough for landlords to crush their tenants. Since the Union, several statutes had been passed in favour of the landlords and against the tenantry.

There was now a servile war raging in Ireland; a war of poverty against property; and he was afraid that the discontent of the lower classes would only be aggravated if any steps were taken to increase the power of the landlords over the tenantry.

Subject, STATE OF THE COUNTY CLARE; *Date*, APRIL 13, 1831.

Major Macnamara said the outrages, which were undeniable, resulted from the terrible distress of the people. Mr. Maurice O'Connell spoke to the same purpose in a forcible and excellent speech. He said, he and Mr. Steele had spent a day trying to get the peasants to give up their arms. Mr. Brownlow said, "there was not a people in the world more easily governed than the Irish, if they were not goaded into disorder by oppression and misery!"

Mr. O'Connell had not intended to have troubled the House on the present occasion, but he could not refrain from adding one sentence to what he had said at other times, when the distresses of Ireland had come under their consideration. He was opposed on every ground to the introduction of the Insurrection Act into that country. An Act of that coercive nature might be a very good and effectual method for quelling disturbances and riots at the moment, but it ever left a sting behind it in the bosoms of the peasantry, who would be readier to join in any subsequent insurrectionary movement, from having suffered under the arbitrary oppression of such an Act. He entirely concurred in what had fallen from the right hon. gentlemen on the other side, with respect to the real cause of the disturbances now existing in the county of Clare. They were not the result of any political feelings, but the sole and only cause of those disturbances was poverty—grinding, hopeless, poverty; and they had the additional stimulus of complaint, from seeing the produce of the country sent out of Ireland, to be sold for the benefit of the absentees, to the amount of £210,000 a-year, not one farthing of which ever returned to them. He had been himself a long time opposed to the introduction of the Poor Laws into that country, as he was aware of the inconveniences and evils with which they were attended. But, in respect to Ireland, it had become a question of life and death, and he believed that the enactment of a legal provision for the poor out of the produce of the soil ought no longer to be delayed. The opposition of the people in some disturbed parts of Ireland to the exaction of tithes had been much spoken of; but he would ask, did gentlemen think that the present system of tithes could continue? The people, for the support of the

religion in which they believed, paid willingly for one Church, and the laws compelled them to pay for another, with which they had nothing further to do than to support it at a vast expense. There were thus two funds in Ireland which ought to be made available for the support of the poor—one, the excessive income of the Church; the other, the excessive rent of the absentees. While he was member for the county of Clare, he had made but one application for a gentleman to be put in commission of the peace. That gentleman was a Mr. Bridgman, a person in all respects qualified to be a magistrate; but the late Chancellor had not condescended even to return an answer to this application. Notwithstanding what had been said of the respectability of the four stipendiary magistrates in Clare, to whom the enforcement of the Insurrection Act would be intrusted, should it be put into operation in that county, he could assure the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, that two of the four had been insolvent, and that people said, with what justice he did not know, that one of those gentlemen had not undergone a clean "white-washing." But be the character of the magistrates what it might, the powers given them by that Act were such as no man ought to possess. The necessary consequence of its operation was, to render the notion of the constitutional law a matter of ridicule with the people. It turned the court of justice into a court-martial, with all the arbitrary severity, but with none of the honour of the military court.

Subject, REFORM BILL COMMITTEE; Date, APRIL 19, 1831.

This was a reply to a speech of Mr. North's, in which he tried to give a "No Popery" turn to the question, as he would probably have given to any question that he disapproved. "The Protestant interests of the empire," he said, "required to be secured from the ascendancy of the Catholics." It was certainly very wonderful how often Protestant interests required preservation, and still more wonderful how they escaped so many dangers. The escapes of the Protestant religion in Ireland were simply marvellous. The No Popery cry fell rather flat from reiteration.

Mr. O'Connell was not surprised that the hon. and learned

member should have been one of the first to introduce religious altercation into this discussion; for he had done the same on the Catholic Question. It was easy by such means to catch a ready cheer, and captivate a few votes for the amendment. In all that concerned Ireland, nothing was more insulting than the air of patronage assumed by some men, who had no other claim to superiority than a pompous diction and theatrical gestures, and who pretended to take the poor agitators under their protection. The hon. and learned member for Drogheda, though he now sat for an Irish city, had been introduced into Parliament for one of the rotten boroughs, and nobody better than the hon. and learned member could defend them. He was, however, quite misinformed, and the House was misinformed as to the probable effects of the Reform in Ireland. The hon. member said that he (Mr. O'Connell) advocated Reform in Parliament as a means of obtaining a Repeal of the Union. He had done no such thing. He had advocated a Reform as a means of getting justice for Ireland. He repeated it: he required justice for Ireland, and he believed that there was a chance for obtaining that from a Reformed Parliament.

He had said that a Reform of Parliament would be beneficial; but did the anti-Unionists join him? Did not Mr. George Ensor, who was one of the most intelligent and clever advocates of the Repeal of the Union, call on the people of Ireland to oppose Reform, as likely to raise up obstacles to oppose the Repeal of the Union? That was the argument of George Ensor. The hon. and learned gentleman said that he (Mr. O'Connell) kept up agitation in Ireland; but what was likely to be the effect of introducing the motion of the gallant general? Those who looked at the Irish newspapers knew that the agitation of the Reform question had not been caused by the discussion of the Union question. Those who had most opposed the Repeal of the Union were most in favour of Reform. The counties of Antrim, of Down, of Armagh, which were much opposed to the Repeal of the Union, were the foremost in promoting Reform. He did not mean to follow the hon. and learned gen-

tleman through all his statements; but he would ask, as the hon. member had stated that it threatened the monarchy, the Church, and the peerage, if they all were founded on nomination boroughs?

Did the monarchy depend on them? Could the peerage only exist by the trafficking in boroughs? Could the Church not exist but on traffic, or on corruption? Could the peerage and the monarch depend on practices that were crimes in the eye of the law?

The peerage of England had a better foundation. But was it right to say of the Protestant Church that it was founded not on "airs from heaven, but blasts from hell." If such were the character of the Establishment, would they tell the people that their Church was nourished and sustained by what they knew to be corruption and crime? That description would make the monarchy, the peerage, the Church, depend on very cobweb ties. He knew, however, that they had a far better foundation. The hon. member for Kirkcudbright had spoken of the influence of the Crown being diminished; but the influence which had been restrained was that species of which it had been said, that "it had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished."

It was only the corrupt and improper influence of the Crown which had been diminished, and that had been taken up by the oligarchy. That influence it was now necessary to diminish; and that which had been taken from the Crown and usurped by the Peerage this Bill would diminish. He had formerly spoken in that House of a sordid oligarchy which had usurped the privileges of the people.

But noble lords and honorable gentlemen had well defended the aristocracy, by showing that what they had accidentally acquired of the property of the people they were willing to resign. His accusation had been well replied to, and a noble answer had been given by the splendid speech of an honorable gentleman (Mr. Hawkins) who spoke in the early part of the evening.

The proprietors of boroughs had been willing to resign their

advantages. Would those who spoke of the safety of the monarchy give up their emoluments? Would those who dreaded the fall of the Church, persuade the clergy to resign their plunder?

He was afraid not; but if they would, he would tell them that the Church of England would then have nothing to fear from a Reformed Parliament, but what it might have to dread from arguments founded in reason and Christian charity. The object of the gallant general's motion was to prevent Ireland from getting her full proportion of members. The Bill proposed to add only five members to Ireland, and he could not conceive a topic better calculated to serve the cause of the anti-Unionists in Ireland than the proposition to deprive her of her fair share of representation. The speeches of the hon. member for Aldborough, for Brecon and for Dysart, would admirably serve the cause of the anti-Unionists by showing England, and Scotland, and Wales combined to prevent Ireland from getting her fair share of the representation! The Tories had printed the speech of the reforming member for Preston, and the speech of the gallant general would, on the same principle, be printed and circulated through Ireland. There was no better means by which to rouse the prejudices of the Irish, than to inform them, that the English, Scotch, and Welsh members had combined to oppose doing justice to Ireland. No member was to be reduced from England, no member was to be reduced from Scotland, but Ireland had lost two-thirds of her members at the Union. Ireland was the most miserable, the most distressed country in the world, and what did that arise from but the injustice done to that country?

She suffered from losing her domestic Legislature. All she wanted was justice and adequate protection by a Legislature of her own. Would they do justice to Ireland? Would they give her a full share in the legislation of the empire, so as to take from her the necessity of demanding a domestic Legislature? Every tongue demanded, and every heart throbbed for a domestic Legislature. Would they give that to Ireland? Ireland had lost two-thirds of

her members, and now, when it was proposed to restore part of them, among the persons who were found to oppose that was the hon. member for Drogheda. The hon. and gallant general had referred to what he called the combination of eighty-five Irish members, to compel the minister to agree to their terms. There was, indeed, a meeting of eighty-five Irish members, but only one was willing to pledge himself to resist giving taxes to ministers till they had done something for Ireland; and this was what the hon. and gallant member called a combination. There were eighty-five members met, but only one was ready to agree to the proposition. They were spoken of as a club of mechanics who had combined for an increase of wages; and yet the hon. member for Drogheda supported the motion, and was well content in making his points against the ministers, and lauding his own religious liberality.

As for the hon. member for Liverpool, he was consistent in his hostility to Ireland. In the history of Parliament he never knew an instance in which he had not voted against the interests of Ireland. The Irish members had been charged with opposing all measures for the improvement of Ireland.

There was a time when they were utterly subservient to the minister, and when their names were never heard of except in the lists of the Government majorities; then they never fell under the ban of the gallant general's displeasure. Now that Irish members represented a nation, and not a part of a pitiful province it was widely different. But, he asked, what measures for the improvement of Ireland had they opposed?

Was it the introduction of the Poor-laws? And were they such a panacea—were they found to work well in England? No one would presume to say they had. Therefore, Ireland should not be reproached with not taking English Poor-laws, until they were so amended as to be rendered worthy of example.

The hon. member for Liverpool had also sneered at the statements respecting the amount of population in Ireland.

The authorities to which they referred were the official returns of 1821. And these returns, he could tell the hon. member,

were below the real amount of population. In the county of Mayo, alone, it was a well-known fact that the names of 33,000 persons more were written down as having got relief than were numbered in the returns. Another subject invidiously urged was, that Ireland did not pay her due proportion of taxation. This was a miserable fallacy. And now they refused Ireland the paltry boon of five additional members. But, he repeated, it was a fallacy to say that Ireland did not pay her due proportion of taxation; those who fancied she did not were totally unacquainted with the real condition of Ireland. In the first place, the real amount of taxation paid by Ireland was far greater than it appeared.

The taxes arising from the Customs were not placed to the credit of the Irish Treasury. A great revenue was paid for rum and wine in Liverpool. Then there was all the money drawn from Ireland by the absentee landlords, which was spent in England, and paid taxes in England, without a single sixpence being put to the credit of the Irish Treasury. One-fourth of the surface of Ireland belonged to men whose rents were punctually paid, although they never once set foot in the country. Ireland, therefore, beyond any country on the face of the earth, needed protection when one-fourth of the revenue of the country did not go to the credit of the Irish Treasury, but was expended in England. Taxation had in this country been compared to the moisture which was taken indeed from the earth by the sun's heat, but returned to it again in gentle and refreshing dew; but the scorching sun passed over Ireland, drawing up all the moisture, but no refreshing dew visited it in return. No! Let them talk not of taxation in Ireland until they understood the burthens which she bore. In the appropriation of the additional members, he contended that injustice had been done to Ireland.

There were thirty-two counties in Ireland, of which there were only two with a population of less than 100,000. If, therefore, these Irish counties had been English, they would have had thirty additional members for Ireland. There were

twenty counties with a population of above 150,000. If they were English, they would have two additional members each; and if the Union was not a name and a mockery they would yet receive additional members. There were twelve counties in Ireland that had a population above 200,000, four a population above 300,000, and one a population above 600,000, and yet not one additional member was to be given to them.

This was his case for Ireland. In this impartial proceeding was the real anti-Union agitation—this source was to be found in the conduct of that House, which said, we will keep all for England, and then, if you please, you may come and ask us for more. Even the paltry addition of five was considered by some hon. members too great. He hoped, however, the ministry would have the firmness to persevere. The country was with them—Ireland was with them. The amendment of the hon. member was got up, and the country would feel it, to excite English prejudices; and Ireland would feel that it was anti-Irish and that it was meant to excite a religious feud. It was a base calumny to say that Catholic electors would prefer a Catholic candidate to a Protestant of higher qualifications. He referred to the election of Mr. Leader, who was preferred by Catholic electors to Catholic candidates. He called on any man to prove that this was not the fact. He called on the hon. member for Drogheda, who was the chief calumniator of Ireland at present. (*“Order,” “Chair.”*)

The Speaker explained to the hon. member that his language and manner were both unjustifiable, and expressed a hope that the hon. member would himself feel it.

Mr. O'Connell confessed that in the heat of debate he had been betrayed into expressions which were not Parliamentary; he was sorry for it, and begged to retract them. He contended, however, that it was a gross misrepresentation of the feelings of Ireland to say they were influenced by religious bigotry.

And as to Catholic members, he would in reply to the hon. member say, that they were as deserving of confidence and as independent as any member in that House. They had won their civil rights, and they would wear them thus—by, on all

occasions, supporting the principles of civil and religious liberty. He would now come back to the motion; and had further to remark, that there were fourteen towns in Ireland which, had they been in England, would have received the elective franchise. He declared, in conclusion, that he would support the Bill, because he conceived it would be useful to the people of England, and he was influenced by no feeling of rivalry. He called on the House to reject the amendment; he called on the gallant general himself to fling it to the winds. "But," said the hon. and learned member, "I am laughed at—I have my answer."

Subject, REPORT OF THE ADDRESS; Date, JUNE 22, 1831.

O'Connell's speech was preceded by an amusing debate. Sir R. Inglis complained that there was no allusion to "Providence" in the King's speech, and considered it exceedingly wrong. Mr. Trant said that "Providence had been left out of king's speeches for the last two or three years." Mr. Hunt approved the omission. He said that when any misfortune occurred it was attributed to Providence, and ministers screened themselves; when a success was to be announced they took all the credit. Mr. Warburton said that there had hardly been an atrocity committed by any sovereign which had not been attributed to Divine Providence.

Mr. O'Connell, being prevented by indisposition on the preceding evening from offering a few remarks on the Address, would detain the House then for a very short time. He approved of the general spirit of the Address, although he thought it objectionable in some particular parts. He was sorry that he could find in it no expression of sympathy with the struggling Poles, whom he looked upon as at this moment the most interesting people in the world to every friend of mankind. He hoped, however, that the Government would take a more decided part respecting Belgium. That nation ought to be placed in the same condition which she held in 1790. She demanded no more, and he thought the demand reasonable. He wished also to say that the bravery and perseverance of the Belgians, notwithstanding the dissen-

sions which had been raised amongst them, were above all praise, and raised that people to a high rank among the nations of Europe. They had given another illustration of this lesson, that one nation cannot with impunity continue to wrong and oppress another. He hoped that the Government of this country would benefit by the lesson with respect to a neighbouring country connected with England, which a continuance of bad government would drive into the arms of France, or to the adoption of a republic, which would lead to a French connection! He denied that the distress prevailing in Ireland was to be called famine. It was starvation certainly; but then, it was starvation, not from dearth of food, but in the midst of plenty. In the port of Galway, for instance, there were numerous vessels laden with grain, though 7,000 of the inhabitants were reduced to a meal a day, and the vilest garbage. The same was the case in other places, where provisions were lying on board vessels in harbours ready for exportation, while the people were starving. Distress had been most fatally experienced in different parts of Ireland. In Galway, in the short space of a week, no less than eight human beings perished for want of food; yet from all these places, Galway, Newport, and other parts of Connaught, at the very time that thousands of the people were perishing from the want of food, numerous vessels were daily sailing loaded with provisions. Neither could the inability of the people to obtain a portion of that food be attributed to their indisposition to labour for it. That they were not disinclined to industry was evident in this country, where they cheerfully engaged in those employments which most required physical strength and continued exertion. Their want of means, therefore, to obtain the food which abounds before their eyes must be attributed to mismanagement; not to the mismanagement of Irishmen certainly, but to that of the English Government, whose rule for seven centuries had brought them to a state unparalleled in the history of nations, that of a people starving in the midst of plenty. For that he arraigned the English Government as the sole cause. He did not mean

•

the present Government, which was good to Ireland, but he should have liked to see some earnest of their intention, and what did he find in the King's speech? The utmost that he held out was, the possibility of devising some means of relief. Was it, then, at this time still to be left to a possibility? The late Government, however, used to say that they could not interfere; it was impossible to do anything: Ireland had always been, and would always be, subject to periodical visitations of starvation in the midst of plenty. Since the Union the law had been made stronger and stronger in favour of the landlord and against the tenant. Twenty-five statutes had since been enacted to increase that power, and to enable the landlord to enforce continually increasing rents. He had long been opposed to Poor-laws. He still disapproved of them. But he now saw no other remedy for the poor of Ireland but a compulsory provision for them. Much had been said lately of the security of the Church in Ireland. Now, religion was a good trade in most countries, but in Ireland it was particularly so. The poor of Ireland supported two Churches, one of which they believed to be necessary to themselves, and they maintained it out of their own poverty; and the English Parliament said the other was necessary for them, and accordingly taxed them enormously for its support (*cries of "No, no"*). Yes (said he), you take from the poor man often in a time of scarcity his tenth potato for that Church. Every man who heard him knew, that when the revenues of that Church were transferred from one preceding it, one-third of those revenues belonged to the poor. Why should not that third be now restored to the poor? To see that act of justice done might reconcile the landlords to a compulsory provision. There was another subject which he would not then go into, as he should hereafter have a better opportunity for doing so—he meant the system of taxation by the Grand Jury, which he called taxation without representation. The explanation which had been given by an hon. gentleman opposite, rendered it unnecessary for him to vindicate the Government from the charge of too great lenity towards him.

The Act under which he was prosecuted had expired, and the Government could not obtain a judgment against him. In another respect he would say, that the ministers of the Crown had taken a right view of the borough faction; they treated it as their natural spoil; but now there was a hope of better things. Indeed, the measure of Government was one for which the country ought to feel deeply grateful, and to which he was glad to think the public responded as became them. The Tories, though a few yet were in the House, had been scattered and discomfited—they had been defeated everywhere, from Cumberland to Cornwall, from Dover to Liverpool, from St. Alban's to Bristol—in every part of the country the spirit of Reform had been triumphant, and he heartily rejoiced at it. If in Ireland there were places which had not responded to that feeling, there were other parts in that country which had nobly performed their duty, and members were returned who were staunch friends to the Reform measure. On the whole, in Ireland a considerable increase of members friendly to the principle of the Bill had been returned. In both countries the spirit of Reform had proved triumphant. Let ministers persevere in the measure, and most wholesome would it be found to work. The wound, however, must be probed to the bottom, and the unsound parts cut off. Though not opposing the Address, he had felt it to be his duty to make those few observations.

Subject, TAXES ON THE PRESS; Date, JUNE 28, 1831.

O'Connell opposed Press prosecutions with natural vehemence, Ireland having suffered so much and so unjustly from them; but in this case it must be admitted that there was some reason for a prosecution. Then, as now, a certain class of English papers had made the fiercest attacks on Government, on the Royal family, and, as an almost necessary consequence, on religion. A paper called the *Poor Man's Guardian* was brought before the House by Mr. John Gordon, who read the following extract from it:—"William Guelph (the king) and his minions have not courage enough to bite with their teeth—they will mangle us with the teeth of a deceased bloodhound; cowardly

tyrants." We have no space for further extracts; but revolution was openly declared to be necessary, and the example of France in hurling a tyrant from the throne held up for imitation. Another paper, *The Prompter*, called out loudly for blood, and said, "Either in war or in peace, kingcraft, priestcraft, or lordcraft, is a system of murder, plunder, and spoliation; then, down with kings, priests, and lords." This was tolerably plain, but not plainer than what may be found in some English publications at the present day.

Mr. O'Connell said, that, entertaining strong opinions on the subject of libel, he would make a few observations on this question. He totally differed from the hon. member for Dundalk (Mr. Gordon), who thought that his Majesty's ministers should prosecute such publications as he had referred to. He did not think that any notice should be taken of the ridiculous and disgusting trash which such publications contained; and the only way to disseminate such trash was to take notice of it. The only true definition that any man could give of licentiousness of the Press was the utterance of opinions of which he disapproved. Prosecutions might succeed in smothering the expression of obnoxious opinion at one time, and at one particular place, but they were sure to rise again with an additional excitement, from their having been suppressed by force. Opinions would always be met by counter-opinions, and a notion was sure to prevail that the prosecutor was in the wrong. The Press was free in England only from the unwillingness of Government to prosecute when the Government was possessed of common sense; it was free only because the Government was not disposed to curb it, and because the public mind was strongly set against the prosecution of it. The Press was free in America, and yet there was no part of the world in which public opinion would more certainly crush the Carlises and writers of that class. Carlisle made his fortune by prosecutions. When he was prosecuted he became rich; when he was left alone he sunk into poverty; and he rose to competence again directly the Government attempted to crush him by means of the law. The maiden speech of the member for Dundalk against the Press would make the fortune of *The Republican*, and turn *The*

Poor Man's Guardian into a rich speculation. It was an excellent puff for what the hon. member called seditious publications, and the author must be much obliged to him for having pitied the sorrows of a poor old libeller, who must otherwise have starved.

Subject, IRISH YEOMANRY; Date, JUNE 27, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell observed, that the present Government had involved itself in an error in reviving the yeomanry corps in Ireland. The yeomanry was kept on foot for party purposes. After the peace they were no longer necessary; but the distribution that was made of them showed that the purposes for which they were kept up were those of party. Thus in the small county of Fermanagh, with only a population of 130,000, there were 2,000 yeomanry; while in all Munster, with a population of 1,900,000, there was only about an equal number, or 2,000. He had, on a former occasion, objected to the continuance of this force, and had received not a pledge, indeed, but an understanding from the Government, that it should be gradually discontinued. If the Administration had not been changed, that understanding would, he believed, have been adhered to; but the new Government thought that it would be a good force, he supposed, to put down a popular cause; and that it would strengthen the Government. That was a great mistake. Never was there a greater mistake; for it was invariably found that where a yeomanry force was kept up, it was also necessary to keep up a considerable force of the King's regular troops, to keep down the effects of that excitement which the yeomanry corps never failed to produce. If it was necessary to have a military force in any particular district, let it be of the regular troops, for they did their duty, and nothing more. Indeed it was a matter of surprise that men of the rank in life of the private soldier should be found to conduct themselves with so much prudence, discretion, and forbearance as the regular troops were found to do in Ireland, often under the

most trying circumstances. This praise belonged exclusively to the regular troops, from the highest to the lowest rank. This was the general feeling in Ireland with respect to them; but a feeling the very reverse prevailed with respect to the yeomanry force. Another objectionable force kept up in Ireland was that of the police—a force armed with deadly weapons, which they were reckless in using on very slight occasions. It appeared from returns which he had had laid on the table, that four times more men fell by the hand of the police than by the hand of the executioner. Thus four times more men were shot to punish riots than to punish all other crimes. The land was red with blood spilled by the police. Let them look to the case of Castlepollard; there ten—men, women, and children—were slaughtered, because, as the police said, they were assailed by stones on going to their barrack; but it was stated by the nephew of the Earl of Fingal, Mr. Dease, that the police were animated by party feeling. To this police the yeomanry were only a supplementary force. He supposed that one reason for keeping up the yeomanry was that it was considered that this force was opposed to the Repeal of the Union, which was not necessarily the case. The consequence was now evident. That at Newtownbarry their want of discipline had caused the shedding of blood there could be no doubt. He had seen the letter of a magistrate, who had sat on the investigation, which placed it beyond a doubt that among this body there was a readiness to shed blood; he need not go beyond the fact, that, for many years there, a 1st or a 12th of July had not passed without the loss of two or three lives by their hands. He contended that if the most malicious ingenuity were to exert itself to devise measures to keep Ireland in a state of excitement, of dissatisfaction, and discontent, it could not devise more effectual means than that of keeping up this kind of force. He was far from imputing such an intention to the present Government, but it was ignorant of the real nature of this force and of its effects in keeping up agitation. Ireland had many grievances to complain of, but nothing could so much provoke irritation as keeping up the yeo-

many corps, and he would divide against this vote. Three out of four of the districts of Ireland were unanimous against it. He called on the Irish members to remember that they were bound to their constituency to stand by him in resisting this vote. There was not one member who had a Liberal constituency who was not pledged to resist it. The people recollected that force as connected with the civil war which had been superinduced to extinguish the Irish Legislature. Some efforts he knew had been made by the Lord Lieutenant to form these corps both of Catholics and Protestants, but they had not succeeded. The feelings of the country were against these corps, and respectable men would not join them. One party, then, was armed against the other—the armed party grew insolent—insolence lead to differences, and differences ended in death. If the Government wanted to increase the force—friend as he was of economy, he would readily assent to any increase the Government might think necessary of the King's troops. He could not tell the House what disgust and abhorrence, exciting to resistance, the yeomanry corps were held in by the people of Ireland. He was aware that attempts had been made by the Irish Government to infuse a better spirit into these corps, and to cause a mixture of all parties to enter into them, but he also knew with what little success; and the right hon. baronet (Sir H. Parnell), who knew Ireland well, could bear him out in the statement, that, throughout Ireland, nineteen out of twenty of those corps were composed of men of the most violent party feelings, and belonging to that party which was most obnoxious to the general feeling of the country. It was dangerous to put arms into the hands of such men. He was a friend to economy, but it was no economy to keep up such a corps. It was a mistake to suppose that the yeomanry in Ireland was composed of men of the middle classes, at comparatively easy circumstances. The privates, for the greater part, and the officers for the most part, were men to whom full permanent duty and full pay were an object. (*Two or three Hon. Members here said "No, no."*) He did not speak of the yeomanry in

that part of Ireland (the North) to which the three hon. members belonged; he spoke of the provinces of Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, which he presumed he knew much better than the hon. members who cried out “No;” and he repeated that, to corps so composed, the tranquillity of the country could not be so much an object as any state of things which could give them employment. In his own country a captain of yeomanry had lately taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, yet he had still his company. Would not the pay be an object to such a man? Such men would be on the look out for permanent duty, or, as the sailors would say, “would look out for squalls.” By the discontent of the country they would get full pay—by its quietness they would get nothing, but go on till some of them got whitewashed again. Having these strong objections to this force, he would now move, as an amendment, that the vote be reduced by the sum of £19,290, which was the sum voted for the Irish Yeomanry force. He would not touch the English force, as he was not acquainted with it. He would leave that to the English members themselves. The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by moving that, instead of £189,803, £170,513 be substituted.

Subject, TITHES; Date, JULY 12, 1831.

“ Too bad even for Ireland.”

Mr. O'Connell begged to deny, in the most distinct and unequivocal terms, the statement of the hon. member for Dundalk (Mr. Gordon), that a general resistance was made to the collection of tithes in the south of Ireland, and he called on the hon. member to name the counties in which it took place. Even in the unhappy county of Clare there was no case of attack on clergymen on account of tithes, except one instance, where a clergyman demanded one half-year's tithes three times over, which was rather too bad, even for Ireland. Out of thirty-

five clergymen of the Established Church there, only one had been attacked, in consequence of some quarrel his son had been engaged in; the remaining thirty-four had been unmolested. There had been something like resistance in a part of the county of Kilkenny and the King's County; but in one of those cases it arose from the clergyman refusing to bring his parish under the Tithe Composition Act, and he still persevered in his refusal. The disinclination to pay tithes had sprung from this spot, and was in danger of spreading further. These were the only cases of resistance of which he knew. But the hon. member for Dundalk was incorrect in his geography, if he supposed that either of those counties was in the south of Ireland. The hon. member ought to be better acquainted with the points of the compass than he (Mr. O'Connell) was, and ought to have known that those counties were not in the south of Ireland. He again denied that there was any such resistance in the south. There was a sort of passive resistance; for instance—cattle seized for tithe were sometimes branded, "tithe," and then nobody would buy them. Could an Act of Parliament be passed to compel the people to purchase those cattle? The feeling, out of which this combination not to purchase arose could not surprise any person who knew the means by which the collection of tithe could be enforced, and the oppressive modes sometimes resorted to. The clergy possessed by law ample means to enforce the payment of tithe; they possessed no less than six remedies at present. The great body of the Catholics of Ireland were quite as willing as their Protestant brethren to pay to the clergy of the Establishment the most ample remuneration that could be proportioned to the duty they had to perform; but it was a source of murmurs and discontent to find some of them paid so extravagantly, out of all proportion to what they did. There was, for instance, the See of Derry, now vacant, which was worth £25,000 or £30,000 a-year. It was returned at £22,000, and that was under the mark; besides, there were 96,000 acres of arable land belonging to it. This was a matter of measurement on which there could be no doubt. Now, he

A Bill to stimulate Crime.

I don't believe it. I don't believe that the English Government will ever voluntarily give up any power or dominion they may have over Ireland.

The case of 1782 is not, as we lawyers say, a case in point. England had just lost America by refusing to conciliate. She preserved Ireland by rational conciliation.

The causes that induced England to conciliate Ireland at that period are part of history. It is matter of prophecy, and I firmly believe, almost unerring prophecy, that causes of a similar nature will produce effects not dissimilar.

For the present, my first objection to the Bill is—its perpetuity.

My second objection consists in the absolute falsehood of its title.

It is not "A Bill for the better protection of life, and to facilitate the apprehension of persons guilty of offences in Ireland."

It really and in truth is a Bill for rendering more insecure life and property in Ireland, and stimulating to additional crime.

My third objection is, the absolute and unlimited power, on any excuse, however trivial, or upon any pretence, however untrue, to place the inhabitants of districts, and counties, and provinces in Ireland out of the pale of the law, and beyond the protection of any constitutional right.

I have said so much on these three points in my first letter that I shall now consider.

My fourth objection to this Bill consists in the unlimited power given to the Government over the persons and properties of the Irish people.

Let it be recollected that a proclamation under this Bill will be equally valid, whether it be founded on the assertion of a falsehood or the suggestion of a truth. In other words, truth or falsehood in the allegation of the proclamation is totally immaterial. The proclamation is of equal validity with the one as with the other.

Powers given by the Act.

Well, the proclamation having issued, my fourth objection consists in the extent of powers vested in the Lord Lieutenant by means of his own proclamation—true or false. The powers are these:

First—The power of appointing as many resident magistrates, inspectors of constabulary, head constables, petty constables, sub-constables, and constables, as the Lord Lieutenant shall think fit, such persons to reside in the proclaimed districts, and all of them to be clothed, fed, maintained, and paid at the expense of the occupying inhabitants of the proclaimed districts.

The second power is that of compelling the inhabitants of such proclaimed districts to remain within their respective places and homes from sunset to sunrise.

The third power, that of allocating any sum of money to any amount the Lord Lieutenant chooses, as a reward for the apprehension or discovery of any persons being guilty of any offence in the proclaimed districts.

The fourth power is to allocate any sum of money the Lord Lieutenant pleases to the relations of any person murdered in the proclaimed districts, or to any person permanently injured in that district.

The fifth power given in the Act is, that which makes the former power of allocating money to injured parties and their relations afflictive and grievous. There would be no objection to a reasonable allocation of money to compensate injured persons and their relatives; but that should be done in a constitutional way, out of funds voted by Parliament by annual votes. The objection to the fifth power is its totally unconstitutional nature.

This fifth power the Lord Lieutenant, by his proclamation, invests himself with is, that which enables him, if he thinks fit, to levy the most enormous sums of money from the occupying inhabitants of the proclaimed districts merely at his will and pleasure, without control, without check, without any legal responsibility.

would say, that, with all the disposition to pay the clergy of the Established Church the fullest remuneration for the duties they had to perform, it was enough to breed discontent to see this immense wealth poured into the lap of one clergyman while thousands of the poor peasantry around were starving. The country was almost overladen with provisions, the granaries were bursting with corn, and the people were dying with hunger. The noble lord who had presented the petition had alluded to a pamphlet published by Dr. Doyle. Why did not the noble lord or some of the petitioners answer that pamphlet? It stated as an historical fact, which could not be denied, that tithes were unknown in Ireland until they were introduced by the English who came over with Strongbow. When tithes were first established in Ireland, one-third of their produce was set apart for the support of the poor; but now not a single shilling was appropriated to that purpose.

SAME SUBJECT ; SAME DATE.

Mr. O'Connell said none of the facts had been contradicted which he had mentioned. The hon. member for Oxford had given them a short treatise on the diocese of Derry, and stated that the lands of the bishopric were let on leases for lives; but here he had been corrected by the hon. member for Derry, who had, however, omitted to mention that, in addition to the £12,000 a-year, the income of the See, there was to be added the fines on renewals. The bishop had also the power of running his life against leases, as other bishops had done, and thus, together with the fines, amassed large fortunes. It was a remarkable fact, that the late Bishop of Derry had actually presented twice over to every living within his diocese, and had all his patronage in addition to his immense income. The hon. member for Cavan (Mr. Maxwell) had contradicted him, asserting that the seizure of Newtownbarry was only for two half-years' tithes; but he had not asserted that the seizure was made

for three half-years, but that three half-years had been claimed, and whether that were correct or not was an open question yet pending in the courts, and of course pending when the seizure was made.

Honourable gentlemen, he was sorry to observe, still defended the course pursued there, and asserted that the yeomanry and police did not fire until fired upon. Captain Graham, indeed, asserted that he had given no orders to fire, and no person could be found who had given such orders; and as no person would acknowledge having given such orders, he was justified in terming it a massacre. It was also clearly proved that the yeoman who was shot was killed by one of his own party; and yet, although twenty poor men were in their graves, he had not heard one word of commiseration, as it was of no importance how much Irish blood was shed when the struggle was to obtain half a year's tithes.

Subject, KILDARE-STREET SOCIETY; Date, JULY 14, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell thought that the gentlemen of this Society must be of a nature rather extraordinary, as they professed to know the doctrines of Catholics better than their bishops and clergy. He had subscribed to the Society, being misled by its prospectus, which promised equal favour to all religious persuasions. This was, however, a false pretence, and this Society had misled many by such pretences. If the Society was good for Protestants, let them support it; but let the same liberty be allowed to Catholics; and if they acted under the influence of prejudice or error, let them alone, so long as they did not attempt to force their doctrines upon others. The objections urged against Catholics were, that they would not read the Bible without note or comment, or have it made a school-book. One part of this had been answered by the Protestant bishops themselves, and there he would leave it.

When that Society was so useful, it was extraordinary that

only one petition had been presented in its favour. The Catholics wished to bring up their children themselves; they did not desire to be interfered with, or interfere with others. There was a great deal of fine writing in the petition, but notwithstanding that, he hoped the Society would be put an end to. All he asked was, and he expected it from the present Government, that any grant for the purpose of education should be fairly distributed—Protestants, Dissenters, Presbyterians, and Catholics, all to have their share, and dispose of it according to their own modes.

Subject, IRISH YEOMANRY; Date, JULY 18, 1831.

The Education Question and the Tithe Question were the two great subjects of the day, as far as Ireland was concerned. The Kildare-street Society had for its object the perversion of Catholic children, and tried to effect this through the usual medium of offering those educational advantages of which the Irish people had always been so singularly desirous. For centuries, all education had been forbidden at home; for some years it had been made penal to seek it abroad. But now a new trial of constancy was offered. The time of persecution had almost passed away; but the time of temptation had begun—of a temptation difficult to resist, and devised with malicious craft. But the people were still firm, though they owed much of their resistance to O'Connell's powerful exposure of the snare. The persecution of demanding support for a Church which was alien to their own was in full force, and the Irish yeomanry, under the command of Orange magistrates, were employed to hunt down and shoot down a people whose only offence was a refusal to obey the mandates which were contrary to common justice—which were contrary to the very liberty of conscience of which Protestantism made so loud a boast.* On the 18th of June, a terrible tragedy was enacted at Newtownbarry. A Protestant clergyman (Mr. M'Clintock) obtained the assistance of the police and yeomanry in collecting and selling his tithes. The people were determined on a peaceable resistance; they rarely offered any other. They assembled in crowds in the market-place, to prevent by persuasion the sale of the goods. The police and yeomanry were ordered to attack the unoffending people; thirteen men were killed, and twenty were severely wounded, but no redress was to be had for the unhappy victims.

* We have collected some curious examples of the intolerance of Cromwell and other Protestants, to sects who dared to think for themselves on religious questions, in our recently published "History of Cork."

Had such an attack been made by Catholics on Protestants, an ocean of blood would have been shed to appease the victims. During the debate, Mr. George Dawson made this remarkable statement, that any attempt to put down Orange processions (he might have added outrages) would utterly fail. Sir John Newport made the manly declaration that if such celebrations had followed the battle of Culloden, Scotland would exhibit as bitter religious animosities as now afflicted Ireland.

On the 19th July, 1831, O'Connell spoke twice briefly on a petition being presented against the grant to Maynooth, in which Catholics were called idolators. He called attention to the fact, that the religion thus malignèd was the religion of one-third of the British empire. The debate was carried on with unusual moderation. Lord Miltown, who described himself as an ultra-Protestant, said men had often religious zeal enough to hate one another; he wished they had enough charity to love one another. He condemned such language.

Mr. O'Connell wished to advert to a subject in which he felt a deep interest. When the subject of the Irish yeomanry was formerly before the House, he had understood that the right hon. gentleman had pledged himself that the issuing of arms to the Orange yeomanry should be discontinued. But he had been informed that, on the 11th July, a new company had been organized, called the "Ogle Blues," and had received arms from the Government. That company did not stand high in the estimation of the county Wexford, in which it was formed. However, on 11th July, it received its arms in the town of Wexford; the men had gone up the river afterwards in a boat, bearing orange flags, firing shots on both sides of the river, and having a band playing party tunes. Such was the pledge which he understood had been given, and such was the manner in which it had been redeemed. More blood had been shed in Ireland. At Banbridge, four men and one woman had been shot, and it was said that two or three Orangemen had been shot. The latter was doubtful; but it was quite certain that the Catholics had been killed.

In the town of Enniskillen, general officers had joined the procession of the Orangemen in their regimentals; and how was it possible, he would ask, to preserve tranquillity in Ireland if

such things were practised, and arms were put into the hands of one party? That more blood had been shed was not, he believed, the fault of the Catholics, who had acted with a degree of forbearance which entitled them to the protection of Government.

In Enniskillen, the proclamation had been disregarded, and disregarded by the magistrates who had attended the procession which the proclamation forbade. As Lord Redesdale said long ago—there was in Ireland one law for the poor and another for the rich. Let the House look at what had happened at Newtownbarry. The Government, indeed, had done its duty on that occasion, and deserved his thanks. But what had happened there? Why, the private yeomanry had been sent to gaol, while the officer who had given orders to fire, according to the testimony of three or four witnesses, was let out on bail. This was extraordinary, too, because, of three magistrates who had conducted the investigation, two were for committing all the parties to gaol, but three or four magistrates were let in from the county, and they overruled the decision of the two magistrates who had gone through the whole investigation. That fact was only one of a family, and it might give the House a clue to the disturbances in Ireland. One class of persons despised the proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, acted against it, encouraged processions, and saw the land deluged with blood. Ought these magistrates, ought the people who did these things, to be intrusted with arms? On such a subject it was impossible for the representatives of Ireland to do their duty and remain silent.

The processions of the Catholics were not joined by any gentlemen of family or influence; they were exclusively processions of the people; but the instant the proclamation was issued, the Catholic gentlemen used their influence to suppress these processions, and succeeded. There were no processions this year of the Catholics. The Catholic population had obeyed the Government; the loyal population—the population who called themselves exclusively the friends of the Government—disobeyed

the law and defied the proclamation. He felt it his duty to ask, therefore, if he had misunderstood the right hon. gentleman, and if he had not pledged himself that no more arms should be issued to the yeomanry? If the right hon. gentleman had, as he understood, given such a pledge, he was sure that it was not the fault of the right hon. gentleman if arms had since been issued to the yeomanry.

Subject, DISTRESS IN IRELAND; *Date,* JULY 25, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell rose to make, he hoped, a very short speech. First, with reference to the petition, he must say, that it was not the reduction of the barilla duties which had injured the kelp manufacturers. He knew well that the soap-boilers of Dublin had not for some time past any kelp; and though the soap-boilers at Cork still used some, the quantity was small, and it was there going out of use. What had ruined the soap trade of Ireland was the circumstance, that there was no excise duty on it there, while in England there was such a duty. That duty was, however, remitted in a shape of drawback, and by a peculiar management, known to the soap-boilers, the drawback was made very much to exceed the duty, so that the Government gave a large bounty to the soap-boilers of England to ruin the soap-boilers of Ireland. In fact, they were encouraged by the laws to send large quantities of soap to Ireland. They undersold the Irish in their own markets, and that had ruined the soap-boilers and the kelp-burners of Ireland. Moreover, the soap-boilers got sixty-one days to pay the duty; the drawback was paid immediately; and two months being sufficient to complete his manufacture, and send it to market, he was able to trade on the capital furnished by the Government in the shape of the drawback. Misgovernment, then, had ruined the Irish manufacturers. The people of Ireland did not want treatises on political economy; these were of no use to them, because there was a fact peculiar to Ireland which existed no

where else, viz., the large mass of her landed proprietors owned estates elsewhere, and lived out of the country. It was the absentees who injured Ireland. A Roman Catholic bishop had stated, and truly stated, that in his diocese eighteen out of twenty of the landed proprietors were living out of the country. That was a state which no introduction of capital could redeem. In fact it was idle to talk of introducing capital into Ireland; Ireland did not want capital. Whenever any useful enterprise called for it, he would undertake himself to get within a fortnight in Dublin £500,000, on adequate security, if there was a chance of its being profitably invested; and he would undertake, in one month, to raise £1,000,000 in Dublin for any gentleman who might want it for any useful purpose. It was not only the absentees who afflicted Ireland—the taxes levied on that country were all drawn from it, and spent out of it. The taxation of Ireland was altogether supposed to amount to £7,000,000. This sum was made up of taxes acknowledged and taxes not acknowledged. The unacknowledged taxes were those paid upon articles consumed in Ireland, after undergoing excise and custom duties in England. Innumerable were these articles. They included not only tea, hops, sugar, wine, timber, coffee, molasses, dye-wood, spices, articles of dress, and implements of various kinds, but books, papers, cards, insurances, patent medicines, and even newspapers. English journals circulated extensively in Ireland. The readers, of course, paid the tax upon them, but it was credited to the English, and not to the Irish revenue. Of the produce of all these taxes, not £3,000,000 were required for purposes that could be called Irish, and certainly £3,000,000 was not spent in Ireland. The expenditure, such as it was, was annually decreasing. Nearly half a million had been saved within the last ten years on revenue collection alone. The grants for miscellaneous services were every year undergoing a reduction. There was a heavy pension-list, but the greater portion of the receipts went into the pockets of non-residents. Amongst other persons deriving benefit from the money voted for Irish pensioners, as they were called,

was the Princess of Hesse Homberg. A large sum was voted for military purposes, but a great deal of it went into the pockets of English clothiers, accoutrement makers, and horse-breeders. In short, the portion of the Irish taxation actually spent in Ireland was under £3,000,000. Then a surplus of £4,000,000 was drawn away to be added to the absentee rents. Some estimated these rents at £3,000,000, others at £4,000,000; but supposing them to swell the tax-drain to £7,000,000, which was clearly under the mark, that was enough to account for the impoverished state of Ireland. This drain had been going on for years. It was annually increasing, and the means of the country to resist it were yearly diminishing. The large expenditure and high prices of the war made compensation to the country while the war lasted. The prices had fallen from 50 to 100 per cent.; the expenditure on the army alone had been reduced to the extent of nearly £3,000,000. It might be said, that, to make up for fallen expenditure and reduced prices, there was the advantage of diminished taxation. Such was the case in England, but the very opposite was the case in Ireland. Strange as it might appear to some gentlemen, it was not until the means of Ireland were greatly diminished, and were hourly diminishing, that it appeared wise to British financiers to "assimilate" the taxes of the two countries in all respects. In a debate on the state of Ireland in 1822, the late Lord Liverpool admitted the "suffering of Ireland from an excessive diminution of expenditure," and yet since that period taxes had been imposed upon Ireland which her people had not known before. Approaching the termination of the war, all the excise duties on necessaries or luxuries were raised to the British standard; seven or eight years after the war, all the customs' duties were raised to the British standard. To be sure, there was a relief in respect to the assessed taxes, but that had been a good deal counterbalanced by taxes imposed. Ireland was then and now nearly in the condition in which she was, as to the pressure of taxation, during the war, though it was the boast of the minister that the people of England had received a relief to the extent

of two or three and thirty millions. What country could bear up against such a state of things? Now, too, the ministers were doing away all the Boards—everything was to be taken away from Ireland, and she was to have nothing left but the privilege of sending all her wealth to England. As to the transition state, which the hon. member had spoken of, he could tell the House, if that were the cause of distress, it was not yet over. He had that day seen letters from Dublin, describing the failure of three wealthy houses, which no man could have possibly expected. He was ready to admit that the Government would do something for Ireland; but—and he said it without any feelings of hostility to Government—those measures had only tended to increase ill-will among the different parties, and promote the frightful anarchy which prevailed. More virulence was now displayed than had been in existence for the last ten years. Blood had been shed, and all the angry feelings had been roused. He did not state this with a view to disturb the Government; but in the discharge of his duty, he was bound to allude to those circumstances. There never was a ministry so mistaken in their policy towards Ireland. No man who heard him could deny that a more deadly spirit of animosity existed at present in Ireland than for a long time past. What would the House think of it, when a grand jury gave as a toast—an incredible toast, which he would not have believed had his informants not been men of undoubted veracity—“Our feet on the neck of the Papists?” This grand jury had also drunk “The Yeomanry of Newtownbarry,” with all the honours. This grand jury, too—he meant the grand jury of Carlow, for he would not mince the matter—had given “The 12th of July.” Was that proper in men who were called upon to administer justice in the country? He would ask, also, if the nephew of the noble lord, whose agent Captain Graham was, ought to have been on the grand jury of Wexford? Ought Mr. Irving to be on that grand jury? Common decency forbade it. The Government had issued a proclamation to forbid Orange processions; but it had not succeeded in putting them

down. He was informed by a gentleman, a Mr. Randle Kernan, a barrister, that after this proclamation had been issued, several magistrates had walked arm in arm in an Orange procession at Enniskillen. The mischief had begun, and something must be done to remedy it. The state of Ireland was frightful. To poverty, misery, and disease, was now added bloodshed. He had been applied to by the Catholic clergy to speak to the people, but what could he say? He could tell them to be tranquil, but he could not promise them anything as a means of keeping them so. The Government must do something. If the magistrates became partizans, they must excite disrespect, and they ought to cease to be magistrates. If such men were dismissed, in a short time tranquillity would be restored. He began by saying he wished to make only a short speech, and he had made a long one. He repeated, that he was not hostile to the Government; he would give it his support, admiring its conduct towards England. Towards Ireland it had as yet done nothing good, however well it intended.

Subject, GRANT TO MAYNOOTH; Date, AUGUST 5, 1831.

O'Connell defended the education of the Catholic clergy.

Mr. O'Connell said, that the hon. member for Dundalk had ample opportunities of entering into theological discussions elsewhere, and he had hoped he would not have chosen that House, which certainly was not a very fit arena for theological display. He had termed the Catholic doctrines unChristian. He did not know how far the hon. member's Christian charity might carry him; but the same spirit which he had evinced might be sufficient to qualify him for the office of Chief Inquisitor of Spain. He had also attacked the priests, whom he (Mr. O'Connell) declared were most exemplary, and most diligent in their attention to the temporal as well as spiritual wants of the poor of their flocks. They had the entire confidence of the people,

whom they assisted and comforted upon all occasions, when they were deserted by all the rest of the world. They were to be found by the bedsides of the poor and destitute, when they were ill or on the point of death, and so well was this known, that they might judge of the health of a district, during the prevalence of contagious disorders, by the number of priests who died; yet these were the men who were calumniated. Three hours each day were the students employed in reading the Scriptures, and yet the hon. member had the hardihood to assert they did not receive a scriptural education. There had been strict examinations into the system of the College by the Chancellor and judges of Ireland, who had made no complaints of the education given at Maynooth. He knew the students well, and could assert, that few bodies of young men in any place of education possessed more extensive information than they did. He was utterly surprised at the hon. member's zeal in support of the exclusive Church of England, when the hon. member, in his own country, was a dissenter—he belonged to the Episcopal Church, while the mass of his countrymen were Presbyterians, and regarded the cope of his bishop as a rag of the Scarlet Lady. He (Mr. O'Connell) was for no exclusive Church, and hoped the time would come when every man would resort to his priest as to his doctor or lawyer, and pay the man whose aid he might require. As to the grant for Maynooth, of which some hon. members seemed to think so much, he could assure them that no such grants need have been required, if the Catholic families of Ireland had obtained that compensation to which they were entitled for the loss of the property which some of their ancestors had expended in foundations in France, for the education of youth intended for orders in the Catholic Church in Ireland. The British Government obtained a large sum from France as a compensation for losses sustained by British subjects at the French Revolution. Of that sum, the Irish Catholic families obtained no part for the losses they had sustained in the way he had described, though in justice they had a claim to £150,000. Had those foundations in France,

stood in the same situation as before the Revolution, he should, in right of his family, have a presentation for thirty-six Catholic divinity students. At present he had only four! Let hon. members, when the grant of £9,000 a year was proposed, recollect those circumstances. He wanted no partial liberality—give, he would say, to the Kildare-street Society, the management of any funds necessary to educate the Protestants, as it had their confidence; but do the same to Maynooth, which possesses the confidence of the Catholics.

Subject, OUTRAGES IN IRELAND; Date, AUGUST 9, 1831.

Orange Societies.

Mr. O'Connell wished to draw the attention of the only law officer of the Irish Government then present to several statements of occurrences in Ireland which had come to his ear, and seemed to require explanation. He wished that the right hon. gentleman the Secretary for Ireland had been in his place, as he meant to ask if he would allow the papers concerning these outrages to be laid on the table. In his absence he would only say that a party of Orangemen, on the 19th and 22nd of December, paraded the town of Maghera, in the north of Ireland, with symbols, flags, and Orange music playing, and had sung songs to provoke a breach of the peace. They afterwards came into the town with guns and bayonets, and committed gross outrages, wounding and stabbing some of the harmless women and children. They set fire to and destroyed the village. They took the furniture out of the houses and set fire to it; they abused the old women, all the males having fled, with the exception of one, who had become an idiot in consequence of having, upon a previous occasion, seen his father murdered by the Orange party. The damage done to the poor inhabitants amounted at least to £400, and Government had sent down a Commission to try the offenders. Verdicts, it appeared, were

given, all against the Roman Catholics, while not one Orangeman had been found guilty or punished. He should wish to have some information on this subject, and should have been glad to have been allowed to see the report of Mr. Perrin, who was sent down on the occasion by Government; but as the right hon. Secretary was not in his place he must postpone his questions till a fitter opportunity.

Subject, THE YEOMANRY OF IRELAND; Date, AUGUST 20, 1831.

The Slaughter at Newtownbarry.

Mr. O'Connell said he was obliged to commence his observations on the slaughter committed at Newtownbarry in the same manner, he was sorry to observe, that he had been compelled to adopt upon former occasions when that subject had been brought before the House. Here were seventeen individuals sacrificed—in all forty persons killed and wounded—and yet not one solitary expression of regret was uttered for that horrible and most unnecessary waste of human life. It seemed to be treated as nothing but an ordinary occurrence—a mere every-day matter—and therefore unworthy of particular notice. Gentlemen talked of everything, they spoke of everything, but not one particle of pity was shown for the agonized feelings of the surviving relatives of the slain. This was the fifth time that the subject was introduced, and still no touch of compassion was manifested for those unfortunate persons. What was more, he would ask, had any effort been made to visit the perpetrators of this cruel deed with retributive justice? No, no; the parties remained in triumph, and the hon. member for Cavan came down with his exculpatory document, signed by nobility and gentry. There never was so false, so atrocious a document as that to which the hon. member had first referred. In that document they were told that the yeomanry were necessary to preserve the peace. Why, at that time, Wexford was the most peaceable county in Ireland. To preserve the peace! There was not a single instance of breaking the peace, until the

occurrence of the Newtownbarry affair. O nobility ! O gentry ! you assert a falsehood when you say that the peace of that county, or of the country requires the aid of such a force. Secondly, it was stated in this document that the yeomanry were necessary to keep down insurrection? Where was there a particle of insurrectionary spirit to be seen? Who thought, who dreamt of insurrection. No one but those noblemen and gentlemen. Here were those men, after this slaughter, this massacre, coming forward and charging the people with a tendency to commit a breach of the peace and with harbouring feelings that pointed to insurrection. Where was the breach of the peace? When was the tendency to insurrection? If neither took place—if neither were to be traced anywhere—what then, became of the hon. member's highly respectable certificate? But who, he would ask, were on the grand jury? The friends and relatives of those whose conduct he reprobated, who made false charges, and who, when human blood was shed—when men, women, and children were slaughtered—remembering that they were the friends and relatives of the parties inculpated, would not find a bill against them even for manslaughter. Where were the people, in such a state of things, to look for justice? Where were they to seek redress? Where could they hope to find protection? If they wanted not to drive the people of Ireland to madness—to despair—let them immediately wrest the arms from the hands of the low Protestants. Could the hon. member for Cavan deny that he had designated them correctly? Could he say that they were not low Protestants? He would call emphatically on the Legislature to free Ireland from the scourge of the yeomanry—to free her from a proud aristocracy, who unnecessarily, by the agency of an infuriated yeomanry, shed the blood of innocent people. What had occurred not long since in the north of Ireland? Here was another specimen of the equal justice which was distributed in Ireland. Two parties, consisting of Orangemen and Catholics, had an encounter; the magistrates interfered, and the Catholics threw down their arms and fled; in their flight these unarmed indivi-

duals were fired at; and he had yet to learn whether any of those who had thus assailed them had been brought to punishment.

SAME SUBJECT.

Mr. Dawson interrupted O'Connell for a moment to say that the magistrates wished to act impartially, "but one party was too strong for them."

Mr. O'Connell continued. The Catholics stated, and the fact was not denied, that they were fired at when they were running away. Four times had he mentioned the Maghera case in that House, but no mention was made of it—it did not go out to the public at all. He supposed that it did not suit the purpose of those who were employed on these occasions. On the 17th of December the Orangemen made a complete wreck of the habitations of the Roman Catholics, destroyed their furniture; assaulted the men violently, and even beat the women. With respect to the charge of firing over the chapel while a solemn service was in the course of being solemnized, the hon. member had brought forward the affidavits of eleven persons in contradiction to that fact. Now, he should be glad to know whether only one religious ceremony was performed for the repose of the souls of seventeen slaughtered persons? Besides the High Mass, would there not be a solemn service for every one of them? The hon. member's eleven witnesses seemed to think that only one service was performed; and it certainly was a very extraordinary circumstance to find eleven Protestant gentlemen walking close to the chapel at the identical time when no shots were fired. It was a very marvellous coincidence indeed. He attributed the whole of the frightful party feelings which agitated Ireland to the Orange magistracy. Why, he demanded, did the Government permit those parties to continue in the commission of the peace? Why should Government fear them? Why should Government, in opposition to the great body of the people, protect, uphold, and support them? Let them but strike three or four of these magistrates out of the commis-

sion and the remainder would become perfectly calm and quiescent. The Government had said a great deal, the Government, doubtless, intended a great deal with respect to the welfare of Ireland; but still things went on precisely in the same old and objectionable way. Let them refrain from sending forth their instructions and their letters missive; let them, instead of taking that course, dismiss three or four of these exotics—these Orange magistrates—from the commission, and they might depend upon it that the remainder would be perfectly tame. What was the consequence of keeping up this yeomanry force which Government refused to disband? Why, the Ribbonmen were again organizing. He understood that 8,000 of them had assembled together very lately, and of these 200 were armed with muskets. This was an appalling state of things. Would men thus situated calmly suffer themselves to be slaughtered? He feared not. If they did not show their resentment in the day, they would at night. The wild justice of barbaric revenge, if not called into operation in the light of day, would perhaps be fatally busy in the dark. The ministers had not acted with that just spirit which the people expected, and which they demanded. They had, in fact, alienated the people from them and given their support to a faction who hated them even worse than they hated those whom they wished on all occasions to oppress.

SAME SUBJECT, AUGUST 26, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell said that, as he had been personally assailed by the hon. member for Dundalk, he must say a few words in vindication of himself. Because he had complained that some gentlemen had expressed no pity for the unhappy persons who had been killed by the yeomanry, the hon. member had turned round on him and said, that he never expressed pity for those who were waylaid and murdered in Ireland, and that he seemed to desire that all the commiseration should be on one side. Now was that fair? He would tell the hon. member that he had

never spoken but in terms of execration of the miscreants who had committed the foul deeds of which the hon. member had spoken. The hon. member complained of his having called the Orangemen "exotics." But the hon. member was himself a proof that it was not considered a crime in Ireland to be an "exotic;" for, if it had been, how could the hon. member, speaking a dialect which few Irishmen could understand, have won his way at Dundalk? It could not have been by the bewitching accents of his tongue; he must have gained their hearts by the sweetness of his countenance. He had another charge to make against the hon. member for Dundalk, and he should like to hear his answer to it. That hon. member some time ago read a letter to the House, which he stated had been written by the Rev. Mr. Murphy, a Catholic clergyman in the county of Clare. Observing some Scotticisms in the letter read by the hon. member, his suspicions were awakened, and finding that the document which the hon. member read was not in the handwriting of the Rev. Mr. Murphy, with whose handwriting he was well acquainted, he asked the hon. member for the original. The hon. member then said that he had read to the House a copy of the original letter, and that he would produce the original. He repeated the same promise to his friend opposite, the hon. member for Ilchester, who put a similar question to him on that occasion. It was about two months since the hon. member for Dundalk had made that promise, but had never fulfilled it, and he therefore defied the hon. member to produce the original of that letter, which he stated had been written by the Rev. Mr. Murphy, and which he had promised to produce. There never was a grosser mistake than that which had been committed by the hon. member for Dundalk in attributing to him the statement, that if the yeomanry were disarmed the people would attack them. What he meant, and what he had said was, that the Government, while they pursued the system that they did, durst not disarm the yeomanry. The right hon. member for Harwich had, in fact, in the course of his valorous speech, told his Majesty's Government that if they

disarmed the yeomanry they would get arms themselves, and he had put it to the Government whether they would put those poor Orangemen to 25s. a-head expense. The Government ought to despise such threats from the Orange party in Ireland. There never was a Government which was so capable of meeting, if it chose to do so, the threats of the Orangemen of Ireland with utter contempt and defiance as the existing Government of this country. While the country is with them they surely should not experience any alarm from the impotent threats of such a miserable faction. Let the Government take the King's arms out of the hands of the Orange yeomanry, and then, if they should dare to beard the Government, the unarmed peasantry would be able themselves to preserve the peace and to defeat the efforts of the faction. The shedding of blood daily and hourly in Ireland was a sufficient excuse for the Government to put an end to such a mischievous force. Why not disband this yeomanry force, and in its stead augment the number of the King's troops in Ireland? Or why not send over 20,000 or 25,000 of the English militia to Ireland to take the place of such a justly-obnoxious, long-censured, and most mischievous body? For his part, he for one would be ready to vote that the whole expense of maintaining that militia should be thrown upon Ireland, if the yeomanry force were put to an end. It was absolutely necessary for the peace of Ireland to get rid of such a party-prejudiced and factious force as the Orange yeomanry presented. They wanted a force in Ireland, and while it had arms in its hands it should not be mixed up in village feuds and party animosities, which were still further enhanced by the infusion of religious discord. They did not, at the same time, require that this force should be cut down at once. All they asked for was, that it should be gradually abolished. During the preceding administration, and up to the time when the present ministers came into office, this force was a perfect nonentity—the very shade of a shadow. But the present Ministry had put arms into the hands of 28,000 of those men, and they had been ever since affrighting and alarming the country.

*Subject, SUPPLY—SECEDING PROTESTANT MINISTERS ;
Date, AUGUST, 1831.*

The Church endowed by law could be disendowed by law.

Mr. O'Connell was convinced that it would be a gross injustice to stop this grant to the Presbyterian preachers. As to the right of Parliament to alter the disposition of Church property in Ireland, that was, he thought, quite clear. The Church Establishment was founded on Act of Parliament, and could be altered by the same authority. He was sure that the yearly income of the see of Derry was not one shilling less than £20,000.

Subject, IRISH EDUCATION ; Date, SEPTEMBER 9, 1831.

There was nothing certainly in O'Connell's speech to provoke such a remark, but at its conclusion Mr. Gordon said, he was "no match for the hon. member in the language of the fish market."

Mr. O'Connell did not think the House had ever witnessed a greater contrast than was exhibited that night in the House, between the two speeches on the same subject; one by the right hon. Secretary, and the other by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. The one was distinguished by good taste, good feeling, and charitable consideration upon those points in which others might differ from him. The other, that of the hon. member for Dundalk, was marked by the want of those qualities, by bigotry, intolerance, and ignorance, which were new to many hon. members, but not to him (Mr. O'Connell), recollecting the quarter from which they came. But even from that quarter, he was astonished at the length to which they had been carried in this instance. Respect for the Committee prevented him from applying the deserved terms to the charge which had just been made against the Irish Catholics. He did not rise for the purpose of replying to the farrago of bigotry to which the Committee had been listening for the last half

hour. The calumnies which had been just uttered had been heard and refuted a hundred times over in Ireland. The story of the number of Catholic children who had been brought, against the will of their priests, to Protestant schools, was too stale now to make any impression. He had himself heard in the town of Ennis about the 400 being brought to one Protestant school. And how did the Committee think it was managed? Why the schoolmaster acknowledged that he gave each of them twopennyworth of gingerbread for coming to the school. The same master dined on one occasion with the Catholic priest, and after they had taken some glasses of wine, the schoolmaster said, "What a good thing this religion is for you and me." This had been openly stated on the authority of the priest, the Rev. Mr. M'Kiernan, and to this day the schoolmaster never ventured to contradict it, and no doubt, for obvious reasons, because he could not. He was bound, however, to state, that this veracious master afterwards said that it was said in joke. It had been stated publicly that there were 3,100 schools in one district in connection with the Papist Society, and he had no doubt but that the Committee would be amused with the manner in which this number had been made out. It was thus: the actual number of the schools stated in the report of the rev. gentleman, who, residing in the district, furnished the report, was thirty-one, as declared by the rev. gentleman himself. Now, by the slight operation of adding two ciphers, the thirty-one schools were converted into 3,100. After such facts, the Committee were not to be surprised at any statements, however exaggerated, made in such quarters, particularly when such easy methods of imposition were discovered. Yet such statements had made impressions on English credulity, and the Committee gravely referred to the figures and calculations of these societies as unanswerable arguments. The hon. member for Dundalk said, that if the Committee doubled the funds of these Societies, he would undertake the number of scholars would also be doubled. Of this he (Mr. O'Connell) had no doubt, considering the terms and calculations of the Societies. In addition to the misstate-

ments respecting the schools, they had heard of the often-repeated and as often-refuted calumnies against the Irish priesthood, and, amongst others, an attack was made upon that able and most excellent bishop, Dr. Doyle. He who electrified the Committee of the House of Lords, before whom he was examined, where he answered, in reply to a question put to him respecting his income:—"It is not a matter to which I attach any importance, as I have no care for money." However, such a man, the hon. member for Dundalk had selected for abuse. It was true that the rev. prelate had a controversy with Dr. Elrington on some disputed point, and the hon. member might think Dr. Elrington right; but however that might be, the point could not be decided. The hon. member had accused Dr. Doyle of having mutilated passages from Scripture, and having inserted them in that state in his Catechism. If such a charge could be made out, the streets of Carlow would have been placarded with accounts of it. He was quite aware that the differences which existed between himself and the hon. member for Dundalk were matters of religion; and it was no wonder that persons thinking themselves right should wish others to think of them as they thought of themselves. The hon. member thought the Catholics wrong; he for his part thought the Protestants wrong. But if either of them had the proper and necessary feeling of Christian charity, which was expected from persons professing in so many things the same doctrines of Christ, they ought not to make their conscientious differences the grounds of rancorous personal hostility, and far less were they justified in making them the grounds of gross calumnies. Then the hon. member said, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland had one description of Catechism, whilst those of England had another and totally different one, wishing the Committee to believe, that in this country the public see the best side of the Catholic religion, whilst its real deformity is exposed in Ireland. Could it be expected that the credulity of the Committee would go so far as to believe this statement, whilst every Catholic in both countries knew the statement was

utterly unfounded? Was it possible to believe that such a difference should exist amongst Catholics professing the same creed and speaking the same language, and that no better proof of the fact could be found than the assertion of the hon. member? The Committee were not to be surprised at the reiteration of such calumnies, when they knew that some persons lived and made their livelihood by their promulgation; that by their zeal and activity in giving currency to such calumnies, some individuals had been raised from low situations to occupy a place in society, and were brought into circles in which they could not otherwise expect to move. Was there, he would ask, sufficient credulity in England to be imposed upon by such statements? There was, indeed, and he regretted to say so, enough of it in Ireland, and a profitable use had been made of it; but now it was seen through there, and the deceptions of those who had practised those arts, but still talked of the ignorance of the Irish people, and referred to figures in support of their statements. The hon. member for Dundalk might have the multiplication table at his fingers' ends, but did that prove more than that he had been at school. In reply to what had been said by a Scotchman of Irish ignorance, he should not say one word in disparagement of that people; but he must be allowed to say, that some very strange men now and then went from that country to enlighten Irish ignorance, some of whom gave every day fresh proofs of their prudence in not stopping at home. He would not retort the charge of ignorance on the hon. member's country, but he felt perfectly justified in flinging back the charge upon the hon. member himself, for he had betrayed the grossest ignorance on subjects respecting which the most ordinary capacity might be well informed. What could be thought of the knowledge of a man who did not know, until reminded of it in the House, that he himself, an Episcopalian, was a Dissenter in his own country, and gave so many other proofs of his ignorance upon subjects with which it might be supposed he ought to have had some acquaintance? The Catholic priesthood of Ireland came in for their share of his

abuse, on the ground that they were enemies to education and the diffusion of knowledge. Was he ignorant of the fact, that there was scarcely in Europe a college, except that of Dublin, which was not founded by Catholic clergymen? If it were not for the dread of detaining the Committee longer, he should show, incontestably, that the priests of Ireland were the friends of education. In every village in Ireland they had schools for the moral and religious education of the poor; and the assertion that they were inimical to education could be refuted by every unbiassed person who had visited that country. He acknowledged that in many—nay, most—situations, their means were inadequate, and it was from that cause alone that education in that country was deficient. When the hon. member talked of the deficiency of zeal for education on the part of the Catholics, he would ask, did not the nuns educate a large portion of the poor Irish females? and the Committee ought to know, that there was a convent in every town of importance in Ireland. These amiable ladies, separating themselves from all worldly and domestic ties, devoted their lives, in most cases, to gratuitous education of poor female children. The education monks, who had been sneered at, were, for the most part, respectable tradesmen, who, retiring from business, with a few hundred pounds, devoted their time to the gratuitous education of poor children. The charges against these classes of persons were wholly untrue, and were only intended to impose upon Englishmen. With respect to a more agreeable topic, the project of the right hon. Secretary, he had heard it, in common with many others, with great satisfaction. He looked upon the proposed change as the commencement of a new era in Ireland, and he sincerely hoped that the promises which were made would be fully realized. No more effectual step could be taken to put down agitation; no injustice had been done to the Kildare-street Society, which had received due notice of the intention of Government. All he wished for was, that Catholic children should participate impartially in the funds apportioned to education in Ireland; but he did not wish, in the least degree, to interfere

with the Kildare-street Society, or any other Protestant Society, in the manner in which they educated Protestants. Let the Protestants and Presbyterians be educated in Scripture, or any other course of study they pleased; all the Catholics asked was the benefit of education, accompanied with their own mode of religious instruction. To this it was replied, that the Catholic religion was false, and ought not to be propagated. Yet he and other Catholics were called upon to support the Protestant religion, which they believed to be false. As the fund for education was obtained from Catholics and Protestants, the children of both should equally partake of its benefits. It was charged upon the Catholics that they would not be content with equality, but that they sought ascendancy. He, for one, wished to state, and he made the declaration in the presence of that God who would judge him by what he then stated, to eternal weal or woe, that he should be as strenuous an opponent of Catholic ascendancy in Ireland as any Protestant in that country. Ascendancy only corrupted religion, and he loved his religion too fondly to wish to see it in the ascendant. The hon. and learned member for Dublin College said, that Catholics belonged to the Kildare-street Society. That was true; but he, with others, left it when they found that it had changed its principles. The statement of the influence of the Catholic priests was used in several ways, as it suited their opponents for the moment. At one time they were represented as having lost all influence, and at another it was stated that their influence was paramount. They had influence, and he was glad of it for the sake of the people. They were opposed to the Kildare-street Society, and when its original plan was departed from it was checked. Its schools formerly averaged an increase of 239 in the year, but they were only now about twelve; and this falling off took place whilst the demands for schools increased. He objected to the Society, because it had produced the same violent discontent. When the Society departed from its original plan, coercion was practised. The fathers of children who did not go to the school were driven out of their houses, and the mothers

to starvation and beggary, and he could prove that cases of this kind were not of rare occurrence; and he did not hesitate to say, that many of the disorders in the county of Clare were owing to that and other such societies. The unpopularity of the Society was easily ascertained by its failure, notwithstanding the liberality of the grants to it. But he was now glad to see one great cause of discontent removed; he hoped the promises and expectations of Government would be realized, and that the benefits of education would be equally extended to all classes.

SAME SUBJECT.—CONTINUATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. O'Connell, after shortly replying to the extracts read by the hon. member, said he could not pass over the remark about the anathemas of the Catholic clergy without one observation. Some of the statements of the hon. member contained great falsities; but not one greater than that as to the compensation which he had received from the Irish people. He had received a compensation from his countrymen, and those might sneer who had not made the sacrifice that he had, and who little knew how he had earned such a compensation. At the time he was returned for Parliament, he was gaining £7,000 a-year by his profession; and if his countrymen thought fit to make him some compensation for that loss, he did not see why he should be taunted for it. The hon. member had said something about taking the bread out of the mouths of the poor; and, in reply to that, he would only say, that he would rather starve than be guilty of such conduct, and that the statement was totally unfounded in fact. Other countries had made compensation. The senates of other countries had made compensation; but he considered it a much higher honour to receive such a compensation from his countrymen than from any senate, and regarded it as the proudest circumstance of his life. The hon. member had spoken of the difference between the two Catechisms; but

he ought to know that the Catechism used by the Catholic Church was the same as that used by Luther. In fact, that was only omitted which was stated in the preceding commandment, in order not to give the same commandment twice over.

*Subject, CHURCH PROPERTY; Date, SEPTEMBER 12, 1831.**

Mr. O'Connell said he must always protest against having Church property set down as held by the same title as other property. It was trust property, and might be taken from one and transferred to another by Act of Parliament. If a clerical person, holding Church property as a clergyman, became a Jew or a Catholic, he forfeited the property; and if the principle was adopted, that Church property could not be alienated, he begged to ask what became of the title of the estates of four-fifths of the members of that House? Why, the Duke of Bedford, and many other noblemen, would be stripped of their property. No one ever objected to paying the clergymen of the Established Church according to their employment. The Rev. Thomas Percival Magee, whose name was before the House a few nights ago, signed twice to the same petition, had no less than eleven livings. The reverend gentleman would require more lives than a cat to want all those livings, or to attend to them. There was also another case brought under the consideration of the House a few nights ago, in a petition from a parish in the county of Kildare. It appeared that the rector of that parish, who was an absentee, had an income of £1,100 a-year, whilst the curate, who performed all the duty, and had a large

* In a recent speech, Mr. Jacob Bright says: "The Church of England is conducted for the few, and the foe of the many." We are very far from endorsing this statement; but we would call attention to the fact, that it is not Catholics who are trying to overthrow the Established Church; and surely thoughtful men must be struck with the reflection that this very Church, which it cost torrents of blood to establish, is now being treated as an evil and an incumbrance.

family to support, received no more than £75 Irish, or £69 7s. 4d. English. Could anyone say that in a country where such a state of things existed, Church property was properly distributed?

Subject, SUPPLY—MAYNOOTH GRANT; Date, SEPT. 26, 1831.

On the 14th September, 1831, there was a sharp debate in the House on Church property. There can be no question that O'Connell paved the way for the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland by the steady persistency with which he brought forward incontrovertible facts to prove its uselessness, and how cruel it was to compel a whole nation to support it, when only about five per cent. of the population availed themselves of its ministrations. But there were some far-sighted men who said, even then, that the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland must lead, as it is leading, to its disestablishment in England. Mr. Lefroy said: "If the Church of Ireland were taken down, that of England would not last very long." It was admitted on all hands, that it was a mere political association, and having been made by law, could be unmade by law.

Mr. O'Connell was not prepared to expect that hon. members would allow the vote to pass without some such objections as some of those he had heard; but he owned he had not expected to hear hon. members go the length they had gone on this occasion. That many hon. members were conscientiously opposed to any grant to Maynooth College, or to any establishment having the same objects in view, he admitted, and did not object to them on that ground; but that a man should ground his opposition on a total misrepresentation of those objects, he was not prepared to expect. However little prepared he might have been to expect the concurrence of the hon. member for Tiverton on this occasion, he owned that he had not expected to find his opposition to the Roman Catholic religion couched in such terms when speaking of the doctrines of that creed, as if he arrogated to himself the infallibility of the Godhead. Was it charitable, was it Christian for one man, believing in the same Christ, to tell his fellow-man that his mode of worshipping God was false and damnable? Whatever the hon. member for

Tiverton might think of the Roman Catholic religion, he could assure that hon. member, that he was glad that he did not belong to a religion which held such uncharitable, such unchristian language. With respect to the grant before the House, however he might concur in what had fallen from the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, he owned that he did not feel flattered with the importance that the right hon. gentleman attached to his grant. In amount it was nothing; and if it were withheld altogether, about which he was perfectly indifferent, it would be found that the Catholic priesthood would be as fully provided for in Ireland as at this moment. He was not surprised at the hon. member for Tiverton, and other hon. members complaining of being called on to give any support to a religion in the truth of which they did not believe. Any conscientious man might feel the same objection; but did it never occur to those hon. members to deal out the same meed of justice to others which they claimed for themselves in this respect? Did it never occur to them that the Catholics of Ireland were compelled to support a Church in which they did not believe? That they were not only obliged by tithes to support the wealthiest body of clergy in Europe, but that the building of churches, the repairs, the ornaments of these churches—nay, even the very price of the sacramental elements, were taken from their pockets; and yet, now, when a paltry grant of the public money was proposed for the support of their own clergy, hon. members turned round upon them, and said: “No, you shall not have any money from the public to support your creed; because you believe that which is false; because you believe that which is damnable.”

Was fallible man thus to assume the attribute of infallibility? Was a poor worm of the earth thus to set himself in judgment over the eternal doom of his fellow-being, and thus blasphemously presume to state that his opinion must also be the opinion of God? What an example was here held out to the people of Ireland. If that example were followed, what must be the consequence? Let this grant be but refused, and, he repeated, he did not care for the grant, but let it be refused, and in one

month after, was it not probable that the tithes and the church-rates of Ireland would not be collected unless at the point of the bayonet? Were the supporters of the Protestant Church in Ireland prepared to attempt that mode of collection, or did they believe that the Catholics alone were the only parties who would object? Let them not be deceived in that respect. No very inconsiderable number of the Protestants in the north of Ireland would be glad of the opportunity to resist the payment. Be that, however, as it might, he would confidently assert that in three provinces, out of the four in Ireland, it would be impossible to collect tithes and church-rates but by physical force if this grant were refused. Were hon. members prepared for these consequences from the principles they had this evening declared? With respect to the grant, he again repeated, that he did not value it as a boon to the Catholics. They would be most willing to support their own clergy liberally without any aid from the State, if, like the people of Scotland, they had only their own clergy to support; if they were not pressed down by the burdens of a Church in which they did not believe. He hoped, however, that the time was fast approaching when the principle of each religion supporting its own pastors would become general.

The hon. member for Tiverton, no doubt, believed that the religion of the Catholic Church was an error. He believed that it was true; but did he, on that account, presume to sit in judgment upon his fellow-man? Forbid it, Christian charity! He left men to be judged in religious matters by that Being who alone could judge justly. The intolerant spirit which the hon. member had breathed forth that evening was the spirit which had produced the Inquisition in Spain and the Orange Lodges in Ireland, and in each case the result was similar. Christian charity and Christian forbearance were forgotten; bigotry, prejudice, and personal rancour supplied their places; and so it must ever be where man presumes to deny to his fellow-man that liberty which he himself claims in matters of religion. The priesthood who were educated at Maynooth,

were made the subjects of opprobrium and attack. Upon that subject he would not at that time enter further than to appeal to those hon. members who had opportunities of judging of the character and conduct of the priests in Ireland. He would appeal particularly to those hon. members who differed from him in religion, and who, he was sure, would not allow that difference to hinder them from doing justice to that able, intelligent, pious, and indefatigable, but yet, much calumniated body of men. As to the grant, if the House divided, he felt that he must give his vote for it; but he must again beg to repeat that he was perfectly indifferent whether it was given or not. Hon. members had objected to the establishment of Maynooth, because, they alleged, the cheapness of education there induced some of the very lower classes to send their children, and that consequently a large body of the priesthood were thus taken from the humblest classes. He would not then enter into the question, whether a man from the humblest class in society might not by education be raised to the highest acquirements in literature and science; examples of this kind were of every-day occurrence. Now, what was the fact as to the cheapness of education at Maynooth? It could be proved beyond a doubt that education in most of the foreign universities could be obtained for one-third what it cost at Maynooth. He had investigated this fact, and found that it required three times the sum to pass through Maynooth that it did through any of the foreign colleges. The sum of money Maynooth cost each individual was three times greater. The first year alone cost £40. That sum would certainly have been amply sufficient to have taken the priest to France, to have kept him while there, and then to have paid his expenses home. It had been said that this was a safe place for the Catholic clergy. Years ago this might have been an argument, in by-gone times, when they fled from persecution, and when the name "refugee priest" was a common one throughout the country. In times such as those this might have been an argument; but Maynooth had given rise to a class of priests of

a very different description; these priests had discovered that they had political rights as well as religious duties to attend to, and that they were as much bound to preserve the one as they were to perform the other. But they gave abundant satisfaction to their own flocks, who looked up to them with gratitude and respect—who supported them with pleasure—who educated them at Maynooth—and who contributed from their own stinted means of support for this purpose.

The priests discharged their duties in return, and were esteemed, valued, and beloved by their flocks! Maynooth had produced this effect, although one-fifteenth part of the Roman Catholic clergy were educated in Ireland. Before he sat down he must repudiate one idea which the hon. gentleman appeared to entertain. He rebutted the charge, he denied that any man in that House was his superior, or that he had any worldly advantage to look up to in consequence of professing the Catholic religion. He was as ready to prove his belief in those doctrines as any man could be in a proper place; he was as convinced of the truth of his religion as any gentleman could be of the truth of his. He asked no compassion, no forbearance, from any man who made him a handle for abusing his religion; although he must confess, that he should prefer it if the charge were made in a little more courteous language, and with less acrimony.

Subject, STATE OF THE NATION; Date, OCTOBER 10, 1831.

Mr. O'Connell said, that a right hon. gentleman who had recently addressed the House had told them that the question then under discussion had been forced upon them. He agreed with the sentiment of the right hon. gentleman. The question had been forced upon them; it was intended that it should be forced upon them, for, backed as it was by the unanimous voice of the British nation, it was forced upon the consideration of a British Parliament, and it should be carried into effect; ay,

and if need be, forced into effect against whatever opposition might be arrayed against it, notwithstanding the decision in another place—the weak and the foolish, he would not call it wicked, decision. It was the business of that House to see that the interests of the people were not neglected, were not injuriously postponed. Members had combined to insure the passing of a measure of Reform. He could not see that any dissent could reasonably be offered to the motion before them; that motion did not affect the details of the Bill, it only dealt with its principle; and regarding that there could be but little disagreement, since everybody was ashamed of not being a Reformer now, the only point of distinction being the quantity of Reform it was expedient to bestow.

The other proposition included in the motion was whether the confidence of that House should be reposed in his Majesty's ministers. He was for imparting to them their full confidence; and his reason for so doing was, that they had brought in the Bill, and defended it and carried it through the most tiresome, if not the most vexatious, opposition that ever attempted to stay the progress of a beneficial measure through that House. In stating this he begged to say, that by an accident he had had the misfortune to lose the speech made that night by the hon. member for Boroughbridge. Yet he did not know that the privation was a misfortune. He was not quite sure that he was justified in regretting the loss of the hon. gentleman's eloquence, seeing that he had had the fortune to hear him address himself to the question of Reform no fewer than seventy-five times; and he doubted whether even the fertile imagination of the hon. and learned member could at that hour enrich his oratory with any new flowers of argument or any new terms of expression.

An hon. member near him (Mr. Fane) had brought forward the fruits of his historical research, and told them that the concessions granted to their subjects by Charles I. of England and Louis XVI. of France had been the cause of their ruin.

Now he (Mr. O'Connell) would inform the hon. gentleman that this mode of illustrating his argument proved that he had been reading history for little purpose. He would give him a different reading of the events to which he had referred. It was because Charles and Louis had conceded too late that they were ruined. The hon. member had informed the House that these monarchs perished by concession, while George III. was saved by refusing to concede. He would also set the hon. gentleman right on that point. George III. had nothing to concede to England, but he had concessions—equitable concessions—to grant to America, and there, in the sole case in which they wanted and demanded concessions, he lost his sovereignty over the country whose appeal was disregarded.

• None of these instances presented any parallel to the present. The sovereign of these realms had attended to the prayer of his subjects. Our gracious King had no concession to make. That which barred the strong and general wish of the nation was a rapacious, a sordid oligarchy, standing between the throne and the people. An interested faction had usurped the privileges of the one and the rights of the other. For the first time the people of England, Ireland, and Scotland, had banded themselves firmly together to cry for the restoration of their rights from the boroughmongers, and who or what should gainsay their demands? It was, he admitted, rather unreasonable to ask Tories to read history; but he would not require them to travel very far back. He would ask them what they understood by the transactions of that House concerning another measure, happily now passed into law? That House had three times passed the charter of his country's liberties; three times, he repeated, had the Bill for Catholic Emancipation been forwarded to the House of Lords, and as many times it was rejected, in opposition to liberty of conscience and to the freedom of the country. But he would ask the opponents of Reform, did that rejection succeed in putting down the feelings of the people? Did it succeed in restoring tranquillity among those who called for their rights?

No; it only served to prolong for some additional years the continuance of agitation and strife, and it ended—how? By the enemies of the measure being at last obliged to yield to the pressure of justice and public opinion. He could not precisely say whether the same strong feeling were extant in England on the subject of Reform, but he did think that the people of England were not less resolute than his countrymen. He knew the spirit that prevailed in Scotland, and he could tell the inhabitants of those two great sections of the empire, that the people of Ireland were equally determined as they were to see that justice should be done. They had been told that if the members of that House only acted discreetly—only preserved a laudable moderation—only affected to believe that the public mind had relapsed into quiescence—that the people would be lulled into a forgetfulness of all that had passed.

But the people were not so blind as some persons chose to pronounce them, and they would not submit to be deceived by that, or by any other House. What would the people of England say to the Administration formed on anti-Reform principles?

What would be the fate of such an Administration had been already seen; for at the moment after a late minister had made his celebrated declaration, from that moment the persons of him and his colleagues ceased to be safe. Was it not true that they were afraid to enter the city of London unguarded? Could the hon. gentlemen have forgotten the fears of the late Premier of being attacked in the city of London, from the time he uttered the declaration against Reform until he tendered his wise and proper resignation, and appeased the popular discontent?

Suppose a new Administration were formed, taking away from Scotland all hope of regeneration, what would be the consequences of driving to despair her brave and determined people? What would be the consequence of restoring to long-abused power a party inflamed to frenzy by the curbing of their malevolent passions; a party to whose spleen and selfish-

ness the interests of the people had been sacrificed for years? What would be the consequence of allowing faction again to reign triumphant in Ireland, of permitting the Orange flag to float over that island, and the black flag over Scotland? What would be the result of turning a deaf ear to the manufacturing towns which had been basely deprived of their proper privileges? He would call him a bold man—he would also call him a bad man—who should advise that House wantonly to sacrifice its sole remaining chance of becoming in tranquillity and concord the real organ of public opinion. They had been interrogated as to what good would result from acquiescence in the present motion.

The good was palpable enough. It would prevent the people from sinking under apprehension or becoming outrageous from disappointment; it would cause hope to take the place of despair; it would throw overboard that body of discontent which distressed and impeded the majestic course of English destinies, and which had been generated by a long night of oppression, and was nursed and fostered by the decision of the House of Lords; all this would it do if they spoke their minds emphatically that night.

They were bound to support ministers, and they might support them without fear. It was the act of his Majesty's ministers which had brought them there; by that act ministers were pledged to abide, they could not shrink from the trust, and the House had a right to call upon them to proceed in their purpose by all the paths and ways recognised by the Constitution. The powers of a right hon. gentleman (Mr. Croker) had failed him when he attacked the speech of the hon. member for Clare; a speech distinguished by genuine eloquence, the brilliancy of which met the mental eye with greater lustre because it was set off by the light of profound judgment. And how had the right hon. gentleman assailed this speech? By selecting portions of isolated opinions, and animadverting upon them, to the exclusion of other and essential considerations.

He had endeavoured to ridicule the hon. member's ideas of the force and dignity of public opinion, by bringing forward the wrecking of machinery as an example of the absurd and mischievous effects it had produced. He had not given his example fairly. Why did he confine it to the act of poverty and ignorance? To meet the scope of his argument he should have had the judges and counsel indicted for the same crime. Opinion, when once awakened, would soon make itself heard. He was declaring no secret when he said that it was but for the purpose of avoiding danger that the Bill for emancipating the Catholics had been introduced to Parliament by the previous Administration. He understood that the state of the country was awful. He was not himself acquainted with the state of England, but he had heard that there had been a reaction of the question of Reform in the public mind, and he found that, in reply to this assertion, the people had assembled in multitudes in the tranquil determination to seek and obtain their rights. He might be told that he was mistaken; he might be told so by some poor Radical, who made a trade and profession of his politics. [Mr. Hunt cried "*hear.*"] He begged pardon of the hon. member for Preston; the late Secretary for the Admiralty had quoted him in his absence.

That right hon. gentleman relied much on his opinions respecting the people of England. How were those who threw a doubt upon the popular feeling answered? Why, that very day there had been a meeting of 40,000 persons in the parish of Marylebone, to consider the course it became them to adopt on the vital question. He was happy to see the Holy Alliance that had been formed between the right hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Preston; but notwithstanding their united efforts he ventured to predict that peace and liberty would survive to bless the nation. The stand made against the Bill by the Tories left him one consolation, for if it were postponed much longer, more would be demanded; and if the prayer of the people did not go the length of Universal Suffrage, it would most probably call for the excellent measure

of the Ballot; and if the aristocracy could but see their own interests they would have attended early to the popular voice. If no concession were made to the first demands of the people, might they not eventually protest against any aristocratic rights whatever?

Were their lordships wise in telling the people that the representation must not be amended? Might not some one start up and talk of the absurdity of hereditary legislation? Might not some person next week—a man who had spoken in glowing and generous anticipation of the harmonious blending of King, Lords, and Commons, devoted in unity to the whole Constitution—might not such a person, in the bitterness of baffled expectation, question the right and sense of voting by proxy—of deciding without having heard? Might not men be stirred to speak of the absurdity of a legislative power which descended from father to son—from wisdom to idiotey—from him who had rendered splendid services to his country, to him who had done nothing but mischief to his country? If such topics were raised, with whom would they originate? All at that hour was peace; not a turbulent hand had been raised; but who would answer for the occurrences of another month—a week—a moment after the absurd rejection of the conciliatory measure in another place? a proceeding, which, whatever sanctity the House that authorised it claimed, left no impression of that sanctity clinging to him. He would now put it to the House what they were to do for the people. His counsel would be that they should rally round ministers. During five years of Mr. Pitt's Administration one hundred peers had been created to second his views; that was their only service. The country expected that the King's ministers would imitate the example, and come forward with manliness and apply a remedy adequate to the existing emergency. If there were a majority of forty-one in the Lords, why not create eighty-two? The people had sent to that House a sweeping majority in favour of the Bill; why should not ministers introduce eighty-two Reformers into the other House? Then would the peerage be

safe. Did hon. members hold the House of Peers to be so good that it would be tainted by a sprinkling of Reform? Was it so good a thing that the Tories wanted to monopolise it? He believed they would as long as they could keep the property of the boroughs in their clutches.

He had heard only a few days before, that one of them had given £80,000 for Gatton, which his lordship might naturally desire to keep by his vote. He would forbear to trespass longer on the time of the House. The Bill for readjusting the constitutional interests of the empire had been brought in by the ministers, and he anxiously and earnestly hoped, that hon. members would come to a division that night, guided, by their conscience and the interests of their country, such as might lead, by doing justice, to the speedy settlement of the question, thus allaying those angry passions that shook the frame of the community, rendering England contented, Scotland satisfied, and Ireland delighted.

Subject, TITHES, IRELAND; Date, JUNE 23, 1832.

Mr. O'Connell said, that judging from the observation which had just been made by the learned gentleman, it would seem that he had not read the Irish Reform Bill. If he looked at the Bill, he would find that it did not extend the elective franchise at all. Before the Union there were 300,000 votes in Ireland. These had been cut down to 15,000 or 16,000, and the Reform Bill would not add more than 300 or 400 to the number. He denied that the people of Ireland were violating the law by the opposition to the payment of tithes. There was no law to prevent the evading of the payment of tithes. Process might be served on those who were in arrear, and their property might be distrained and offered for sale; the law authorised that as the means of recovering the tithes. But men might turn their backs on the auctioneer, and refuse to purchase the goods so taken in distress. That, however, was not breaking

the law; and he defied that House to make any law to compel the people of Ireland to purchase what they did not fancy or did not want. At the same time he wished it to be understood, that he desired to see the working clergy of the Protestant Church fairly paid. He was sure that not a man in Ireland would object to a hard-working curate getting £200 a year; but every man would object to a rector getting £1,800, and giving his curate, who did all the duty, £75. The entire national will of Ireland was opposed to tithes; and he would ask of those who talked about the firmness of English gentlemen, what would be said to them, supposing the English people to be as unanimous upon any given point as the people of Ireland were with respect to tithes, if they stood up, and recommended that the very great majority of the community should be coerced to make their opinions agree with those of a minority.

Subject, EDUCATION, IRELAND; Date, MAY 7, 1832.

Mr. O'Connell said, the hon. members who supported the petition had taken upon themselves to eulogize the talents and learning of the clerical personages who signed the petition, but these hon. members should recollect that there were also great talents and learning amongst the respectable body alluded to by his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex. At the head of that meeting was Sir Daniel Sandford, the Greek Professor of the University of Glasgow. A more powerful and rational speech than that of Sir Daniel Sandford's never was delivered. What a contrast did it form to the vulgar bigotry which marked the lucubrations of those who opposed the Government plan of education! The hon. member (Mr. James E. Gordon) in the plenitude of his kindness, had talked of his disposition to extend toleration to the Catholics of Ireland. She did not want the toleration of the hon. member. The pride of the Irish Catholics was to stand upon a level with all other denominations of Christians in the empire, and neither to seek nor require tolera-

tion from any of them. The petition which had been presented was a most bigoted and intolerant production. All the meetings which had been held, and all the speeches which had been delivered, against the Irish Board of Education, were a tissue of the most gross and disgusting cant and hypocrisy. He would cast no imputation on hon. members, but on every occasion, whenever the subject was introduced, either in the House or out of it, he would denounce this as a factious and bigoted opposition. An hon. member stated that the Catholics dictated to the New Board of Education; but only two Catholics belonged to that Board; and by what species of logic would the hon. member undertake to prove that two persons could dictate to seven? The present plan of education was not framed by Catholics. It was a measure brought forward by the Government on their own responsibility, and it was supported by the Catholics because they considered it a good one. The Catholics were anxious that Protestant and Catholic children should be educated together, but they did not desire to force any system of education on the Protestants of Ireland. An allusion had been made to Emancipation. It had been asserted that the measure effected no good in Ireland. He would tell the hon. member that Emancipation had been productive of the most salutary results. Parties who had been opposed to each other were now united in the closest bonds of amity, and the only class of persons who endeavoured to keep up dissensions were those who acted from the basest and most interested motives. The Government plan of education proposed to devote two days in the week to religious instruction, and four to literary instruction; it did not interfere with any schools but those which were carried on under their direction. Each party would be instructed by clergymen of their own persuasion, in separate apartments; and all the books employed in the schools were to be selected and arranged by the Managing Board. Many of the objections to this plan came with a very bad grace from those who had supported the Kildare-street Society, which had gone so far as to allow the use of Catholic versions of the Scriptures. Hitherto religion

had been prostituted in Ireland, under the plea of supporting a peculiar system of education. What state of society must that be, in which it was necessary for the landlord to consult his clergyman as to what schools he had better counsel his tenant to send his children? If any Protestant could prove that he had ever been interfered with as to the education of his children, he would join him most sincerely in trying to remove so intolerable a nuisance; and he demanded the same freedom for the Catholics of Ireland. The present opposition was resorted to because the measure had been brought forward by a Reforming Government. If hon. members who declaimed so loudly in favour of liberty of conscience, if they would now take up a case which had been alluded to before in that House, but which had never been followed up—he alluded to the case of two officers, belonging to the British service in the island of Malta, who had been dismissed from the army because they refused, from conscientious motives, to bow before the procession of the Sacrament in that island—if that case were brought forward he pledged himself that it should have his support.

Subject, RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS; Date, MAY 9, 1832.

This was a debate of great importance. The members of the Upper House were bitterly opposed to the Reform Bill. There was only one thing they dreaded now, and that was the threatened creation of new peers. For half a century the Tories had the peerage list in their own hands; to see new men sent in to support a Bill they hated by a Government which they cordially detested was too much for them. But the Reform Bill was a pressing and immediate necessity. On the 7th May, when the House met after the Easter recess, the Bill was considered in Committee. The House of Lords was still determined to defeat the Bill notwithstanding the overwhelming majority in the Commons—amendments on the franchise question were passed, and the Cabinets met to consider their position. The King was personally anxious for the success of the Bill, but he refused to create the number of peers necessary to pass it through the Lords. The ministers resigned. The Duke of Wellington offered his services, saying that he would be ashamed to show his face in the streets if he refused. Sir Robert Peel, with equal vehemence, said he would be ashamed

to walk upright into the House if he assented. The Ministry at last resumed office, but not until the King had given them the promise they required. The passing of the Reform Bill might be said to have rung the death-knell of the old Tory regime.

Mr. O'Connell spoke as follows. The right hon. baronet appears to me quite inconsistent in his observations. First, sir, he makes an open and avowed declaration against all Reform, that is, against the power of the people honestly and truly expressing their sentiments in this House; and then he is apprehensive that they will obtain that power to which they are entitled; he declares that he will oppose them, and then he thinks that they will be able to beat him. I am delighted to find that such a declaration has been made by the right hon. baronet. I am rejoiced that he has expressed himself so clearly and distinctly upon this point. I am glad that, so far as he is concerned, there can no longer be any delusion upon this subject, for he tells the people this most important fact, that from no Administration of which that right hon. baronet forms a part, is Reform to be expected. Upon the part which I myself have taken respecting the Reform Bill, I can feel but one regret, and that is for having consented to so high a qualification as that of £10. From the feelings which appear to have actuated many gentlemen, and from the part that I have seen them act, I can have but one regret, and that is to my consenting, not to so low a qualification, but to so high a qualification as that of £10. Had I, sir, been aware, when I agreed to that qualification, that it would extend no further the right of suffrage than I have since found it does, I certainly never should have consented to it; and it is my hope, nay, my confident expectation, that should the Reform Bill again come back to this House, the people will insist upon a much larger and more extensive Bill, and one that will confer still greater rights and privileges upon them than were conceded in the Reform Bill already agreed to by this House. The resolutions which are now before this House have my most hearty assent, and they shall have whatever support I can give them. I thank the right hon. baronet

for putting these resolutions upon their proper ground. He has most truly stated, that the resolutions mean to express our confidence in his Majesty's ministers; they most certainly mean that, and also, that we intend to express that confidence, on account of their conduct, in giving to his Majesty that advice which they have lately tendered to him. Such is the meaning, and such the intention of the resolutions. The hon. member for Worcester has frequently felt it to be his duty to differ from his Majesty's ministers. I, too, have differed from them upon many occasions, but especially concerning the manner in which they have governed Ireland, and the measures they have proposed respecting that country; but, though I have done so, I feel it to be necessary, and so does the hon. member for Worcester, to vote for these resolutions, and, upon this ground, that they express our confidence in the ministers for the advice which they have given to his Majesty. I agree to these resolutions, because I concur in the wisdom of the advice they gave to the King. I agree to these resolutions, because I am convinced that it was necessary for them to tender the advice to the King which they have offered him. I agree to these resolutions upon such grounds, without further committing myself by that declaration of confidence than such grounds can commit me. The right hon. baronet has addressed a speech to this House, which does not seem to me to be at all suited to the occasion on which he has delivered it. The right hon. baronet should have recollected that we are not now engaged in a war of words between two parties. This is not a question of Whig and Tory—whether the one is to continue in place, and the other to remain out of it. It is not a question as to who is to have the gift of office and the exercise of patronage. No; it is a question between slavery and freedom. It is a struggle between liberty and despotism. It is a conflict between the ruthless despotism of a selfish oligarchy and the ardent, the enthusiastic hopes of a freeborn and brave people. Yes, I repeat it; the question is now between freedom and the despotism, the ruthless despotism, of a sordid oligarchy. The unconstitutional

power assumed by a sordid and worthless oligarchy to nominate members of Parliament, has twice been condemned by overwhelming majorities of this House. The power has been denounced by this House; and let it be recollected that, as often as the Speaker takes the chair in this House, at the commencement of the Session, it is declared to be a gross infringement of the rights and liberty of the subject for any peer to interfere in the election of members of this House; and yet, in spite of these declarations, in open and shameless violation of them, the nominees of peers continue to occupy seats in this House. They do so as the nominees of Peers, and not as representatives of the people. The question, then, is not a party one, it is not one of Whig or Tory, but whether so atrocious a system of flagrant corruption and open violation of the Constitution is to be perpetuated or put an end to. I repeat it, then, this is a question between liberty and despotism; whether the Lords are to continue to control this House, or the people to obtain an increase of power in their own House? There is, however, another question to be considered. The security of the throne is now involved; for, let the members here delude themselves as they please, the people are unanimous out of doors. Some people, indeed, talk of a reaction. The question of Reform has been before this House for eighteen months. Has there been an attempt made at any public meeting to discuss petitions against Reform? Has there been in England, Scotland, or Ireland, a single public open meeting against the principle of Reform? The people, therefore, so far as they are concerned, have proved their partiality to Reform. They have declared that corruption is not to continue, and does the House think that disposition is abated? Have the people of England relaxed in their determination? Are the symptoms of it to be perceived at any meeting since the House of Lords have by their dexterity rendered it essential for his Majesty's ministers to bring on the crisis which they have wisely brought on? They anticipated the dexterity of their enemies. I can understand clearly from the right hon. baronet what he wished. He

wished to drag on the ministry for a fortnight or three weeks amidst vain hopes, idle expectations, and loss of the confidence of the public.

How can any man tell me that gentlemen deserving of the confidence of the public, or who had any confidence in themselves, could allow a Bill to proceed, the conduct of which was taken away from them? They would from that moment have been degraded in their own feelings, and condemned by the unanimous voice of the people, if they had kept their situations without taking adequate means for the success of the measure. They were responsible to the people for the Bill, and how could they continue in office without making the measure what it ought to be? I cannot, therefore, but commend the ministers for the advice they have given. Now, let the House see whether that advice was wise and proper. Calculations have been made as to the number of peers that would be necessary, and the hon. member for Middlesex has been taunted for having said he would have created one hundred peers if it were necessary, to carry the Reform Bill. Would any ministers be so absurd as to go to the King with a half measure, and ask him for a given number of peers, without knowing whether that number would be sufficient? That would have been too absurd. Their enemies would have rejoiced at their having taken that line, as their friends rejoiced at their having scorned it, and asked for an adequate number of peers to carry the measure. But the House is told that this would be a dangerous precedent. It is not asserted that the thing is exactly unconstitutional. I should have wished that the right hon. baronet had supplied me with that argument, for I have a strong recollection that, at the time of a measure called the Union, one-third was added to the Irish House of Peers, to enable the minister of the day to carry that measure. And if that was done to extinguish the right of a free and independent nation, shall I be told that it is not to be done to revive the liberties of England? The precedent is good for me, but bad for the right hon. baronet. At this moment peers have influence in this

House. A peer from Ireland, who voted against the Reform Bill, nominated another individual, and sent him to this House to vote against it also. This House has declared against the system, but the peers say they will not give it up. They say: "We are the majority, and we will keep the nominating power." And how is this difficulty to be got rid of? It may be got rid of by force. I recollect that, at a Reform meeting, somebody suggested that the *Ægean* stable of the Lords should be cleansed by turning the river into it; when another person proposed, as an amendment, that, instead of turning the river into the House of Lords, the Lords should be turned into the river. This is certainly, one way of getting rid of the difficulty; it is to be commended for its expedition, though not for its consonance to the Constitution. That, certainly, is not the mode that I would either support or adopt; so far from recommending, I would dissuade the people from adopting that mode. His Majesty's ministers have recommended a different mode. No force or violence is reconcilable with a constitutional mode of proceeding. They cannot overpower the House of Lords by any other branch than the Crown. On such an occasion, it is reserved for the Crown constitutionally to get rid of the difficulty; by, instead of turning the river into the Lords or the Lords into the river, exercising its power of creating a number of peers, and sending into that House members who have no selfish interest, no borough-mongering interest, and who are able to vote disinterestedly, and therefore honestly. The Lords, therefore, need neither be sluiced by the river, nor thrown into the river, but may retain their existence to its full extent. I regret to hear that any influence has been exercised to induce the Crown to reject this advice. I do not think that they were very enviable persons who exercised such influence; but if a new ministry were to be formed in despite and contempt of this House, and if an anti-reforming ministry be appointed, it will be in contempt of this House and of the British people. I cannot conceive it possible to look without apprehension to the consequences, and without regret for the conduct of those who have brought the

country to such a state, from the supposition that the people of England will be satisfied without an ample measure of Reform. There never was a grosser delusion than to imagine that the people of England will suffer their Bill to be mutilated; and those who expect that what is called the good sense of the people will put down their desire for Reform, reason rashly and unwisely, and will find themselves greatly deceived by the event. It is said that these resolutions are unconstitutional in calling upon the King to require a pledge, and the precedent of 1807 is referred to, the most unfortunate precedent which the right hon. baronet could have selected. It would be too much to expect Tories to read history; but do they understand their own history? Do they understand their own acts? Do they understand their own tale? In 1807, the cry was raised of—"The Church in danger!" and "No Popery!" and the country was excited from one end to the other. The ministry went out and the Tories came in triumphantly. But did they put an end to the Catholic question? Did they put an end to agitation? Did they succeed in their objects? No. They gave the country twenty-five years of agitation, confusion, and disturbance; they absorbed the public attention from every other important subject, and they ended by being disgracefully beaten. That is the history of the short epitome of Toryism. They had to do with the patient people of Ireland. I repeat it, they had to do with the most patient people on the face of the earth. Even the sneering contempt with which a reference to their patience is heard, only proves to me that their forbearance endured not only injury and oppression, but base insult. They have done so, and they have succeeded, without violating one law or committing one crime; for I defy anyone to point out a single crime committed by anyone who has been active in asserting the rights of Ireland. I much doubt whether they would have so patient a people to deal with in England; and I do not believe they would find them by any means so patient in Scotland. Let the right hon. baronet, therefore, make the

utmost of his precedent of 1807. But is it so unconstitutional to require a pledge? Were no pledges required from ministers in 1807? Have there been no pledges against liberty since that time? Will the right hon. baronet tell me that administrations have not been looked for whose principles were known to be hostile to freedom? And will any man refuse to pledge himself to his own principles, unless, indeed, he intends to forsake them? That would be an admirable Tory distinction. But I entertain a firm conviction, that any man who would violate his principles would throw in the pledge too; he would not be the more bound by it. The objection certainly should never come from those who have broken their pledges to a party—who deluded their followers into one line of policy, and then adopted for themselves another. It does not appear to me that there would be anything unconstitutional whatever in the King's ascertaining the principles of the ministers, and calling upon them, before they held office, to become Reformers. The present ministry came into office as Reformers. On their coming into office, they pledged themselves distinctly to Reform, and by continuing such ministers in office, the King was himself pledged to Reform. I do not mean to say that the King has violated that pledge, for the King, of course, can do no wrong; but those irresponsible persons have much to answer for, through whose advice his Majesty is now placed in such a situation as to appear opposed to Reform. I am glad, sir, to find that his Majesty's ministers have acted as they have done. If they were endeavouring to create a good opportunity for retiring from office they could not have selected a better one than the present. The ministry have retired from office, but they have done so with their characters pure and unsullied, and they have done so with the public confidence in them undiminished. Soon, sir, I hope to see them returning again to power—to power which they have endeavoured to exercise for the good of the people, and which I hope they may be enabled to wield much more efficiently and effectually than they have yet

been able to do, for the permanent and full accomplishment of the desires, the wishes, and the just demands of a great and enlightened and a brave people.

Subject, MINISTERIAL PLAN OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND;

Date, MAY 21, 1832.

Mr. O'Connell deprecated every attempt to interfere with the religious education of Catholic children. Let Protestants educate their own children as they choose; all the Catholics asked was to be allowed the same privilege. The grossest oppression had been practised in compelling Catholic parents, under the penalty of starvation, to send their children to the Kildare-street schools, and against this system he had loudly protested. In the new system the Bible was not used as a class-book for four days in the week, and this was the only restriction imposed, as on Fridays and Saturdays Protestant children were to have the Scriptures, and if they did not then read them, it would be the fault of the Protestant instructors. A great deal of cant and hypocrisy had been bestowed on this subject out of that House, one-half of which must be attributed to the plans originating with a reforming ministry, a similar plan having been previously approved of, even by many of the clergy of the Established Church. Some persons rejoiced that the poor Irish peasant was exposed to the risk of excommunication; but he pitied the man who could rejoice at the idea of these miserable beings having only a choice of evils—either quarrelling with their priests, or suffering starvation by quarrelling with their landlords. He was extremely sorry to see the intelligent people of Scotland led astray upon this subject. They had a right to establish a system of education suitable to their own religious opinions, but that system was not necessarily suitable for Ireland. Indeed it was very unsuitable; and the Scotch had no right to force a system upon Ireland, at variance with their religion and habits. The Irish might be wrong, but

they sincerely believed that it was not advisable to allow children the unrestricted use of the Bible. They thought it introduced a familiarity inconsistent with the respect due to the sacred volume. Such were their opinions, and, whether they were correct or incorrect, they had a right to be consulted in the education of their children ; and he would put it to the hon. member for Scotland, whether they would allow the clergy of another creed to interfere with their clergymen, and prevent them teaching the children of Scotland according to their own creed and method.

Subject, REFORM BILL FOR IRELAND—SECOND READING ;
*Date, MAY 25, 1832.**

Mr. O'Connell said, upon such an occasion as the present, one of such deep importance to the country, and of such vital interest as affects the question of Reform, I cannot, indeed, but feel indebted to the gallant and hon. member for provoking me to meet him in the field of politics. Mighty and powerful a campaigner as he is, I do not fear to encounter him. I feel obliged to him for the challenge he has given me, and I feel, too, still more obliged for his having afforded me, by the violence of his opposition to Reform, an additional argument in its favour. I have gathered from the opposition of that member much useful matter, and one that he may be assured I shall avail myself of—*fas est ab hoste doceri.*

The lesson he has taught shall not be forgotten ; I trust I shall be able to make it a profitable one for Ireland. I should,

* At a meeting of the National Political Union, in January, 1832, O'Connell was strongly urged to oppose the English Reform Bill, because equal justice was not done to Ireland. But this, with his usual nobility of character, he refused to do, adding these memorable words : " I will ever assist those who are struggling for freedom, no matter what their creed, nation, or class may be, without reference to the effect on our own claims." In an address to the people of Ireland, same date, he said :—" I wish to do good to England, though she has done little good to Ireland."

indeed, be truly ungrateful, if I did not treasure with thankfulness the trust that he has given me, that the Union between this country and Ireland is solely dependent upon, and is solely connected by thirteen little rotten, paltry, and corrupt boroughs. For the insinuations respecting me, with which the gallant member has thought fit to interlard his discourse, I feel obliged to him, and I am truly indebted to him for the power which he has conferred upon, and which he has assured me I shall possess under the Bill which is now before the House. He has prophesied great things for me. Assuredly I should, at least, be not the first to doubt his powers of divination. Let us now, however, look at the argument put forward by the hon. and gallant member. Of the Protestantism of that gallant member no one could doubt, for he has himself assured us of its purity; and yet what does he say of his Protestantism, or what kind of religion does he seem to regard it? Why, he assures us that his Protestantism will be destroyed, that it will be for ever annihilated if you destroy thirteen rotten boroughs! The gallant member's Protestantism is not "built upon a rock," but upon thirteen rotten boroughs; and if this House will but allow the waves of Reform to "prevail against it" it will be swept away, and as completely obliterated as if its foundation were of sand, and not thirteen rotten boroughs! Boroughs, too, so rotten that they are sold as openly as beasts in the Smithfield market. Protestantism must, indeed, be a truly sagacious faith, if it depends for existence on thirteen rotten boroughs, each of which borough is dependent on pounds, shillings, and pence.

But, I deny, sir, the truth of the assertion; although not a Protestant, I utterly and totally deny that it has any connection with corruption, or that its creed would be bound up with the sale of a seat in Parliament. Such assertions are unworthy of the party even from whom they come; and such observations will, I am certain, be regarded as utterly unworthy of attention from this House. An address has been made to you this evening by the hon. and learned member for Dublin, the Recorder and "upright judge" of that city. That speech, I own, has

surprised me, for the hon. and learned member has exhibited himself in a new light—an actual and veritable convert to Reform! He has, indeed, spoken of the evils of Reform; he has descanted upon all the calamities of Reform; but, then, he began and concluded his harangue by assuring the House that he is himself a Reformer. I am sure he is a Reformer. I am certain, too, he would have continued a Reformer, and that he would have thought nothing could be more excellent than Reform, provided only that the last Government had continued three days more in office. In such a case, so convinced am I of the sincerity of the learned Recorder, that I am sure he would have pledged himself to support Reform, even though that support was in opposition to every vote on Reform which the hon. and learned member has hitherto given. I am aware that I have been called an enemy to the Established Church. I have been called so most unjustly; for, though I am a decided enemy to the imposition of tithes, as unjust and iniquitous; though I am an enemy to them, as I am to all other abuses, yet, sir, I deny that I am the enemy of the Established Church. I am opposed to all abuses; but I am not opposed to the conscientious tenets of any man or body of men, and I defy any hon. member of this House, or any man out of it, to point out one sentence which I have ever spoken inconsistent with a due respect and tenderness for the conscientious opinions and religious feelings of others. I have laboured to accomplish religious freedom for myself and my Roman Catholic countrymen. I did so because I considered it most unjust that one man should attempt to shackle the conscience of another, or punish him because he would not violate his religious feelings. I have ever shown myself willing and ready to concede to others the fullest extent of the same privileges which I claimed and insisted upon obtaining for myself—full and unrestricted freedom of opinion, and the undoubted and unalienable right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. I belong to a Church which has been in Ireland since Christianity was introduced there. It is a Church that has continued perfect in

all its gradations; it possesses a hierarchy as exalted as they are pure, and a priesthood whose apostolic life and conduct have rendered them beloved by the people, and esteemed by all those who differ from them in religion, and whose estimation is worth preserving. That Church has existed for centuries; it has gone through ages of persecution, but is still as perfect as when persecution commenced its terrors and its tortures. It has existed, too, without any legal provision for its support; it has been maintained by the affections, the piety, and the respect of the people; and I do trust, that never will that Church—the Church to which I belong—be degraded and disgraced by having a legal provision made for it. I never, sir, shall feel the slightest hesitation in avowing my opinions respecting tithes, respecting church-cess, and respecting vestry-rates. I am opposed to them, but I am not opposed to Protestantism, for I deny that tithes and church-rates constitute Protestantism. Though an enemy to abuses, I am not the enemy of the Protestant Church. I respect the opinions of every sect of Christians. My life has been passed in the presence of the public; my sentiments, whether they were popular or unpopular—whether they were likely to be displeasing or grateful to my auditors—I never concealed, I always spoke them out boldly and distinctly. I have now been for thirty years of my life before the public. I ever had an inimical Press watching me during that time, and I defy the hon. and learned member, I defy any other man, to point out, as has been too frequently and too flippantly asserted, even a newspaper report of any speech of mine, in which can be found one sentiment uttered by me, or even ascribed to me, that is inconsistent with the most perfect respect for the religious opinions of those differing in creed from myself. Much indeed has been spoken in this House to-night which, if it were spoken out of it, I should not be surprised to hear designated cant and hypocrisy, respecting the introduction of religion into politics. I do not know what connection religion can have with such a subject as this. Let me tell gentlemen that for twenty-five years the people of Ireland had been struggling for an equality

of rights, under the influence of various feelings, but, with the exception of Dr. Drumgoole, not a single person who had taken part in the public proceedings of the Catholic body had spoken in bigoted terms of the Protestant religion; and the language which that individual employed called forth a unanimous vote of censure. Not a second Catholic in Ireland could be found to echo the opinions of Dr. Drumgoole. Why, sir, do I mention such a circumstance? Because I wish to show that bigotry is not founded amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland; and because the peculiarity of this debate has led me into such a discussion. Because hon. gentlemen have been talking about religion when they should be thinking of politics. This, sir, however, is not the line of conduct which I am disposed to follow. In considering a question of this kind, in fixing my attention upon a measure of Reform, my eyes shall not be diverted either to one side or the other, nor shall I feel at all anxious whether I am upon this side to uphold Catholics, and upon that Protestants. In politics I disavow all such speculations, while I reserve for the temple of my God my religious feelings. To Him I trust my devotion is offered with sincerity, and I believe that it may not be the less acceptable because it is not tinged with a sectarian feeling when mixing in temporal matters. This, sir, is a subject which should never have been introduced here. It is one that I abandon with alacrity, and which, if it had been possible to avoid, I should not have touched upon. The right hon. the Secretary for Ireland had done me the honour of quoting a letter, written by me, respecting the Irish Reform Bill. He objects to that letter, because I consider it as calculated to promote an Orange ascendancy in Ireland, and that it was, therefore, most likely to receive the support of the Tories. I do not, sir, object to the right hon. gentleman quoting my letter; but I have the most decided objection to the manner in which he has thought fit for his own purposes to quote it. The right hon. gentleman was satisfied in quoting a sentence of my letter to suit his own purposes; if he wished to serve the ends of justice, he should have quoted more. It

should be recollected that, in that letter, I stated that I approved of the principle of the Bill, but that I objected to the details.

I ventured to prophesy, too, that the right hon. Secretary would be supported in those very details by the same persons who were opposed to the principle. The only objection, the only shadow of a reason, which they advanced against the principle of the Bill was, an objection to one of the details, namely, the enlargement of the franchise; therefore the hon. gentleman must see that the other details of the Bill would meet with no opposition. No; he might assure himself of the support of all the Tories. The right hon. Secretary knew very well, though he did not choose to state it to this House, that it was to the details of the Bill that my objections were directed. He knew, too, that in those he would be supported by the Tories. Such is the feeling, and such, too, the opinion of the learned Solicitor-General for Ireland; for he admits that the details of the Bill are *Conservative*—that is the fashionable term, the new-fangled phrase now used in polite society to designate the Tory ascendancy. That they are so is beyond dispute, for you have the high authority of the Irish Solicitor-General to assure you of the fact. Is it, then, with the details of such a Reform Bill that the Irish people would be satisfied? Are they to be satisfied with a Bill which will perpetuate among them the power of the ascendancy which has withered up their hopes and blighted their fairest prospects of peace and prosperity in their country? I tell the right hon. Solicitor-General that he is mistaken if he thinks his *Conservative* measure will satisfy the people of Ireland. They will expect what I, in their name, demanded—a Bill, the same in principle and every way as popular as the Reform Bill for England. With any other measure, they will not and ought not, to be satisfied; and as an humble individual, so far as I am concerned, with any other measure they shall not be satisfied. If they are to be united it can only be done by fair and equal dealing; and the only way to amalgamate the countries into one common interest is to

give each equal freedom and similar institutions. This is what I want; that the people of Ireland should now be amalgamated with the British Constitution for the first time since the British Government commenced its sway in Ireland. The right hon. Secretary for Ireland talked of our having a population of 7,000,000; it would be much more correct if he had said 8,000,000, for I happen to know that there never was anything more erroneous than the last census returns. In my own county alone there are twelve parishes not included; and in individual instances, the calculation is very different—many families are entirely omitted; my own, for instance, and I am thankful to Providence that it is not a small one; yet my family has been entirely omitted in the census returns; and I am sure it cannot be considered that we are not natives of Ireland. The Irish population, the right hon. gentleman states to be 7,000,000. I contend that it is at least 8,000,000. Out of this population the right hon. gentleman states, there are 52,000 persons entitled to votes.

Mr. Stanley interrupted O'Connell, who continued:

It is no matter; but he has said that 52,000 were entitled to votes; but is not that a very small number for a population of 8,000,000? This is an erroneous calculation, however. The £10 freeholders are stated at 22,000, whereas they don't amount to 5,000. Besides this (I am confident the right hon. gentleman has made the statement from want of information) it will be found that this enumeration is totally incorrect. Those entitled to vote in Ireland will, on examination, be found not to be half that number, and certainly do not exceed 25,000. The return includes all those who have been registered since 1790, and makes no allowance for all that have died in the interval. Thus it will appear, from strict examination of statistical documents, that out of a population of 8,000,000 there are not above 25,000 entitled to votes. And when I put forward this fact, and address myself to English Reformers, may I not justly ask, will such a state of things be permitted to con-

tinue? I call upon the Reformers of England—I call upon the men who have beaten down the oligarchy in this country—to say whether this is a measure, or this is a state of things that ought to satisfy the people of Ireland? I toast the memory of King William in association with liberty, and those who hail him and celebrate him as their deliverer from Popery and slavery. I ask those men who toast William III. and the Revolution of 1688, will they now shrink at the very prospect of liberty?

Oh! shame upon them if they do. Is it thus that they demonstrate their attachment to liberty and their recognition of its principles? I do not call those men Protestants; those men are not Protestants; they libel and disgrace the religion of which they profess themselves to be members. Those are not Protestants. I should be sorry to call those men Protestants, or at all confound them with the large body of respectable Protestants who, outside this House, are the friends and the advocates of rational liberty. I fearlessly ask, is this a measure that should or ought to satisfy the people of Ireland? The principle of the Bill is the same for the three countries. England has got her Reform, Scotland is to get her Reform, and am I to be told that this House will be called upon to decide by a majority whether or not Ireland is to have a Reform? I ask the question again, because I feel it is one that ought to be answered. Is Ireland to have no Reform? Is this the proposition of the hon. and learned Recorder of Dublin? Is that the proposition of the noble lord who seconded the amendment of the hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin?

The noble lord has talked of Sangrado and of bleeding. I am sorry that the noble lord, of all others, has talked of bleeding; the surviving friends of many a mangled victim would scream when they heard the name of the noble lord mentioned in conjunction with bleeding. The learned members for the University and city of Dublin, and the party by whom they are backed, will give Ireland no Reform, because they say it will throw all the power of the country into the democratical party—it will increase the influence of those who are disturbing

the country, and will strengthen the hands of him whom the gallant member for Donegal has been pleased to call the hon. agitator. I will just thank those gentlemen to look a little at the other side of the question. The best mode of putting an end to discontent is, to do justice to the people. If I know anything upon any subject it is agitation. I, therefore, am admitted to know something of agitation and I have always found that there never was any real agitation unless when a real grievance existed. I do not speak of the puff and wind of agitation, such as have been raised upon the subject of Irish education, and which will produce no more effect than the wind whistling round the walls of an old house. I speak of real agitation, and I say that I never knew real agitation to exist unless when there co-existed, as its cause and essence, a substantial grievance. Let them give me time and place, and I defy them to point out a single instance where a substantial agitation ever existed without a real grievance. Don't grant us Reform, and then we shall have agitation in abundance. The ministers talk of all they have given up, and the Tories talk of all they have lost. It is the peculiar good fortune of the Whig government in Ireland that they are more disposed to favour their enemies than their friends. I will take, for instance, the ten northern counties. There they have only appointed nine Clerks of the Peace, who are Orangemen. Indeed, I will do them the justice to say, that in one county out of the ten, in the county which the gallant colonel represents (the county of Donegal), they have appointed a Catholic. There is the county of Tyrone, in which both members are opposed to his Majesty's Government, and yet, as I can understand, in that county, upon the recommendations of those members, they have appointed as Clerk of the Peace the principal Orangeman in the county. Who have the Government appointed to the high office of Attorney-General; one of the highest appointments in the country? They have appointed one of those who have always been opposed to the King's Government, I mean to the Reforming Government.

What did they do for the late Solicitor-General for Ireland, a man always opposed to them? Why, they gave him a high judicial situation. But I turn back to the Reform Bill, and I ask, will you give us this additional ground of agitation? I ask the reformers in this House do they so soon forget the services of Ireland? Do they forget that in 1831 it was the Irish members that carried the second reading of the English Reform Bill?

There was a majority of English members against it; there was a majority of Scotch members against it; there was a majority of Irish members in favour of it. Do you forget this? Do you forget, too, that we have left our business, our occupations, and the study of our health, to attend here, day after day, and night after night, to watch over every addition to English liberty and Scotch freedom—and do you forget this? Night after night we have been at our stations in this House, giving our most unqualified support to the English Reform Bill, not taking advantage of circumstances to dictate terms for ourselves, but generously and perseveringly giving our untiring and effectual support to every addition to the liberty of England. Do you forget this? Furthermore, when the crisis came, and when the great question arose between the Duke of Wellington and the people of England, what was the conduct of the Irish members? We, thought, indeed, for a moment of our own grievances; but we then threw ourselves manfully into the breach, and generously united heart and hand with the English people, and by our votes in this House, we mainly contributed to the restoration of a Government supported by the people, and by that restoration, to the ultimate passing of the English Reform Bill. We have done all this, and, after having so acted, will you, English Reformers, send us back to our countrymen to tell them that, after all the services we have rendered you, an English House of Commons has refused to grant to Ireland the paltry boon of a miserable, jejune, narrow, and niggardly Reform Bill? I do not want to be supposed as using a threat to this House; but this I say, that if you refuse a Reform Bill

to Ireland, you will have a Parliament in Dublin before six months. You hear this declaration in silence; but never mind—I prophesied before, and I was not mistaken. There is just as little danger now but that my predictions will be verified. If this House refuse Reform, I will appeal to the people of England; I will appeal to their generosity, to their good sense, to their spirit of fairness, and I shall be sure of obtaining Reform.

From the time of Henry II. to the present hour, it has been the constant solicitation of the Irish people to be embodied in the British Constitution. Successive attempts were made to accomplish this object, and through mistaken motives they were continually refused and disappointed. It was attempted in the reign of that paltry bigot, Edward VI. Successive monarchs were applied to, who refused the application. It was attempted reign after reign, and always with the same success, for we always met with the same refusal. From that period religious persecution commenced, and the starless night of a nation's desolation followed. We survived that persecution, unbroken in heart and in energy; undiminished in faith and in fortitude, we emerged from that persecution more numerous and more powerful than when we entered it. We struggled on through the gloom of our bondage; we achieved our religious equality; but during the progress of that struggle, we always declared openly and above board, that we had ^{no} ulterior objects.

We never disguised our intentions. I always avowed myself to be an agitator with ulterior objects. The only object of our religious equality was, that we expected it would lead to our political equality. You have admitted us within the pale of the Constitution; we ask from you, and demand, without which we never shall be satisfied, a full and entire participation in the rights and privileges of that Constitution. What we ask, and what we have a right to ask, is full political equality.

You have admitted the principle of Reform, by passing the

English Reform Bill; surely you cannot refuse to admit the principle, by rejecting the Irish Reform Bill. I listened attentively to the speech in which my hon. and learned friend, the member for the University of Dublin, introduced his amendment. Indeed, as respects the speech of the noble lord who seconded the amendment, much was not to be expected from him. I did not much mind the rabid argument of the noble lord, because he is a young man of very little experience, and little skilled in debate. I pass by the discursive and animated speech of the noble viscount, but I must not avoid adverting to the chivalrous and very curious address which has been made to the House by the evangelical Recorder of the city of Dublin. This most strong specimen of the reforming genius, with eyes of habitual upliftedness, had assured us that he was a Reformer. He is certainly an excellent Reformer, and he acts well upon his theories. He is so firmly persuaded of the necessity of Reform, that he has made up his mind to vote against it. The excellent member is so well convinced of Reform, and so thoroughly a Reformer, that he does not act upon his own theory. The pious Recorder, with that elevation of his eyes, and that peculiar gesture, which befits his peculiar piety, has assured the House that he belongs to no party. I would beg respectfully to ask, is there no Orange Corporation in Dublin? Has there been no election lately in Dublin? Was there a certain pious judge a candidate? Were there no placards posted about the city, crying—"On Priests—on Purgatory—on Poverty—Shaw and Ingestrie for ever?" Might it not happen that the judge who stood as candidate to-day would be called upon to try the man that voted against him the next day, or to decide a question between those who voted against him and those who voted for him. I will not say but that his decision would be as they always have been: but I must say, that, being a bit of a Papist, I should not repose much faith in such a decision. I do not wish, however, to be understood as casting any imputation upon the judicial character of the hon. and learned gentleman. Has the learned Recorder heard nothing of the Corporation

of Dublin—a little wretched knot of a remnant of that faction that have so long cursed Ireland. The other day, when they heard that the Duke of Wellington had returned to power, in a fit of exultation they shipped the state coach to London. If, however, that elegant toy escapes the dangers of the journey, I am sorry to declare my apprehension that it will have to return to Dublin without having performed any of the functions that befit a Corporation state coach.

To be sure it would be delightful to see the Recorder driving up in the city state coach to read the dutiful address of the ancient, loyal, and Protestant Corporation of Dublin to the King, on the appointment of a Tory Administration. Indeed, I heartily pity him that he has been disappointed of a jaunt in the state coach.

With reference to the danger to arise from extending the popular franchise of the Bill, I beg to remind the House that the 40s. freeholders have been destroyed. What a great deduction that has been from the popular power in Ireland. The right hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that, in Ireland, the qualification is half as high again as it ought to be, when we consider the difference between the countries. He proposes to give us the £20 chattel franchise at a lease of sixty years. The number of freeholders, as returned by the right hon. Secretary, is much above the real number. The chattel franchise of £20, with a lease of sixty years, I have reason to know is an illusion. I know much of Ireland. I know something of Ulster; I am well acquainted with Connaught; I am completely conversant with Leinster; and I have a perfect acquaintance with Munster, for three counties of which I have been returned. I have also had great experience as a professional man, and have been consulted by a particular class, the mercantile men of Ireland, respecting their purchases of estates; and from my knowledge of the tenure by which land is held in Ireland, I am convinced that this £20 franchise in chattel interest will be illusory.

The *Evening Mail*, in the report of the Tithe Committee

which it has published, states that there are 700,000 acres of bishops' lands in Ireland.

There are about 12,000,000 of arable acres, so that, including other lands, there may be one half of the arable surface of the country in the hands of the Church. The College has also a large territory. In the county which I represent, there is at least one-seventh in the hands of Trinity College. All these lands are let at no longer leases than twenty-one years, so that the chattel interest of £20, with a lease of sixty years, is an illusion, for no such tenure will be found in more than one-half of the country. This Bill gives us also the names of the £10 franchise, which is essentially different in England and Ireland. The tenures are different, for in Ireland we never talk of a freehold in fee. The tenants in Ireland and England are placed in a position essentially different; and the £10 franchise, which may be good for England, will be much too high for Ireland, and instead of being an instrument of Reform, will, in many instances, be the instrument of corruption. The dangers of an enlarged constituency are much overrated. Now, I ask, what is all this foam and fury about? After the Reform Bill passes, if it be let pass, what great alteration will it effect in these boroughs? Let us first see in the nomination boroughs what constituency will it give: Cashel, for example, will have 193 votes; Bandon, 233; Coleraine, 184; Dungarvan, 200; Kinsale, 220; Portarlinton, 180; Tralee, 246.

Thus there will be 180 to give votes in Portarlinton. Now, I can see very little difference between the present condition and this. Hon. members' at the other side of the question affect the greatest alarm at the destruction of these boroughs. There is Dungarvan, which has at present 640 electors—these will be reduced by the Bill to 200, whose votes will be in the hands of the Duke of Devonshire—and this, forsooth, is a popular measure of Reform! There is another ground of complaint to which I will advert—namely, the registry of votes. In England no man is called upon to show his title unless by previous notice; in Ireland a scrutinizing assistant-barrister

examines it without any process being served on the man who comes to vote, calling for the produce of every deed. The barrister may put inquisitorial questions to the voter, and through vexatious litigation shake his independence. In Ireland 2s. 6d. is the sum paid for registry—in England it is 1s. Is this equality? Is this union? Can this conduce to a continuance of the connection between the two countries? Above all, is it calculated to support Protestantism in Ireland? Though I find so much to censure in the Bill before the House, still I shall support it for the good it will effect. I will support it, because it will strike down the Corporation of Dublin—that body despicable in their bankrupt circumstances, and disgusting for their corruption. I will support it, because it will open the borough of Belfast, and give the country the benefit of the commercial intelligence of that enlightened and flourishing town, whose representative has hitherto been appointed by a noble marquis (Donegal), like his groom or his footman; although I must acknowledge that this power has been wholesomely exercised in behalf of Reform. It will be delightful, however, to see that great commercial town thrown open; it will be delightful to see the strong Presbyterian good sense which prevails there, fairly represented. Many boroughs though thrown open will, in effect, remain still nomination boroughs—as Enniskillen; and I say, most unaffectedly, God forbid that that should not. The noble lord, who at present influences it, resides in its neighbourhood, spends his fine fortune in his own country, and exercises a liberal hospitality which will always deservedly give him influence there. Such men will always exercise all the influence property can give them. The Bill may cast out a few speculators—may disappoint a set of men who slander their neighbours—and who, not satisfied with cultivating their own religion, have a ferocious species of charity for ameliorating the religion of others; but it will be the first voluntary attempt, for 700 years, to combine the people of England and Ireland—the first act of real justice which will not have been dealt out, as Emancipation was, in a spirit so

paltry, so miserable, as to desire that it should be accompanied by the outlawry of an individual so humble as even myself.

The moment, I tell the House, has arrived for conciliating the people, and binding them to you by the links of that brotherhood for which they are as anxious as yourself. It is a period most auspicious to the perfect and perpetual reconciliation of Irishmen and Englishmen. You have done us wrong—the hour is now come, when you may, with grace, make the reparation. I appeal to the generosity as well as to the manly feelings and good sense of Englishmen. England is free—Scotland is free; and with all the fervency of my heart, I implore you that Ireland also may be free.

Subject, MINISTERIAL PLAN OF EDUCATION, IRELAND; Date, MAY 31, 1832.

There was certainly nothing in O'Connell's speech to call forth personalities, but Mr. Gordon, who seemed utterly unable to control his tongue or temper, accused O'Connell of "bringing into the House the vulgarity of a pauper and the insolence of a demagogue." He was called to order by the Speaker, but took care to say he only apologized to the House.

Mr. O'Connell was sure that his hon. and gallant friend, the member for Clare, being a resident landlord, a magistrate, and a grand jurymen of that county, must be better acquainted with the causes of the disturbances which took place there than any other gentleman, Englishman or Scotchman, in that House. The hon. gentleman who so flatly contradicted his hon. and gallant friend was much out in his chronology; the hon. member had attempted to show that persecution was not the cause of disturbances in 1829, because in 1825 there was no persecution, and the people were compelled to receive a scriptural "iddication." His hon. and gallant friend had pledged his high character to the statement he had made as to the origin of the disturbances in Clare. And most truly had he stated, that they proceeded

from the cruel persecutions of the bigots of that county, seeking to force Catholic children into the hands of Protestant teachers. A magistrate of that county had been publicly convicted at sessions of breaking into a house where the Catholic priest was administering the Sacrament to a dying Christian, for the purpose of disturbing him in the exercise of his sacred functions.

Subject, STATE OF IRELAND; Date, MAY 31, 1832.

Mr. O'Connell said, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, instead of supporting the motion, appears to me to have opposed it. He talked of the distinction of Catholic and Protestant being put an end to. He expressed a wonderful anxiety to terminate all sectarian distinction in Ireland, and in the very same breath he did all in his power to be its most effectual and successful promoter. I ask any one who has heard the speech of the hon. and gallant member, whether he has or has not most happily illustrated that kind of oblivion of religious differences which he inculcates. The hon. and gallant member expressed his dislike to anything like the distinction between Catholics and Protestants, and in the very same breath he showed how much his practice differs from his theory, for whilst he expressed a dislike to religious dissensions, he accompanies that expression with an attack upon an eminent and distinguished prelate of the Catholic Church. We have, however, got one declaration from the gallant member, that there is nothing of Catholic or Protestant in the disturbances at present going on in Ireland. I wish, before I go further upon the subject of the present motion, to know whether there is any truth in the rumour, that Government have agreed to give their support to the motion of the right hon. baronet, on condition that there shall be no inquiry into the causes that have produced these disturbances.

It has also reached me, somewhat indirectly, that this motion

is nothing more or less than a pretext for the renewal of the Insurrection Act. I hope the Government won't deceive us on this point. Let them for once be candid and tell us what they mean. I don't speak from authority, but certainly the rumour has reached me that Government have consented to the committee upon condition that there shall be no inquiry into the causes of the disturbances. It is certainly of importance that, if there be no truth in this rumour, it should be denied. I hope there will be no delusion on the subject. There has been enough of delusion practised towards Ireland, and let the Government at once be candid, and tell us what they mean. Is this motion an application for the Insurrection Act? I certainly look upon it in no other light. The speech of the right hon. baronet who introduced the motion has been a speech for the Insurrection Act. The motion itself appears to me to be a motion for the Insurrection Act, and it is, therefore, of the utmost consequence that we should know what are the exact intentions of the Government upon this subject. I again say, that I trust there will be no delusion. Let them speak out plainly, and tell us what they mean. Has not the hon. baronet spoken of the danger of bringing his family into the country unless the law was additionally strengthened. The right hon. baronet, to be sure, is ready to go there and stand the battle, but he says, that he could not venture to bring his family into the country, unless under the protection of the Insurrection Act.

Here O'Connell was interrupted by Sir Charles Coote, who said he was afraid to take his family to Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell—I will wish to ask, what else can the hon. baronet mean by a strong measure but the Insurrection Act? Does he mean to say that there can be any determinate measure between the laws which exist and the Insurrection Act? I wish to ask, is it possible, when hon. gentlemen talk of strengthening the existing law, that they can mean anything else but the Insurrection Act? I would wish to be more

fully informed upon this point, for it does not appear to me that there can be any medium between the law as it exists at present and the Insurrection Act? Is there not the Whiteboy Act, every step of which has been trod in blood? Is there anywhere a code of more sanguinary severity? It makes almost every act capital felony, and it is a code by whose sanguinary genius thousands of victims have been immolated. Under this code, assaulting a dwelling-house is made capital felony. To raise the hand is an assault, if the intent be proved; and thus to raise the hand against a dwelling-house, even though that house be empty, is a felony, punishable by death.

Never was there a more sanguinary and terrible law; its very letter is trodden in blood and desolation. I admit that many of these laws have been much mitigated with respect to offences committed by day, and the beneficial effects of that mitigation have been practically felt in the restored tranquillity of a part of the country which was before the scene of great outrage and disturbance. Believe me, that it is not severity and strong laws that always best succeed. The peace of a county or a country is as often restored by justness and vigour in the execution of laws that do not shock the Constitution, as by resorting to measures of extreme severity and unconstitutional rigour. I have heard much talk about a strong measure. I should like to ask what is meant by a strong measure? The right hon. baronet who instituted this motion, and the right hon. baronet who seconded it, have not pointed out any intermediate measure between the existing law and the Insurrection Act; and what is the Insurrection Act? I say this, and I say it emphatically, that if the peace of Ireland cannot be preserved without the Insurrection Act, that the connection between the two countries is not worth preserving for one single hour. I repeat, that is my conviction. What is the Insurrection Act? It abrogates all constitutional authority. It goes to supersede the judges of the courts. It takes away the power and protection of juries! It destroys the prisoner's right of challenge,

and places in the hands of a few individuals and one or two king's counsel, the rights and liberties and life of every individual man in the entire community. Is this the law that is now sought for? I ask any man in this House, who has ever witnessed the effects of that measure, to say whether, with a heart in his bosom, he could wish for its recurrence? I ask any man who has ever seen the operation of that law in Ireland, to ask his own conscience whether he can consent that it shall be again wielded against the unfortunate people of Ireland? Oh! how often have I watched and traced its progress in oppression, and bloodshed, and immorality, and tyranny, and oppression. Oh! how many an act of immorality has it not produced.

Many a blooming, chaste, and innocent sister has been seduced to the commission of immorality to bribe some village despot or some neighbouring magistrate, that a brother or a father may be kept at home. Oh! how many a farm has been given up, and how many a home left desolate to bribe some heartless landlord, that a father or a brother may not be transported under the operation of this law. How many a claim of right has been surrendered, and how many a litigation given up, to bribe a landlord to make interest or to exert his own power as a magistrate in favour of some unfortunate relative falsely, perhaps, accused under this Act. Have we not often (and the instances are on record) heard of the policeman hiding gunpowder in the thatch of the house and sending another policeman to find it? And have not there been instances where a man has been induced by the servant of a magistrate to walk out of his house after sunset, and when he had proceeded a little from his own house, overtaken by the police purposely sent to watch him, then taken before the magisterial tribunal and transported.

I have witnessed the horrors of that unconstitutional law, and I say that the social state is not worth preserving under the Insurrection Act. It is better, that it be dissolved at once. It would be better for Ireland to be annihilated than cursed again

with the operation of that horrible and unconstitutional enactment. The Insurrection Act marks the end of all civil government. Every species of abuse, and tyranny, and oppression, are perpetrated under its guise. Oh! let me entreat of the Government to abandon all idea of the Insurrection Act. Let them abandon the government of Ireland altogether, or make up their minds to govern it according to the principles of the British Constitution. What then is the pretext for this committee? What will be the result of its labour? I am anxious for information upon these points. Either this committee is a pretext for the Insurrection Act or it is not. If it be not, I cannot conceive what object it can possibly have. Talk, indeed, of an inquiry into the state of the country. Don't you know what that state of the country is? Does not everyone know what the state is? If you want a record of the crimes or a chronicle of the offences, all you have to do is to look at the newspapers and you will find it. Do you want to know what the state of the law is? Go to the Four Courts of Dublin, or even without going to the Four Courts of Dublin, you may acquire that information. What, then, do you want? I say the Insurrection Act. I can see no other object in the proceedings of such a committee. It is little wonderful that crime should be committed in Ireland, where so little attention is paid to the condition of the people. Somebody or other is eternally engaged either in transporting or convicting them. The upper classes have no sympathy with the people, and those who ought to be their natural and legitimate protectors are, in many instances, their most cruel and tyrannical oppressors. What can be expected when the people are driven out upon the roads, or into the bogs to starve? I have heard a great deal of the disturbances that have taken place in the Queen's County, and I think it was in that county that one single proprietor turned off his estates and out of their holdings, 800 human beings, who were thus driven into the dykes and ditches to perish or starve. Can anyone wonder that such excesses as these should prove the fruitful parent of crime? Can anyone wonder that disturbance should exist where outrages of

this nature are perpetrated on the people? I have heard of another part of the country—and it is a fact which admits of proof—that an entire village was destroyed, and the inhabitants turned out upon the charity of the winds of the world, because a report had accidentally reached the landlord that a school belonging to the Kildare-street Society had been pulled down. It is oppressions of this kind, perpetrated against the people, that produce disturbances of this nature. This is what in Ireland is technically called clearing the land; but I ask, do we ever hear of outrages or disturbances throughout whole districts, unless where they are directly produced by this clearing of the land, or by some such oppressions of the people? There is another great source of oppression, the high rent at which land is let out to the people for that food upon which alone the unfortunate wretches subsist. Now, I believe the disturbances in one part of the country, which was greatly disturbed, were directly to be traced to the high price of the con-acre, which was £10. How can there be anything but distress, and discontent, and disturbance, when the con-acre is set for £10? These disturbances have nothing at all to do with religion; they have nothing to do with tithes; on the contrary, the resistance to tithes is from a class perfectly and essentially different from others. It happens that Mr. Lalor, of Tenekil, who was the first to resist the payment of tithes in this country, had his house and property attacked by those people. These disturbances entirely originate in what is called the clearing of the land; and it is only where they have been oppressed that the people have at any time attempted resistance. The disturbances of Ireland have a palpable and evident cause. They are produced by the total alienation and estrangement of the upper from the lower classes of society, by the accumulations of want in the country, and the continual export of its produce, without any return. The people are neglected, impoverished, and oppressed. Can it be wondered at, then, that they should be discontented; and that under the pressure of evils that press upon them, they should occasionally break out into discontent?

The great evil of Ireland is the accumulation of rent in the country, which is spent out of it. I ask, is not the annual drainage of seven millions out of the country fully sufficient to paralyse and wither the arm of industry? It is astonishing how the country can subsist under such a continual drainage of its resources. Ireland, indeed, may be said to be in the situation of a strong man who has a vein in his arm opened, from which the blood is constantly flowing, and which is a source of progressive and increasing weakness. These disturbances are some of the throes which in the man precede death; but which, in Ireland, precede destruction, unless some means be taken to rescue the country from its present position by measures very different, indeed, from the inquiry of a committee, or the extension of an Insurrection Act. Such disturbances have often before occurred, and the existing laws have been found strong enough to put them down. All the experience we have had sufficiently convinces us that the existing laws are strong enough to quiet the country and put down all disturbance. Take any county that is disturbed; the assizes comes on—convictions are made—the state of the country may require that this assizes should be followed by a commission. After this, perhaps, a few may be found bold and daring enough to commit crime; but after a time they relax, and in all instances, at the utmost, a second commission has been found perfectly sufficient to restore tranquillity to a county. The Insurrection Act, so far from putting down crime, is itself the parent of crime. It has never been found effectual in repressing crime; but, on the contrary, has led to its additional commission. I have considerable acquaintance with those who conduct crown prosecutions in Ireland, and I believe a majority of these gentlemen will concur with me in these opinions.

I believe also that there is at present in this town a gentleman of great experience, who has been many years engaged in conducting crown prosecutions, and I believe his experience would bear me out in the fact, that all the murders of magistrates which have taken place in the counties of Clare and

Limerick, have been murders of those who were active under the Insurrection Act. This was always seen to produce dissatisfaction, and those who have suffered by this kind of severity have been ultimately the magistrates themselves. The Insurrection Act, instead of having a tendency to check crime, has always a contrary tendency, and has uniformly been found inefficacious to repress disturbance. What, then, can be the object of the present inquiry? If we want to get a detail of the crimes that have been committed, we have only to look for their chronicle in the newspapers. If we want to ascertain the state of the law, we shall find it elsewhere, and I therefore should be glad to ask, what good can possibly result from this inquiry, or what possibly can it add to our information, unless the hearing of a tale which we have heard more than a hundred times told? I hope that the Government will treat us with candour, and let us know fairly whether they intend to give us the Insurrection Act, or whether they have any understanding with the right hon. gentleman that this motion should lead to the Insurrection Act. I wish to know whether this motion is not supported from some secret desire on the part of those who wish for the Insurrection Act. The right hon. baronet has talked of the security of his family. I can assure the right hon. baronet that no person can be more anxious than I am that his highly respectable family should have all the security and protection possible; but he mistakes if he thinks that protection can or will be derived from the Insurrection Act. Surely he cannot think it. No one would more regret to keep that hon. baronet or his family out of the country than I should; but would he prefer to return there as a soldier, bearing the Insurrection Act alone with him, rather than as a friend, the capacity and character in which he has hitherto visited the people? What was there in a committee to state facts, or produce facts of a different complexion from those which have already existed? If this committee sit, what will be the result of its labours? They may summon witnesses, but what then? Why this; they get one magistrate to give them a chronicle of

offences such as exactly may be found in the newspapers for the last six months; another magistrate will be ready to indulge some speculation as to the causes of the offences; and a third will be ready to ascribe them all to the interference of Dr. Doyle and the Catholic clergy. This will be the full amount of the labours of the committee, and this will be their result. I call upon the King's Government to disconnect themselves from this proceeding. Let them take the preservation of the peace of the country into their own hands. Let them go on with their special commissions and succeed, as they have already done, in restoring peace and tranquillity to the disturbed districts by the firm assertion of the existing ordinary law. I am sorry that, in the course of the observations which an hon. and gallant member had made to this House, the trials of the county of Kilkenny have been alluded to. I was there, and have a right to have some knowledge on the subject, and I must say that never was any county more slandered than this county by the King's officers. In regard to the acquittal that took place, no conscientious jury would have come to a different conclusion; and, in my mind, there never was a more upright or conscientious verdict. Now, so far from the law having been found inefficacious, in many instances at those assizes several convictions took place for Whiteboy offences, and for crimes connected with the combination of the Blackfeet and the Whitefeet. With respect to the jury that tried Kennedy, five of that jury were nominated by the Crown after all the prisoner's challenges had been exhausted. It is quite impossible that any honest or conscientious jury would have found a different verdict. I entreat the Government not to resort to the dangerous experiment of the Insurrection Act. It is unwise and imprudent. It is teaching a bad lesson to the people; when you show them an example of a disregard of all decency and respect for the Constitution, and reckless prostration of all the safeguards which British law has set up for the protection of the subject, you must expect that they will improve upon the lesson you teach them. I sit down in the confident hope, that her Majesty's

Government will disavow all those intentions that rumour imputes to them; that they will be frank and candid, and that, above all, they will disavow any intention of again subjecting Ireland to the terrors of the Insurrection Act. If they do, the committee goes for nothing.

Subject, REFORM BILL FOR IRELAND COMMITTEE;

Date, JUNE 13, 1832.

Mr. O'Connell said, he rose to take the sense of the House upon the motion which he then felt it his duty to make. He wanted to re-establish the 40s. franchise in fee, and he intended to move, that such individuals residing in counties possessed of a fee-simple estate of the value of 40s. should be entitled to vote. The Reformers of England would have to decide this important question; the Reformers of Scotland would have to decide upon it, and a few hours would determine whether or not they were sincere in their professions. He claimed this for Ireland as a matter of right and justice. He could not see what possible motive could induce them to refuse, unless, indeed, they were determined to treat the Irish with contemptuous indifference; or to exhibit a hostile disposition to the just demands of his country, instead of meeting them with a fair and conciliatory spirit. The people of England retained this franchise, and why, he would ask, had not the people of Ireland the same right to it? Would the ministers dare to treat England in this way?—and if the English people would not permit them to do so, did they suppose that the people of Ireland would suffer such treatment with impunity? The Bill which was proposed to reform the representation of Ireland was founded upon a wrong basis, and had certainly been framed with no friendly feeling towards that portion of the British empire. What he understood by Reform was, the removal of abuses, whether existing under a base oligarchical system, or arising from any other cause in the representative system. Such at

least, would be the principle of the English Bill. But far different would be the effect of that measure in Ireland (he was referring solely to the county constituency); they proceeded on the foundation of the franchise as it was, without taking the trouble to inquire whether that franchise was a proper one or not. - He demanded a Reform Bill for Ireland upon the same basis as the constituency which existed in 1829. He merely required the restoration of that franchise by which the 40s. freeholders in fee had been unjustly deprived in 1829. He knew no possible pretence that could justify this act of spoliation; still less could he discover any reasonable ground upon which his demand could be refused; for it ought to be recollected that the Administration of the Duke of Wellington (no Reformer) merely voted for that Bill to make another measure palatable, but which they did not hesitate to call a bad Bill. Thus, in order to carry the question of Emancipation the English Reformers voted for this measure. Instead of increasing the freedom of election, the Reform Bill for Ireland would have a directly contrary effect.

If the object of its framers (he did not mean to say that it was so), but if their object was to throw the representation of Ireland into the hands of absentee proprietors, this Bill could not have been framed in any way better calculated to effect that purpose. His Majesty's Government refused to give the Irish, except in one solitary instance, and just where it could be of no possible use, a chattel franchise of £10, and this concession was made, not from any conviction of its utility upon the mind of the right hon. Secretary, but upon the recommendation of a noble lord, the representative of a northern county. He could not be charged with impeding his Majesty's Government, for he had refrained from pressing the grievances of Ireland upon them until the English Reform Bill had become the law of the land; and even then he did not complain until he went, as the delegate from a most respectable body of gentlemen, to the noble lord's Opposition, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the noble member for Devonshire, and also

to the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for Ireland. If he went alone, he felt that he might not be entitled to more than ordinary courtesy; but he was accompanied on that occasion by the venerable and estimable gentleman, Sir John Newport, whose opinion, at least, ought to have some weight. He did not wait upon these personages, not indeed, with "bated breath and suppliant knee," but with the upright and bold port of men demanding justice; for the purpose of remonstrating with them, and pointing out the injustice of this measure. He thought he made an impression on two of the noble personages. If he knew anything of human nature, he was quite sure he produced an impression upon the mind of one of them. But there was one right hon. gentleman upon whom his reasoning had, he knew, little influence; a gentleman, who, from the very outset of his career, had, in all his acts, distinguished himself as the enemy of the liberties of Ireland. He now solemnly warned that right hon. gentleman to adopt some far different course with regard to Ireland. His contemptuous conduct would no longer be tamely borne; if he persevered in such a course, he would produce strife and bloodshed in the country, which must end in separation. He called upon the right hon. gentleman to review his conduct since he became officially connected with Ireland. His first act was the celebrated circular letter to the Magistracy of Ireland. He next re-organized a body which were nearly defunct when he came into office; a measure which brought out Captain Graham and his yeomanry to butcher the people, and he afterwards dismissed this very same Captain Graham for so doing.

"Let the right hon. gentleman go on in this course," said Mr. O'Connell, "and I tell him that the insurrection against tithes in Ireland will be swelled into a formidable and bloody rebellion which he may not find it so easy to put down."

He (Mr. O'Connell) was convinced of the value of the connection between the two countries, and so long as he lived, he should use all his influence to preserve it. He could not, however, say how long it might be in his power to do so

Indeed, it required all the influence of persons in whom the Irish people placed confidence to prevent its being severed at this moment. He could, however, tell the right hon. gentleman, that the concession he now recommended was the only method left to England of preserving her connection with Ireland. It had been invariably stated that the number of £10 freeholders in Ireland was 20,000. It was little more than 19,000; there would not be 28,000 voters. He was quite sure that there would not be 30,000 for a population of 7,500,000. This fact he would prove at some future stage of this Bill. He was prepared to do so then, and to go fully into the details; satisfied with this point alone to try the feelings of English Reformers towards his country, and he would ask, even amidst the declamation of granting equal justice, was there equal justice between the two countries? It was known that, until the reign of Henry VI., everybody had a right to vote. From that time to the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill, the 40s. franchise had existed, of which Ireland had been deprived at that time. He could not but contrast the conduct of the noble and distinguished individuals constituting his Majesty's Government at present with what it was when the disfranchisement of the 40s. freeholders of Ireland was discussed. The late lamented member for Liverpool (Mr. Huskisson) was followed in his opposition to the measure by the noble lord (not now in his place) the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The right hon. gentleman, the President of the Board of Control, delivered a most admirable speech in favour of their rights, though he afterwards, certainly, voted for their disfranchisement, and in short, the 40s. freeholders were then supported, even in the abuses which were asserted to arise from their franchise, by every influential man in the present Government, including the illustrious individual, the present Lord High Chancellor of England.

In 1829, it was alleged as a ground for the disfranchisement of the 40s. freeholders, that they had left and abandoned the legitimate influence of their landlords, and yielded them-

selves to the influence of their priests. He denied the insinuation, and hesitated not to say, that the priests were then as now under the control of the popular opinions and sentiments of the great majority of the population of the country. In proof of this he would mention the case of a Catholic clergyman, at his election for the county of Clare. The Reverend Mr. Coffey marched into the town of Ennis, at the head of a body of freeholders, which he was bringing up for the purpose of voting for Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, a most estimable gentleman, whom the 40s. freeholders turned out of Clare for joining the Administration of the Duke of Wellington. The moment the freeholders arrived in the town, they took off their hats, gave a hearty cheer, bowed to the Reverend Mr. Coffey, and walked off, leaving the reverend gentleman standing alone. The alleged influence of the priests was made one ground of a petition against the returns of no less than five counties in Ireland—namely, Westmeath, Dublin, Galway, Waterford, and Clare, the last against his (Mr. O'Connell's) return. But in three cases the counsel for the petitioners had abandoned that branch of their case; and in two instances evidence in support of the allegation was gone into; and when it was proposed, on behalf of the parties petitioned against, to proceed to rebut that evidence, in both cases the committee unanimously stopped the counsel, stating that they were satisfied that the allegation was untenable. Thus, he showed, when opportunities afforded of proving that the priests possessed that influence which was alleged (and then believed to exist) the charge was either abandoned or totally failed in proof. The committee, however, decided, by the fact of their going into evidence upon the point, that the interference of priests was a ground upon which an election might be invalidated.

After these facts, it would be a work of supererogation on his part to use any further arguments to show the absurdity of this objection. He only mentioned these things to show how little the real state of Ireland was understood in that House.

He was, however, willing to admit that the people were under the influence of agitators, as they were called. He himself, as everybody knew, had the honour to belong to this class; but these agitators were but the mouthpieces of the people, and they only possessed influence so long as they expressed their wishes and their feelings. To return, however, to the Disfranchisement Bill of 1829, he must remark that, in 1825, he himself was examined before a committee of the House, with reference to the class of voters subsequently disfranchised, and it was then considered and understood (at least it was so by him) that the 40s. freeholders in fee were to remain untouched in their rights and privileges, and yet, in 1829, with a reckless negligence and forgetfulness of every principle, they were included in the measure and disfranchised, although against them there did not exist the least pretence for such a course. He, in addition to what he had already objected, must also appeal against the franchise introduced in the measure, nominally a £10 franchise; but one which, under that Bill, was stated by the right hon. baronet near him to be really a £20 franchise, because it was provided that there should be £10 over and above all charges, costs, and expenses. The franchise had not been diminished, but extended to England. Why should it not be rendered more extensive in Ireland? Why not restore their rights to the 40s. freeholders, and thus give to the peasantry a sense of importance and independence, while we afford them a stimulus to industry? Either the English Parliament thought Ireland unfit to receive this boon (boon did he call it?) nay, this act of justice, or they considered the privilege which was enjoyed in England too good for Irishmen, and grudgingly resolved to keep it to themselves. Grosser injustice was never displayed than that which the Irish Reform Bill exhibited. Who would dare to tell him that Irishmen were not as well entitled to this franchise as Englishmen? After this, they might talk to him of equal rights and equal privileges, but he would laugh at their empty vauntings. What, he would ask, was one of the pleas for refusing it? Why, that they could not disturb the members

of the House. That was General Gascoigne's plea; a man of whom he would say, without hesitation, that he was one of the worst used gentlemen in England. General Gascoigne had moved and carried an instruction to the committee, that the number of members for England and Wales should remain 513. The House was dissolved. The General went back to his constituents; and, under the influence of the Government, was almost hooted out of Liverpool. Yet that same Government actually adopted the principle of the motion they had thus so violently condemned: All the people of Ireland had to contend with was, in fact, a mere prejudice that the number of the House should remain 658. But, even with a knowledge of that prejudice, the Government had taken care to draw so liberally on their bank for the people of England and Wales, that there remained nothing for Ireland. The numbers of the House were now to be scrupulously preserved; England would have thirty members more than originally contemplated, but Ireland was excluded from deriving any advantage; in consequence of the departure from the principles of the first Reform Bill, her numbers would not be augmented. Did Ireland deserve such treatment, after the assistance her representatives had rendered ministers on the English Reform Bill? But this was always the way where Ireland was concerned; her aid was invoked in the battle, but when a division of the spoil came, she was forgotten. The Irish were ready to forgive; they demanded only equal justice; but it is the injured who forgive. Those who do the wrong never forgive. He appealed to the ministers, as Reformers, to remember the situation in which they were now placed. Let them remember that their votes would go forth to the world; that they had to decide upon the claims to equal justice of a large portion of the empire. Would they remind the people of Ireland of that sentiment which had been so often repeated to them?—

“Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not,
Who would be free, himself must strike the blow!”

He would not go into a lengthened view of this subject; but the conduct of the present Government was of a piece with that which had been pursued by every Administration in Ireland since the time of Henry II. The people of Ireland had only put in a claim for an equal participation in those rights enjoyed by the other subjects of the empire. That was done even in the reign of Henry III.; but the just demands of the people were then refused, and their interests were sacrificed to the Conservative party, as they had now been by the right hon. gentleman. He might carry his proposition, but let him recollect that he would not satisfy the claims of the Irish people, and the Conservative party to whom he sacrificed them was not now dominant; he would not conciliate them now. But let him consider well the consequences of his conduct. It had been said that if Henry VIII. had conceded as much to the people of Ireland as he did to the people of England, the Reformation would have been successful in that country. He did not think that, but it had been so stated by more than one historian. When there was the first appearance of concession in the reign of James I., he, by the advice of Sir John Davis, introduced the rotten-borough system there, and by that means destroyed the good he otherwise might have done. James made forty boroughs in one day, with a view to give the dominant party control in the legislature. This was in character with the whole system, to prevent the voice of the people being heard.

It was little more than 200 years since it was no crime to murder an Irishman; and it had only been at periods of danger and of difficulty that Ireland had been able to obtain anything from England. England endeavoured to enslave the people—to destroy their churches—to throw down their altars, and strip their clergy] of their property—but it did not succeed in the attempt to destroy the spirit of the people. The present Parliament had restored to the people of England those rights which had been usurped by an oligarchy. It had rendered useful service to this country, and why not do equal justice to Ireland? In the present instance insult had been added to

injury—the English Reform Bill was brought forward by an English gentleman; the Scottish Bill by a Scottish legal luminary; was there no Irishman to whom ministers could entrust the Irish Reform Bill?—was it necessary that it should be introduced by one who could conciliate nobody—a person in whom no party could confide? Yes, the right hon. gentleman opposite had been fully intrusted with a measure which was calculated to destroy the independence of Ireland. Wise and political statesmen as they were, the present members of his Majesty's Government, they wished to put an end to excitement and agitation in Ireland, and how did they set about it?—by perpetrating an act of injustice which must perpetuate excitement, and leave no room for tranquillity but the tranquillity of slavery, and that, he pledged himself they should not have. He told the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley) he might defeat him (Mr. O'Connell) in that House, but the Irish people would beat the right hon. gentleman elsewhere. They would vanquish him; and in doing so they would violate no law, so long as Algerine Acts, such as the Registration of Arms and Unlawful Processions Bills, did not exist. No; so long as the hon. gentleman left the Irish people one rag of the Constitution, they would take their stand upon that and beat him. In conclusion, he would move, by way of amendment, that it be an instruction to the committee to restore the elective franchise to persons seized in fee, and occupying freeholds of the clear yearly value of 40s.

Subject, PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—IRELAND; Date, JUNE 18, 1832.

This subject brought up Mr. Stanley in one of his bitterest attacks on O'Connell.

Mr. O'Connell said, his object in then rising was, to propose another instruction to the committee. There were other material points to which he was anxious to call the attention of the House, but these he should reserve for a future stage of their

proceedings. He could not proceed without again adverting to the fact, that his Majesty's Government had furnished no information as to the population of Ireland, except that contained in the Boundaries Book. The information which this book contained was most vague and unsatisfactory, and he could not but deeply lament that a production so stupid and disgraceful had been brought forward in that House. Not a single charter had been published in that book of information, although the boroughs were to be affected by the Bill, and yet these documents could have been procured either in the Rolls Office, or at the Bermingham Tower, Dublin—or, if they thought it too troublesome to send to Ireland, they might have obtained charters of a more ancient date in the Tower of London. He had a right to complain of this neglect on the part of those whose duty it was to have supplied this information. When the House came to consider the boroughs, it was most important that it should have before it the charter under which the boroughs had been enfranchised. He complained the more of this neglect on the part of the Government, when he found them actually fighting the battle of the Beresford family in that portion of the Bill which had reference to the borough of Coleraine. It was true that an excuse had been made for the non-production of the charter belonging to the borough of Ennis, namely, that it was pledged for a sum of money to some individual in the county of Galway. In this case, of course, they could not produce the charter, unless they consented to pay off the incumbrance. He thought, however, that all such charters as were not circumstanced in this way should be published for the information of the House. He confessed that he entertained but little prospect of success in his present motion. This apprehension was one of the melancholy effects of the contempt in which the affairs of Ireland seemed to be held in this country. The right hon. gentleman opposite would, no doubt, command a majority upon every point which would limit the constituency of Ireland; he would be ably supported by his new and faithful allies on that side of the House. They

would often have to witness before the termination of these proceedings such miserable spectacles as had been exhibited in that House a few evenings ago. They would behold men, calling themselves Reformers, marching in, arm in arm, with their late opponents, to vote against the men who, through evil report and through good report, had sustained them, and when, without their assistance, they must have been prostrated in the dust. These were the men who called themselves Reformers while they were aiding and abetting the cause of despotism in Ireland. This was Whig gratitude. This was the requital which the representatives of Ireland were to receive for sleepless nights—for their laborious and unceasing exertions—for the numberless sacrifices they had made in defence of English liberty. He expected this. He was prepared for it. It was in perfect keeping with the policy which the Whig ministry had pursued towards his country. Well, let them go on. Let them follow up their system of injustice. He firmly believed that all those things were for the best, and that the right hon. gentleman, in spite of his intentions to the contrary, would be the means of effecting the speedy regeneration of Ireland. The events which had taken place in that country justified him in saying this, and the House might rely upon this prediction, that his contemptuous refusal of common justice to Ireland would lead to results which it was then in their power to avert, and which might yet be remembered by them with regret. He did not hope to carry his present motion, but would, nevertheless, denounce the injustice of the measure. He would reiterate his objections, and if he did not succeed in making an impression upon that House, he would at least expose the conduct of this Whig ministry in the eyes of the people of England. He would now call the attention of the House to some of the most glaring defects of the present measure. In the former Bill the same system of registration which existed in this country was provided for Ireland as a boon. The dissolution of Parliament took place, and Ireland returned to this House Reformers pledged to support this Bill, acting under the compact which it was imagined had

been entered into. In the present Bill the registration remained unaltered. The old abuses were preserved in Ireland, while in England a much cheaper, a less inconvenient, and, in every sense of the word, an infinitely better and more effective measure had been adopted. Was not this a gross, a shameful violation of the compact which had been entered into with the Irish nation? For this charge he believed they were indebted to the Tory Attorney-General for Ireland, and, knowing this fact, it did not surprise him. The compact was, however, broken. This was another insult to the Irish nation; it was another specimen of the fidelity and honour with which England had fulfilled her compacts with Ireland. The first question they had to determine in discussing this measure was, whether the constituency of Ireland was as sufficient and extensive as it ought to be. This was the basis of the English Bill—this was the first question they had taken into consideration, and he thought that the extension of the constituency was the greatest benefit conferred upon England by that Bill. In Ireland how did the case stand? That there was an extensive and sufficient constituency in Ireland, up to the year 1829, was not to be doubted, but now, he should be able to show, it would be reduced to a constituency not exceeding 25,000, and that miserably limited. Up to the year 1829 the constituency was nominally 216,000, and really about 200,000; but by the blow that was struck in that year it was at once reduced to 25,000. He would give the House a few specimens of the numbers that would have a right to vote according to that measure. In six of the counties of Ireland there would not be so many as 300 £10 voters. In Sligo, with a population of 171,508, there would be 299 voters; in Carlow, with a population of 81,576, there would be 193 voters; in Kildare, with a population of 108,400, 191 voters; in Kerry, with a population of 240,000, 178 voters; in Dublin county, with a population of 183,000, 109 voters; and in Donegal, with a population of 298,104, there would be sixty-six voters. Was that a state of things which ought to exist? Non gentlemen whispered he was inaccurate in his

statement, but that could not be, for he had copied the figures from Parliamentary Returns. But he would give the House some other specimens. In seven of the counties of Ireland, the £10 voters would not amount to 400; in Kilkenny, with a population of 169,000, there would be 383 voters; in Louth, with a population of 108,000, 380 voters; in Westmeath, with a population of 136,000, there would be 366 voters; in Mayo, with a population of 367,000, there would be 335 voters; in King's County, with a population of 144,000, there would be 301 voters; in Queen's County, with a population of 145,000, there would be 302 voters; in Meath, with a population of 177,000, there would be 308 voters. In five of the counties the £10 voters would not amount to 500; in Tipperary, with a population of 402,000, there would be 475 voters; in Rosecommon, with a population of 239,000, there would be 470 voters; in Waterford, with a population of 148,000, there would be 483 voters; in Longford, with a population of 112,000, there would be 463 voters; and in Cork county, with a population of 700,000, there would be 477 voters.

With respect to the other counties, Wexford, with a population of 172,000, would contain 672 voters; Leitrim, with a population of 141,000, 455 voters; and Wicklow, with a population of 122,000, would contain 533 voters; the other eleven counties, on an average, contained above 700 voters. And here, by-the-bye, was a very instructive fact; out of these eleven counties, no less than eight were in the province of Ulster, the other three being Galway, Limerick, and Clare. The assistant-barristers of Galway and Limerick were both Catholics, but such was not the case with respect to Clare; and what was the result of this circumstance? The number of voters for Galway, 1,812; for Limerick, 1,396; and for Clare only 946; and from his connection with that county, he was able to state that the registration of those 946 cost upwards of £1,500. No wonder, then, that the Conservatives were all anxious to get rid of it.

From these calculations it appeared, that there were 19,000

and odd £10 voters in Ireland; he would call 20,000; and then again ask, was this a sufficient constituency for more than 8,000,000 people? But no doubt he should be told by the right hon. gentleman that there were other voters, such as the £50 voters and the £20 voters, and according to his calculation, there were 23,000 of the former, and 9,000 of the latter. Such certainly did appear by the documents to be the fact; but every £50 voter since the year 1790 had been reckoned, so that they had three generations on the list, and even with respect to the £20 voters, the same inaccuracy prevailed to a considerable extent. The £20 rent-charges were registered every eight years, so that, after the lapse of eight years, they necessarily had the duplicate entry of the same persons; therefore, taking all these circumstances into consideration, the right hon. gentleman's calculation was infinitely too great. He (Mr. O'Connell) had had the experience of three contested elections in Ireland, and on the basis of that experience his calculations were, that the amount of these voters was not above one-ninth of that stated by the right hon. gentleman; but he was content to give him one-sixth, and then that would yield 26,000 voters for the entire constituency. The hon. member for Kilkenny had made a calculation of the returns of the number of persons who polled at contested elections in eighteen of the counties of Ireland; and that number amounted to 15,211; there then remained fourteen counties unpolled.

But it should be observed that the contest took place in those counties where there was the greatest number of voters. Now, let any man calculate on these data; and he would fearlessly ask whether, in giving a constituency of 26,000 to Ireland, he had not placed the number infinitely too high? He would then ask the House if this state of the elective franchise was to be endured? Were these the advantages which Ireland was to hope for under the Whig Government? Was this an extension of the franchise, or was it to be called reform? Ireland, it was well known, had always suffered as much, if not more, under a Whig than a Tory Government. It was the

Whigs who enacted the penal code; and even in the present Administration there seemed the same determination to use the strong hand of domination over Ireland, as well as to perpetuate all the misdeeds and misrule of their late predecessors in office, and all to gratify petty and contemptible prejudices—prejudices which were by no means confined to the lowest class of the people. Some hon. gentlemen would say, that the franchise had been extended in consequence of the holders of leases, originally granted for sixty years, being entitled to vote. But what were they? Why, he would tell the noble lord opposite, who seemed to consider them as worthy of attention, that there was no such class of voters in Leinster, Munster, or Connaught; nor did he believe there were more than fifty or sixty of these voters altogether in Ulster. There might be twenty or thirty in Armagh; but, with the exception of Down, in which he understood there were twenty or twenty-five on one estate, they were not to be found in any other part of this province. The noble lord had stated that there were a number of Catholics holding leases of this description. Was the noble lord so ignorant of Irish history as not to know that the Catholics were not permitted to hold property in some of these counties? Did the noble lord not know that they were turned out of their lands and possessions, and were sent, as was the fashion in that day in this unfortunate district, to “hell or Connaught.” You boast of this miserable addition to the franchise, which, I again repeat, is of no possible advantage to Ireland, while, in other respects, you reduce the constituencies in counties to nearly half its present amount. For instance, in Kerry we have 178 voters at present. By your Bill you cut off seventy-nine, thus reducing the constituency for such an immense population to the miserable number of ninety-nine. [*Lord Althorpe left the House.*] The noble lord went away. His observations were not, perhaps, worthy of being listened to; but Ireland formed the subject of deliberation, and this, doubtless, was a very legitimate excuse for the abrupt departure of the noble lord. He, however, had left the case to one of his underlings. He could

not have made a more proper selection than the right hon-
gentleman opposite. He was much better adapted for the task
than the noble lord. He possessed the requisite qualification
in acts of domination, and, therefore, he was just the person of all
others most fit to reply to him. What was the object of the Eng-
lish Reform? To increase the constituency. What was the ob-
ject of this Bill? To decrease it. Under the present system a
man who had a freehold of the required amount in the towns was
entitled to vote in the county in respect to his freehold; while,
if he resided in the town, he was also entitled to vote for the
town in respect to his residence. That practice was now to be
abolished, and now inhabitants of towns that were not counties
of themselves were to have the double vote. It might be right
enough to refuse the double vote to the inhabitants of towns
that were counties of themselves, but why were other towns to
be deprived of the advantage? When complaint had been
made of this measure upon a former occasion, the answer given
was, that such a provision was in perfect accordance with the
English Bill—that, in fact, the object was to assimilate the
Irish and English system of voting. True it was, that such
was the principle of the English Bill. This argument was
always used when the constituency was to be decreased, but it
was never applied for the opposite purpose. The regulation
of the English Bill was to preserve the agricultural and manu-
facturing interests, and to prevent the one obtaining an undue
preponderance over the other in the representation. It was on
this principle that the constituency was limited in towns where
it had taken place. But the House must see that no such dis-
tinction existed in Ireland. There was no manufacturing in-
terest in any of her boroughs. Ireland had been long since
plundered of these advantages, and therefore the principle did
not apply; but on what principle was it that the freehold right
of voting was to be taken away from cities which were counties
of themselves? For his part, he confessed his utter ignorance
of any ground upon which such a course could be maintained.
Such was the Reform Bill intended for Ireland. Could any

single human being be found to say with sincerity that it was a just one? Hon. members on the other side of the House might join the right hon. gentleman in voting against him, but he defied them to reconcile to their consciences the justice of the vote. It appeared to him that the object of all parties in that House was to exclude the people of Ireland from all real share in the representation. He was justified in entertaining the belief, not only by what Government had not done, but by what it had done. Could any man think otherwise, when he saw two members given to the College of Dublin, where it was impossible that there could be a single Catholic voter, and where the present representation was amply sufficient? What, he would ask, was this but making a religious difference, and leaving the Catholic question open, as if the Bill of 1829 had never been passed? The right hon. gentleman, on introducing the former Bill, defended the measure against the attacks from this side of the House upon the ground that the Bill of 1829 abolished all religious distinctions—that Protestants and Catholics were by the same measure put upon the same level, and yet they heard the same right. hon. gentleman a few evenings ago declare that the additional member was given to the University because it was a Protestant establishment. How could the right hon. gentleman reconcile this gross inconsistency? He repeated that the £10 franchise would diminish the number of voters for Ireland; and he wished to observe that this franchise had been admitted by the hon. member for Tamworth to be equal to a £20 franchise in England. That statement was true as far as it went, but it might have gone further, and have been equally true. What was the object of thus restricting the franchise? It could only be to prevent the Catholics from obtaining too much power; and what was that but a revival of a religious question which ought to have been buried in oblivion? Did the right hon. gentleman suppose that this Bill was to be final for Ireland? If he did he was mistaken; it not only would not be final, but it would not content the country one hour.

The measure did not satisfy any party. If it conciliated the member for Dundalk or the learned member for the University of Dublin, he could understand it; but there was this singularity about the measure, that no human being was satisfied with it. The ministers, by adopting it, were securing the hatred of the Conservatives, and gratuitously adding thereto the just vengeance of the Liberals. Ministers were doing that which they were accusing him of trying to do, far more rapidly than they imagined. Perhaps they thought they might succeed by playing one party off against another; but they would fail. He would not vote against the Orangemen; and it was surely a gross injustice to take away from the Protestants, because they were Protestants, when it was refused to give to the Catholics, because they were Catholics. And this was the splendid safety-conciliating Administration! They gave to Ireland a Processions Bill this year; last year they gave a Yeomanry Bill; in short, they would give any Bill that should not introduce common sense into Ireland. There was common sense in the Tories; there was common sense in the right hon. baronet; what he said to the Irish Protestants was:—"Assist me in putting down the mass of the population and I will give you great advantages." That was a comprehensible bargain, and the Protestants served him zealously. But this Government had thrown the Protestants overboard; and, after exasperating them to the utmost, it turned round and exasperated the people too. Admirable policy! Most excellent and statesmanlike craft! But the House was told that this Bill would be lost elsewhere; after the passing of the English Bill, however, he hardly thought that was very likely. He might probably be asked what was his remedy for the grievance that he had pointed out. It was a very simple one. Let them give a £5 instead of a £10 franchise to Ireland. Let the machinery of the Bill be substantial, but not expensive. Perhaps it would be said that this was making a new qualification. But were there no new qualifications in the English Bill? And, besides, from his evidence, in 1815, it would be perceived that he proposed the

same thing. His words were often quoted against him ; so, in this instance, let him have the benefit of them in his favour. The right hon. gentleman had told the House that, if he could be shown that there would be a numerous and respectable 40s. constituency, he would consent to that franchise ; and then he went on to quote a case in which eight hundred 40s. freeholders were bribed.

Subject, PARTY PROCESSIONS, IRELAND ; Date, JUNE 25, 1832.

O'Connell's efforts to conciliate this violently aggressive party were well intended, but certainly not effective. To enforce Protestant liberty of conscience by the sword was, and we fear still is, the principal doctrine of that Society.*

Mr. Henry Grattan, who spoke on this occasion, said he saw two men killed in one of their processions, but it was no use to prosecute the murderers as no jury could be got to convict an Orangeman. He further added, that Protestant clergymen wore beads on Orange festivals in mockery of Catholics

Mr. O'Connell said, the right hon. gentleman had stated that the speeches which had been made on the Opposition side of the House demonstrated the necessity of this measure. The speech which the right hon. gentleman himself had just delivered demonstrated that this measure was totally unnecessary. There had never been in Ireland any cessation of the irritating passions occasioned by the severing principle of partial legislation. The right hon. gentleman had talked of his (Mr. O'Con-

* At an Orange *soiree*, held in the Antient Concert Room in Dublin, in January, this year, their principles were unfalteringly announced by Mr. Johnston, M.P., who is reported to have said, that "they were prepared with one hand on the Bible and the other, if necessary, on the sword, to vindicate the Protestant Constitution." This was Mahomet's fashion of propagating his religion—the Koran in one hand, the sword in the other. Such arguments have at least the merit of being brief and to the point ; but do not let the great name of Liberty be profaned in connection with them. He said, also, the Orange Society was a political religious society. Are Catholics, then, the only persons who are to separate religion from politics, as if our public conscience was not as important as our private conscience?

nell) being the Catholic member for Kerry. He could not, of course, consider it offensive to be called a Catholic, because he was one; but he did not come there in the character of a Catholic, or the representative of Catholics; he sat there the representative of his countrymen, Protestants as well as Catholics, and it was his duty to take care of the interest of one as well as the other. The right hon. gentleman had talked of the combination between him and the hon. member for Sligo. He could tell him that, if that combination existed between all the Protestants and Catholics of Ireland, they should be too strong for him, and that it was their divisions that weakened them, and which constituted his power. These divisions were the result of bad Governments, which at one time encouraged, and at another time struck down each party; and all this was done to remedy the blunders which Government had already committed. The right hon. gentleman had talked of the necessity of this Bill, and illustrated it by a reference to the wrecking of a village in the county Armagh. But was there not law enough to punish the perpetrators of that outrage? And had his Majesty's Government to this hour punished a single individual? Not one; nor had they removed one single magistrate in the neighbourhood, although those excesses were perpetrated in open day, and of which ample evidence might be adduced. He contended that no case had been made out for this measure. What should be the first case? That there was no law sufficient to put down these mischievous proceedings. But if these proceedings were illegal, there was abundant law.

The right hon. gentleman had read Judge Jebb's charge, showing that they were illegal. What was it, then, that prevented his putting them down? He had nothing more to do than to make the magistrates act; and if he could make them act, he had quite sufficient law to put them down. But the magistrates were a body of partisans, elected by the Lord Lieutenants of the counties, and were not within the salutary control of Government. By allowing the magistrates to neglect their duties, the right hon. gentleman felt compelled to appeal

to this House for more legislation ; but he had a right to say, that the right hon. gentleman had contributed to the very evils he now sought to remedy. When he and his colleagues came into office, they found the yeomanry of Ireland 25,000 strong, and had they not increased them to 30,000 ? Had they not put arms into hands, which they now said it was unlawful to use ? And now they called upon this House to establish a most dangerous precedent in Ireland, which a strong Government might hereafter imitate in this country, and for a similar purpose. Allusions had been made to the encouragement given by Orangemen to the Repeal of the Union ; but ministers had to thank themselves if that feeling was now much stronger than it formerly was. There were but two kinds of proceedings in Ireland : Catholic proceedings on the 17th of March, and Orange proceedings on the 12th of July, and other days. Now, as to the Catholic proceedings, this Bill was totally unnecessary, for this reason, because those proceedings were condemned by all the Catholics of Ireland who were at all influential in that country. It was only four or five years since they commenced ; there were, therefore, no ancient prejudices in their favour, and he might venture to assert, that no man now imagined that there would be another such procession held in Ireland. Those processions were a base imitation of a bad custom, and had passed away entirely. There was no man, he would venture to say, who would tell this House he believed that another Catholic procession would ever take place. He did not believe it ; it was impossible such should be the case ; if, however, there should be any such processions, the magistrates ought to act against them. It would be their duty to do so, and therefore there was no necessity for this act as against the Catholic processions. Then how stood the matter with regard to these Orange processions. These were for many years subject to no kind of jealousy with the Catholics ; on the contrary, in the year 1782, the first volunteer corps which fired a salute before the statue of King William III. in Dublin was the Irish Catholic brigade, commanded by the

Marquis Wellesley. So far from any jealousy being entertained with reference to the events commemorated on that occasion, there was not a Catholic who did not rejoice to reflect that King William succeeded and that King James was defeated. There was not a Catholic who did not hold the character of the former in the greatest respect, and regard the character of the latter with the greatest and most sovereign contempt; therefore, there was no rational ground for these processions being considered as an insult to the Catholics.

Then, if he took a view of this question as it regarded the Orange party, he would say, that it certainly would be the better course to give up these processions; but his thorough conviction was, that infinitely greater mischief by this Bill would be done, than by any other measure which could possibly be adopted. If these processions were put down on particular days, it must be done by great vigilance, and at the risk of a breach of the peace; but, supposing that they were put down on particular days, what would be the result? There would not be one single incident in the life of an Orangeman on which a procession would not take place. There would not be a marriage, or a funeral, but would be made the occasion for a large assemblage of Orangemen. It was well known that most of the riots occurred at the funerals of Orangemen; and when these should be hereafter celebrated, there would be assemblages of 16,000 or 20,000 men. Could Government interfere to prevent these assemblages? And if not, this circumstance would be made an additional source of irritation to the anti-Orange party; so that, by this Act of Parliament to arrest these processions, instead of preventing bloodshed, bloodshed and slaughter would be promoted. Till he could be shown the case of some one punished for permitting what Judge Jebb called illegal processions, he could see no case for any further enactment. All that would be done by this Bill would be to increase the bad spirit which existed between different parties in Ireland, by bringing them into daily and hourly collision. Particular processions might be prevented, but

this very law would stimulate to similar processions. If Government wished the country to remain in a state of quiet, it must make the magistrates do their duty; it must compel them to act. If that were done they would recommend them so to conduct themselves that there would be no breach of the peace. Then, looking to the Bill, one would suppose that the right hon. gentleman intended to laugh at them. It was to put a stop to processions:—"Who shall wear and have amongst them any fire-arms, or other offensive weapons, or any banner, emblem, flag, or symbol, the display whereof may be calculated to tend to provoke animosity between his Majesty's subjects of different persuasions, or who shall be accompanied by any music of a like nature or tendency."

Now, he should like to know what kind of music it was which was of a like nature with a flag or banner?

O'Connell was interrupted here by Mr. Stanley, who said he should read the whole sentence.

In the debate in Committee on the Reform Bill for Ireland, June 13, 1832, O'Connell spoke strongly of the injustice of English Catholics. He said: "The English Catholics, too, were to be found voting against the people of Ireland on this occasion, forgetting who it was that had emancipated them, when they were afraid even of their own shadows. When he saw the English Catholics going out of the House in company with the Orange member for Sligo, he could not help wishing to see them unemancipated again, for their gross ingratitude to those who had restored them their liberties."

Mr. O'Connell said he would read the whole: "Whereas great numbers of persons belonging to different religious denominations, and distinguished respectively by various emblems, expressive of party feelings and differences, are in the habit of meeting and marching in processions in Ireland upon certain festivals and anniversaries, and other occasions; and as such processions are calculated to create and perpetuate animosities, and have been found to occasion frequent and sanguinary conflicts between different classes of his Majesty's subjects: for prevention thereof, and in order to guard against the recurrence of the tumults, riots, and disorders arising out of such proceedings, be

it enacted by the King's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, in their present Parliament assembled, that from and after the commencement of this Act, any body of persons who should meet and parade together, and join in procession for the purpose of celebrating or commemorating any festival, anniversary, or political event relating to or connected with any religious distinctions or differences between any classes of his Majesty's subjects, or of demonstrating any such religious distinction or difference, and who shall wear and have amongst them any fire-arms, or other offensive weapons, or any banner, emblem, flag, or symbol, the display whereof may be calculated to tend to provoke animosity between his Majesty's subjects of different religious persuasions, or who shall be accompanied by any music of a like nature or tendency, shall be, and be deemed an unlawful assembly, and every person present thereat shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be liable to be punished accordingly." Now that he had read the whole of the sentence, he asked what kind of music that was which was of the nature of banner-carrying? In fact, the attempt to scramble for a particular description had rendered it necessary to use terms absurd in their nature. The Bill then went on to authorize a single magistrate to commit, fine, and imprison persons offending against its provisions, and all without repeal. The latter part of this Act might be abused: by it magistrates were to be made judges in their own cause, so that this was an unconstitutional as well as an unnecessary law. He stood there subject to the taunt of having joined persons with whom he much differed; but although he did not believe in exclusive loyalty, every party in Ireland was entitled to the full protection of the Constitution, without having any of their rights trenched upon, unless a necessity were shown for it. He was glad that the hon. member for Sligo had said, that any efforts of his would be unavailing to get the Orangemen to join him, because it acquitted him of acting from any other motive than that which he was ready to

avow and declare. It was a great object with him to conciliate the Orangemen and reconcile them to their Catholic fellow-countrymen. That, from the commencement of his career, had been one of his leading objects, and he knew that they never could succeed as long as they were battling for the civil rights which one party only possessed. That great battle won, he had thought that all differences should be reconciled, as it was the division between parties that prevented the growth of general prosperity. If the Orangemen rejected his overtures at conciliation, he must only be doubly anxious to protect their rights feebly, for his talents would not allow him to do it otherwise, but honestly and conscientiously. Thus, then, he would say, that this law was perfectly unnecessary, and that the pretence for it had only arisen in consequence of the neglect of the Government to carry the old law into effect. The spirit of a great portion of the community could not be put down by an act of legislation; neither the public mind nor the Orange spirit could be conquered by legislation, and every attempt to do so made its strength more irresistible. That spirit might be managed, but could not be curbed, and therefore, although a Catholic, he should support the amendment before the House.

Subject, TITHES (IRELAND)—ADJOURNED DEBATE;

Date, JULY 13, 1832.

O'Connell began his speech by saying that this was a discussion in which the Irish nation was treated as if it was a combination of tradesmen for the purpose of robbing their employers. He was soon interrupted by Mr. Stanley, and continued:—

Mr. O'Connell—I am glad that I have roused the right hon. gentleman from his torpor, and that he has begun to interrupt me so very soon in my speech. What, however, I say is, that the letter contained a distinct promise, in which, I presume, the right hon. gentleman was afterwards overruled by the rest of his colleagues, who, no doubt, felt that, after what they had said and done when in Opposition, it would be impossible for

them to remain in office if they were to act up to the pledge of the right hon. Secretary. But it is not in this alone that the same disposition towards Ireland has been evinced. What has become of the Grand Jury Bill? Lord Leveson Gower pledged himself to the bringing in of that Bill, and I know that he is a nobleman fully capable of vindicating himself from having violated any pledge. When he went out of office it was entrusted to me; it was afterwards taken out of my hands, and passed into the House of Lords; there it has been slumbering ever since before a nameless committee, for I have not even been able to learn of whom that committee is composed. And why has this been done? Because, in the eleventh hour, the right hon. gentleman has thought fit to resort to prosecutions, and because he well knows that, with a new Parliament and a new Grand Jury Bill, there was no chance of those prosecutions succeeding. Let us remember, too, the way in which those prosecutions have been conducted. I do not hesitate to say, that those charges have been brought forward with an indecency which no ministers would have ventured to exhibit before the English nation. But, according to the right hon. gentleman, anything is good enough for Ireland. How has he treated gentlemen in a rank of life nearly, if not quite, equal to his own? Instead of resorting to a summons, as is usual in such cases, he obtained sworn depositions, and on those the sanctity of their houses has been violated, and they themselves dragged through the streets like common felons at the command of the right hon. gentleman. I do not care to allude to my own case. There is no need of it. Oh! the right hon. gentleman is very welcome to sneer as much as he pleases; but I would at least venture to take the liberty of asking, whether he imagined that there was any danger of my absconding when he directed the privacy of my house to be violated by the thief-catchers whom he sent thither? This, too, I will tell him—that, though he has thought proper to act thus towards an Irish member, he would not have dared to have pursued a similar line of conduct towards an English Member of Parliament. But, in return for

all this evil, have the ministers conferred any good on Ireland? They have given us a stingy Reform Bill. Thanks to the people of England, we have got more than was intended; but heaven only knows what the right hon. gentleman's colleagues may do in the other House; for anything we know, it may be referred to a Lords' Committee, like the Grand Jury Bill, and never be heard of more. What is the principle on which the right hon. gentleman has gone in drawing up this Tithe Bill which he now offers to the House? His grand principle is, to keep up the present Protestant Church Establishment in Ireland—the most monstrous establishment that ever existed in any Christian country. Not the slightest hope or expectation is held out by him that that overgrown establishment is to be reduced within the bounds of common sense or utility; and what are the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman about all this time? Do they suppose that the people of England are indifferent to the question of tithes? Do they suppose that the Dissenters of this country, a numerous and powerful class, have no desire to cease to pay those from which they get no value in return? Do they imagine that the agriculturists here entertain no wish to diminish the burden arising from tithes? Do they not think that the people of England will require pledges from the candidates at a new election that they will assist in reducing the amount of tithes? The right hon. gentleman must certainly be aware that this question has begun to be agitated in England. What chance, then, will the ministerial candidates possess when it is plain that Government have no intention of reducing the enormous Church Establishment in Ireland, but, on the contrary, have even invented a plan to keep up the burden of that Church? £9,600,000 is to be accumulated to purchase lands for the clergy? This is the beautiful scheme that is to tranquillize Ireland! This is the chimera which is to satisfy the people. This is the right hon. gentleman's dream of Irish tranquillity—and, to heighten the effect, he proposes, in order that the affair may be better managed, to place it in the hands of an ecclesiastical corporation. Surely, never did mad-

man dream such a dream within the walls of Bedlam. What! does he think the people of Ireland are in love with corporations? If the Irish have any one special disgust it is towards corporations. The conduct of these bodies has been particularly remarkable by everything that deserves reprobation—from the lowest species of grovelling corruption to the most palpable and barefaced acts of injustice. They have been only known as the advocates of jobbing and dishonesty, as the opponents of justice and equity, as keeping up public oppression and inflicting private wrongs, as the destroyers of trade and the promoters of ignorance; and now to make this tithe bargain more amiable, it is to be embellished by ecclesiastical corporations. Can anything be worse than this? I now tell the right hon. gentleman, if he wished to make any bodies odious in Ireland let him only denominate them corporations and he will completely effect his purpose. But let the House observe the injurious consequences of committing this fund to the guardianship of corporations. Under the existing system there is at least this good, that the Protestant clergyman will oftentimes relieve the distressed and succour the helpless with the money which he receives from the people; once placed that money within the iron grasp of a corporation, no motives of compassion, no feelings of humanity can ever induce them to part with the smallest portion of it.

A clergyman, like any other man, is open to the better impulses of humanity; and when the Protestant pastor heard of the father of a family having died, the son having fallen sick, and the cattle being diseased, he was ready to listen to the tale of woe, and temper his demand with mercy and with pity. But a corporation cannot do this. A corporation can know neither compassion nor relaxation, and in this respect it seems to bear a semblance to the right hon. gentleman himself. Oh, heavens! what species of Government is this, to throw Ireland to his management as the spoil is thrown to the hounds after the day's hunting is over, to be worried and torn to pieces! But it is said that the object of this foolish and impracticable scheme is to conciliate Ireland; and the first thing that is done

by the right hon. Secretary is, to re-enact the principle of the Penal Laws, by excluding Catholics from the committee of inquiry on tithes. I did not require that the majority should be Catholic, but I protested against the principle which excluded the representatives of the Catholic people of Ireland, upon whom the burden for the most part falls. I know it will be said, the reason of their exclusion was, that they would be naturally opponents to that system; but I would ask, on the other hand, were no declared supporters admitted into the committee? Was not the hon. member for Tamworth; whose opinions on this subject are well known to the right hon. gentleman, was he not on the committee? Was not the hon. member for the Dublin University, who, from his position, is necessarily the advocate of the Church Establishment, a member of that committee? And were there not others on it equally anxious to support the Protestant Church? Then, why, in the name of everything that is just, were not those gentlemen, who really represent the people of Ireland, and with whom the people of Ireland sympathise, admitted into the committee? If the majority were not Catholics, surely there was no danger that the friends of the Church would be overpowered. But, sir, I can guess the reason why Catholics were excluded. The right hon. gentleman was afraid that they would demand what he had no disposition to grant, and would have come to no conclusion except one founded on the relative proportion of Catholics to Protestants in the different parishes in Ireland. Had I been on the committee, I should have made inquiries, in order to ascertain the proportion of the two classes—the Catholics and Protestants—in each parish, in order to see what the clergyman did for his tithe. When I demanded these returns on a former occasion, I was met by the right hon. gentleman (who is sometimes very liberal in phrase, when it suits his purpose) with this answer:—"Does the hon. member for Kerry wish to keep up those distinctions between Protestant and Catholic which should have been forgotten on the passing of the Relief Bill?" These were the miserable shifts resorted to by that incomparable

statesman, when I called for those important documents. Now, with respect to the report, the people of Ireland treated both it and the resolution of the committee so constituted as I treated them myself—with the most ineffable contempt. I say this, with every respect for the independent Irish members who happened to be on the committee; but I again repeat, that the people beheld with indignation the conduct of the right gentleman and the deliberations of his exclusive committee, and the voice of a whole people was not to be disregarded. The sole aim and object of the committee was to keep up the Church Establishment in its present shape, without any diminution of its enormous wealth. I have a document which will at once show the absurd and monstrous injustice of the proposed scheme. This is a return of the relative population of Protestants and Catholics in several parishes in Ireland during the years 1828 and 1829, and I will, with permission of the House, read it.

No. 1

Parish.	Diocese.	Catholics.	Protestants.
Clare, Galway, ..	Tuam,	2,000	—
Moycullen,	Same,	3,000	—
Annadown,	Same,	2,000	—
Kilcummin,	Cashel,	2,216	—
Kilmoon,	Kilmacduagh, ..	769	—
Killany,	Same,	471	—
Kilaspuglanaru, ..	Same,	1,322	—
Kilmeen Union. ..	Ardfert.	6,351	—
		18,129	

A clerk of the church paid, but he is a Catholic.

Of Protestants and Catholics.

239

No. 2.

Parish.	Diocese.	Catholics.	Protestants.
Blackditches,	Dublin,	2,980	1
Liskerry,	Tuam,	2,590	1
Seskiriam,	Waterford,	3,000	1
Glenmore,	Ossory,	3,300	1
Kilbannin,	Tuam,	1,997	1
Balnegare,	Elphin,	2,210	1
		16,077	6

No. 3.

Kinvara,	Kilmaeduaugh,	4,376	2
Rose,	Tuam,	5,759	3
Kilgobinet,	Waterford,	3,079	4
Liscannor,	Kilmaeduaugh,	2,576	4
Kilvine,	Tuam,	3,797	4
Templetopher,	Tuam,	6,750	8
Ardagool,	Killala,	2,638	12
Ardeah,	Meath,	3,221	9
Garrunina,	Tuam,	5,834	12
Emily,	Cashel,	3,234	12
		41,274	70

No. 4.

Dunhill,	Waterford,	5,165	16
Killala,	Kilmaeduaugh,	2,760	14
Aglis,	Cork,	2,535	12
Toonadromin,	Same.	2,667	11
Glanbegh,	Ardfert,	4,016	15
Kilteely,	Cashel,	4,040	17
Drumbane,	Same.	4,580	17
Ballybricken,	Same,	2,545	18
Ferriter Union,	Ardfert.	7,721	18

No. 4.—*continued.*

Parish.	Diocese.	Catholics.	Protestants.
Dromod,	Ardfert,	5,391	14
Ballyneale,	Waterford,	4,281	19
Ratheline,	Ardagh,	2,726	20
Kilcrohan,	Ardfert,	3,883	16
Ballyvourney,	Cloyne,	3,677	20
Ringana,	Waterford,	2,464	16
Feakle,	Killaloe,	8,184	—
		66,635	243

In No. 1 there are eight parishes in which there is not a single Protestant, though 17,000 Catholics pay tithes. Not to exclude Protestants altogether, however, I next take six other parishes in which there are some of them to use the church for which the Catholics must pay.

In No. 2 there are just six Protestants to 17,000 Catholics; in the next ten parishes the proportion is somewhat greater.

The summary of the three first tables is this. In

	Catholics.	Protestants
No. 1 8 Parishes	18,129	0
No. 2 8 Parishes	16,077	6
No. 3 10 Parishes	41,274	70
	<hr/>	<hr/>
26	75,480	76

Many of these are extensive unions, and taken at a low average of tithes, glebes, and parish cess, cost more than £500 per annum each; making, in the total for twenty-four parishes at £500 each, for seventy-six Protestants, £157 17s. 10d. per annum per head for their spiritual education (*a laugh*). The fourth table of sixteen parishes, making in all 66,635 Catholics, and 243 Protestants, at the same average, shows a cost of £30 17s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per annum for each Protestant. In one of these returns there is a parish mentioned as containing one Protestant, to which the following

curious note is appended:—"Not likely to increase, being an old man." In addition to these I have another return of eighty-five parishes, only one of which contains more than fifty-two Protestants. This was the system which it was proposed to preserve, and the chief supporter was the right hon. gentleman opposite. If the last Administration had appointed fourteen field-m Marshals, eighteen generals-in-chief, and some 2,000 colonels, to an army consisting only of twenty-five men; and if any man had risen up in that House to propose that £6,600,000 be voted for the maintenance of that force, how would he have been treated? But only transfer the scheme to Ireland, and let the right hon. Secretary bring up two or three voluminous reports, to make the case complicated and confused, and I have no doubt that the right hon. Secretary will be able to convince the House that twenty-five men is a proper army for so enormous an establishment of officers. Sir, I deeply deplore the conduct which the right hon. Secretary has thought proper to pursue towards Ireland. I will tell the right hon. gentleman, that he is a greater enemy of the Protestant Church than it has amongst its opponents. If he began in time he might have saved the clergy from the ruin in which they are now involved. He might have done last year what he cannot do this, and he may do this year what it will not be in his power to do next (*hear, hear*). My assertion may be ridiculed; I may be sneered at by the right hon. gentleman; but I solemnly assure this House that no member amongst them can be more anxious to secure to the existing clergy their vested rights than I am. I am firmly convinced that it can never be done by attempting to exact tithe. Does the right hon. gentleman imagine that his Composition Bill will fill their bellies. To make a commutation of tithes imperative, is a scheme equally unjust, ineffective, and absurd. Yet, while the right hon. gentleman intends to do away with the tithe system, he attempts by a juggle to uphold as great an abuse, only under another name. The clergy at present are in the greatest distress, and all but the right hon. gentleman feel for them. Why, we all know that

men of large nominal incomes are now obliged to borrow £5 or £10 to live from day to day. We all know they are in a situation which calls for our pity and compassion. And in consideration of their condition, what does the right hon. gentleman propose to do? Why, he says he will give them more law, as if there was not law enough already. Would it not have been better if the ministers had come down to the House with a vote of credit? Would it not have been better if they asked for so many Exchequer bills, to be placed at their disposal, to repay which an abundant supply would have been found in the property tax, which must be adopted when we really come to an arrangement of the tithes? If this had been proposed, no one would have been more ready than myself to have concurred in the vote, in order that relief might be afforded to those whose case will only be aggravated by the present plan of the right hon. gentleman. Does he suppose that the prosecutions to which he has now resorted will serve instead of Exchequer bills, and intimidate people into the payment of tithes? If he does, I can tell him that he is mistaken; I can tell him, that these prosecutions are only playing with the ashes thrown from the volcano, while the volcano itself is boiling for another eruption, which is likely, for aught I know, to overwhelm those who are amusing themselves by looking at its former devastations. Neither let it be said, that in opposing the right hon. gentleman's scheme we offer nothing in return. What do we propose? We propose to quiet the people of Ireland, by telling them that tithes are extinguished. The report of the committee has already told them so in name; but he would tell them so in reality, and prevent that report being a mockery. But, perhaps, we shall be told that we cannot extinguish tithes, because they are the property of other persons. I do not admit this; and I will tell the House why. If the landowner does not choose to till his land, he will have no tithes to pay; the tithe, therefore, clearly is a tax on the use of the land; and it is remarkable that the raw material pays nothing towards that tax. In short, like many other taxes, it is paid by the consumer of the article. The effect of tithes is

to make provisions dearer ; and, consequently, every man who eats, pays his portion of the tithe. At first the landlord, the tenant, and the public would mutually gain by the extinction ; but, in a few years, the public would be sole gainers. Ireland is essentially an agricultural country. Prior to the year 1799, many of her inhabitants were employed in manufactures ; the loom in the north, and the woollen trade in the south, supplied occupation for thousands. The effect of the Union, however, has been, to send nine-tenths of the rent of the soil out of the country, into the pockets of absentees ; and the consequence of this has been almost entirely to annihilate the manufactures of Ireland. It is the severity of this burden which is sufficient to account for the combination which at present exists in that country. This is no party matter. In the south of Ireland, many of those who used formerly to be the leaders of the Orangemen are now in the field, for the purpose of obtaining the abolition of tithes, and I know that the Presbyterians of the north, when quitting Ireland for foreign shores, though they wrung their hands for sorrow at quitting a country they loved so well, consoled themselves with the expression, "Blessed be the Lord, we are going to a country where we shall have to pay no tithes." The first part of the plan of the right hon. gentleman is, to make commutation universal throughout Ireland. Now, nothing has been so useful as this commutation ; but not to the people. At first, it seemed to hold out relief to the small farmers, and they joined the clergy in carrying it into effect. But there was hardly any necessity for this union, because the vestry commanded the commutation, and the clergy commanded the vestry, by means of having the gift of endless jobs in their own hands. Why, sir, I actually know of one parish, in which the church has been rebuilt three times within twenty years, and it is now on the point of being built again a fourth time ; and, therefore, as long as the clergyman can accomplish such things as these, there is little danger of a commutation being refused. Besides which, a commutation can only commence with the consent of the clergyman ; so that, in

fact, the power is given all on one side, and the clergy have exercised it over two-thirds of Ireland. Nor is this all. The courts of law have always been with them, for the judges have always seemed to think that the way to save their souls was by deciding in favour of the Church. We have heard a great deal about reverence for the ermine; but were I to detail only a few of those decisions, I think that that reverence would soon vanish, and would be succeeded by a feeling of a very different nature. Though the small farmers were, at first, in favour of commutation, they very soon began to discover their mistake. Under the former system, whenever there was a bad crop, at any rate the clergyman's share diminished; when the crop failed, the clergyman lost all; but now, under this commutation, the clergyman loses nothing. They also get paid twice a-year, whereas formerly they were paid only once; and that at the time when the farmer had housed his harvest, and had everything ready for market. See, then, the difference of the present system. Now, with ever so bad a harvest, the farmer pays the same amount of commutation; and half that commutation is demanded at the very period when he has nothing to sell, and when the driver is sent down upon him, whose fees frequently amount to far more than the whole of the tithes. But what can the right hon. gentleman know of all this? He has spent half a dozen, or a dozen, or perhaps fifty days in Ireland; and does he suppose that that will give him sufficient experience to comprehend the domestic condition of that country? As fester on the body commences in a small and, perhaps, almost imperceptible spot, and extends by degrees, till it contaminates the whole human frame, so the disease of Ireland spread from county to county, till it is now nearly at its height. Men most respectable in character cannot get even their grass cut, because they have ventured to pay tithes; the mail contractors cannot get their coaches horsed for the same reason. The state of Ireland is frightful—the state of the clergy is afflicting: this question deeply interests the finest people on the face of the globe; a great people in their character, though, yet, even

merry in their misfortunes. But can I believe that this is the case, when I look around me? What do I see—not more than five-and-twenty English gentlemen who will take the trouble of listening to a debate of such vital importance to Ireland. The matter is settled; the question is determined; and the right hon. gentleman is as sure of carrying his point, as the gamester of winning his loaded die; but, for all that, I tell him the whole is not lost—I tell him the people of Ireland shall remain quiet, and triumph in their quiescence; they were able to triumph over Wellington of Waterloo, and they are not to be put down by an Irish Secretary.

What possible benefit the right hon. gentleman can expect from this Bill I am utterly at a loss to conceive. Will it appease the two-thirds of Ireland, that are already in commotion, to learn that the other one-third is to be put in commotion also? Will it make them more tranquil? I will tell him that it will not; and yet he desperately determines to try the experiment, in spite of all warning. How will he render his Bill effective? Will he introduce a clause to compel the people to cut hay or purchase tithe pigs? Will he do this? If he does not, I will tell him his Tithe Bills are so much waste paper, and that he is only throwing stones against the wind. Will he stop the mountain torrent? The people of Ireland, I tell him, are determined to get rid of tithes; and, let the right hon. Secretary legislate as he choose, they will get rid of them. They will imitate, in this respect, the people of Scotland, who, in spite of the persecutions of men (whose names are now blasted with the eternal execration of mankind), more bloody-fashioned, but not more infatuated than the right hon. Secretary, persevered until they attained their object. But, not content with his Composition Act, the right hon. gentleman has another plan quite as admirable as the first. He proposes to make the landlords of Ireland his receivers. But does he know that many of those landlords are deeply in debt? Did he ever hear of one instance (surely it seems to me, as if that instance had come from himself) in which a gentleman of £10,000 a-year had a charge of

£9,500 on his estate? And would he put his tithe-charge on that? If he would, the gentleman had better at once make him a present of the estate, and wash his hands of it. But, perhaps, the right hon. gentleman intends to spread the tithe over the whole estate, including the charges; if so, it only shows the entire ignorance in which he is legislating for Ireland. Did he ever hear of the process of custodium in Ireland? Does he know that an estate may be seven, eight, nine deep in custodium, and that the creditors are obliged to scramble, and do the best they can? I myself knew a property on which there were eleven custodees, with the landlord himself in receipt of the rent a second custodee; and under such circumstances as these, I should like to know where the tithe-money is to come from? Does the right hon. gentleman also know, that there are in the Irish law what are called elegits, which will stand in the way of the tithe-charge? Does he know that there are trespassers in possession of estates? Does he know that there are over-holding tenants? These are things, I imagine, none of which have entered into the right hon. gentleman's philosophy; and I suppose I might as well talk Arabic to him as mention them; and yet every one of these are necessary ingredients in the great revolution of property which he is suggesting to the House. If it be the right hon. gentleman's intention to invent a scheme for the purpose of throwing the landlords into the hands of the people, and for making Whitefeet and Blackfeet of the gentry of Ireland, with all his ingenuity he could never have discovered a plan better suited the purpose than this. It would be idle to threaten the Government. I am the last man in the world to attempt it; but I should be wanting in my duty to my country, if I were not to tell the right hon. Secretary, that it is not in the power of England to put down the combinations of Ireland. He may make it disappear for a day; he may make it hide its proscribed head for a night; but, in spite of every effort, it will come back with redoubled force; it will come, too, in a more formidable shape, and it will do the more mischief in proportion as it accumulates; until, at length,

those who now distinguish between the tithes, as an odious tax and the rational rights of property, will forget that distinction, and threaten the very elements of society with destruction, while the right hon. gentleman is talking and laying down his notions of right and wrong in his tithe committees. What I chiefly desire is, that the people of England should fully understand what it is that we propose. We propose the abolition of tithes; we propose to respect the vested interests of the present incumbents; we do not even want to strike a single shilling a year off the income of the present Protestant clergy. The right hon. Secretary has it in his power to make that bargain now; but he will not be able to do so next year. I would give the present clergy the full amount of their livings. Justice and humanity require this; but I would not continue, after their deaths, to pay enormous incomes to those who have no spiritual duties to perform. I also propose to levy a tax on all property, landed, personal, and funded—for I see no distinction between them—for the purposes of religion and charity. By religion, I do not mean the Established Church, or any particular Church, but I mean, to a certain extent, every Church; and, without doubt, the Established Church among the rest, because the Protestant people of Ireland are, from their habits, peculiarly entitled to have their clergy paid out of the fund. A small glebe of ground might, I think, with advantage, be given to the pastors of each, of such a value as would prevent any necessity for their appealing to the feelings of their parishioners for support, but which would not place them above the necessity of performing their duty satisfactorily. I am a decided enemy to the introduction of Poor Laws into Ireland; but I am a decided friend to those charities, from the establishment of which no evil consequences can flow; I mean institutions for the relief of all sick, wounded, and diseased persons, of all those who have any visitation of Providence upon them. To relieve this description of persons the counties of Ireland are already heavily burdened. By the plan proposed, the counties would be exonerated from this expense, which would be thrown upon the tax to which I

have alluded, and thus considerable relief would be afforded to the whole country. The hon. and learned member concluded by imploring the Government not to press forward their proposed measures in the present advanced stage of the session, but to postpone them till the meeting of a new Parliament, and, in the meantime, to take a vote of credit for the purpose of relieving the distressed Protestant clergy. If the right hon. Secretary had the interest of the clergy at heart, he would adopt that course, and he would then meet with the disinterested support of every man who represented the people of Ireland.

Subject, TITHE MEETING AT NOBBER; Date, JULY 20, 1832.

This was an important debate involving as it did the unquestionable right of the subject to meet and petition peaceably. Such a right dared not have been disputed in England. Lord Killeen presented a petition on the subject. A powerful meeting at Nobber to petition against tithes had been dispersed by the army and the police, and he (Lord Killeen) begged the Secretary for Ireland to inform him what an illegal meeting was, for he could not pronounce a meeting of that kind illegal himself. O'Connell flung himself into the debate with more than ordinary energy, and called attention with his usual sense of humour to some old phraseology.

Mr. O'Connell could not help congratulating the right hon. Secretary on the new friend that he had found on that side of the House, though, on reflection, he must feel convinced that the nature of his attentions towards Ireland would always secure him friends at that side of the House. He certainly would not have a more able advocate, or a better lawyer, but decidedly no worse political adviser. The right hon. baronet had not accused his noble friend of acting unfairly towards any person. There was not in the House an individual less capable of acting unfairly towards any human being; but he did not feel surprised that the right hon. gentleman was incapable of understanding minds of the order of that of his noble friend. The right hon. gentleman had declared that Ireland was in a state of direct rebellion. Was it, indeed?

Now, he would beg to ask the right hon. gentleman, at

any of the tithe meetings in Ireland was there a single feather shaken, a single assault committed, or an act of violence of any kind perpetrated by those who met peaceably and constitutionally for the purpose, if possible, of procuring the total extinction of tithes? He would defy him to point out, in all the meetings that had taken place in Ireland, one single instance. He thought that the right hon. baronet, with very bad grace, indeed, had brought a charge of unfairness against his noble friend, for having charged the right hon. Secretary with using the words "extinction of tithes," for the purpose of deluding the people. The right hon. Secretary had certainly used the words "extinction of tithes," and then what did the noble lord charge him with? Why, that after having talked of tithes as a grievance, and declared that they should be abolished, he proceeded to extinguish them by bringing in a Bill to render the payment of them permanent and compulsory. That was what the noble lord complained of, and what he had every right to complain of. When the right hon. gentleman talked in that House of the extinction of tithes, to a people who were anxious for their extinction, what wonder was it that the people should give the words their plain and obvious meaning, without heeding or caring for those explanations which the hon. member had asserted that they were accompanied with? That was the whole amount of the charge of unfairness, but, if there was any unfairness to be complained of, it was the attack which, with such unbecoming taste, the hon. and learned gentleman had thought fit to make upon his noble friend. The hon. and learned gentleman had talked of a rebellion in Ireland—what! a rebellion in which there were no arms? If there was a rebellion in Ireland it certainly was a very extraordinary kind of rebellion, for the people assembled without either musket, bayonet, sword, or pike, and they dispersed wherever a magistrate appeared to declare their assemblages illegal. The people met occasionally in considerable numbers, but their meetings were peaceable and orderly.

Had not the people of Ireland a right to express their

opinions, and to send forward their petitions to that House? Was the right of petition to be withheld from the people of Ireland at the arbitrary caprice of any official underling. Was this interference attempted with the rights of the people of England? Had not the Reformers met in large numbers, and who had attempted to disperse them? When the right hon. Secretary and his colleagues were driven from that bench, and 150,000 Englishmen assembled at Birmingham, who dared to attempt to disperse them? They met without interruption or impediment, because they were Englishmen, and would not permit themselves to be invaded with impunity. Where was the wretched treasury hack, or the paltry scribe, who would have dared to send a circular letter to the magistrates to disperse that meeting, or to tell the people of Birmingham that their meeting was illegal? The people of Birmingham held their glorious meeting. They displayed their power—God bless them for it; and there was no meddling magistrate who had the audacity to read the Riot Act to disperse the meeting, and send the people to their miserable homes, with police running at their tails for fear they would not go fast enough. The people of Birmingham had triumphed, and their triumph was not yet at an end. Its consequences would be felt, and its first and best results would be the security of the constitutional rights of British subjects from insolent and capricious aggression. Let them be assured of it, the Irish Government would have to answer in a Reformed Parliament for daring to interfere with the right of the subject to petition. [*Mr. Stanley smiled.*] The hon. gentleman might sneer, but he would find it to his cost. In the next Parliament they would have the House cleared of two hundred and fifty nominees of peers and borough-mongers; and if he (Mr. O'Connell) had the honour of a seat in that Parliament, he would himself be the person to bring forward the articles of impeachment. To that he pledged himself (*cheers*). Hon. members might cheer, but he was determined that in a Reformed Parliament the right hon. gentleman should be made

to answer for his conduct towards Ireland. Was there ever any such thing heard of as the Irish Government is perpetrating in Ireland?

At the assizes of Wicklow persons had been fined and sentenced to two years' imprisonment for having been present at a meeting alleged to have been illegal. Had they not torn the priest from his altar, the merchant from his counting-house, and the barrister from his circuit, the tradesman from his shop, and the gentleman from his home, in an unholy attempt to put down the Irish mind. Did they not send their thief-takers to the houses of respectable persons, to drag them through the public streets for the purposes of insult, when those persons, who were in a station that was a guarantee for their appearance, would at once have surrendered themselves upon a verbal intimation of its necessity. But he could tell them that they never would succeed in their attempts to extinguish the Irish mind. The people would triumph as they did before. They would persevere in their peaceable but steady course. They would ask the advice of those who had never deceived them. They would disperse whenever a magistrate appeared to pronounce their meetings illegal. They would continue peaceable, quiescent, and imperturbable; but still, nevertheless, they would pay no tithes. Yes, they would pay neither tithes nor Church rates; and the reason was, because they had got no value for either. He had heard it said that the resistance to tithes would end in producing a resistance to rents. He did not believe it. They could not delude the Irish gentry who took part with the people, or detach them from them by such a clumsy artifice. They were too shrewd to be so easily imposed upon. Those who knew the Irish mind required no argument to convince them of the fallacy of such a supposition. The Irish people had strong and ready perceptions. They had a love of justice beyond any people in the world, and they possessed a keen capability of judging what was right and what was wrong. Any man who knew the mind of Ireland intimately, knew that the Irish people could walk on the verge of a volcano with

as much discrimination and as much self-possession as any member of that House could manifest in all the ease, composure, and security of a private chamber. There was no danger of an attack upon that property for which the people received value. The only and the inevitable danger was to that for which they received no value; so that he would make them a present of their silly bugbear. He would now ask the House to consider what were the circumstances attendant upon that meeting that had taken place in the county of Mayo. A gentleman of fortune was in the chair. A magistrate of the county was in the act of moving a resolution to petition this House, when another magistrate stepped forward and pronounced the meeting to be illegal. He was asked why he considered the meeting to be illegal, and he replied, that he had heard that some flags had been used. Was not that a most satisfactory definition of the legality of a meeting—that flags had been made use of? He supposed that it had been declared that the using of flags at a meeting constituted its illegality. This was exactly the Star Chamber addition to the law that was made to sanction the butchery at Manchester, when the Star Chamber sentence was pronounced which consigned the hon. member below him (Mr. Hunt) to an imprisonment of two years and a half, exciting the boiling indignation of every lover of liberty in every part of the empire. That dangerous Star Chamber interpretation of the law was ever found to be the last resource of tyranny, and was always sure to be resorted to whenever oppression and despotic power essayed to abridge the liberty of the subject, to trample on the best privileges of the British citizen, and suspend the Constitution itself. It was the last; and, let him tell the right hon. gentleman opposite, that it would not avail him, for the right hon. gentleman might rest assured that the day would come, and that the day was fast arriving, when he would be put upon his fearful responsibility, and would be made to answer to a Reformed Parliament for his outrageous and unconstitutional conduct towards Ireland. He had said, and he would repeat it, that Star Chamber interpre-

tation of the law and judge-made definition of illegal meetings; whenever it was necessary to suit a particular purpose, was ever the last resource of tyranny; and he had no hesitation in making the right hon. gentleman a present of both. Was there ever such a document issued as this circular of the Irish government to the Irish magistrates? In his opinion it was decidedly insufficient in point of law, for there was no direction to the magistrate to determine the illegality of a meeting by any test, or no direction to act only upon information upon oath. It certainly appeared to him to be a most extraordinary document, and, in his opinion was, as his noble friend said, most vague and indefinite. It told the magistrates to act, but it cautiously avoided giving them any directions to procure any information upon oath, or any sworn evidence of the legality or illegality of the meetings that they might be called on to disperse. He trusted the noble lord would move for the production of this letter, for if not, he would certainly do so in the next Parliament. This letter empowered magistrates to disperse meetings on their own belief of their illegality. It gave to every official in the capacity of magistrate the power of capriciously determining, according to his own fancy, what might be or what might not be an illegal meeting. What other construction could be put upon the letter? No magistrate had the power of dispersing any meeting, or of acting, unless in exceptional cases, without information upon oath. In this case there was no direction to the magistrates to procure information upon oath, and this letter went to violate one of the principles of the British Constitution, which preserved the inviolability of the subject's liberty. It was the very principle of the British Constitution that no magistrate should dare to interfere with the liberty of the subject, or to act without information upon oath. This was a principle religiously preserved and rigidly guarded in England. To act upon his own capricious opinions, let him proceed to violate the liberty of the subject without proper authority by sworn information, and he would have to suffer for it.

But what were the very plain and satisfactory instructions which this letter held out? It is stated to the magistrates that they were called upon to suppress all meetings which appeared to be sudden and preconcerted. Sudden and preconcerted! Was there ever so lucky a definition of illegality. A meeting sudden and also preconcerted! He was sure it was quite impossible that any magistrate could go wrong who happened to be furnished with such lucid instruction. This was the second celebrated letter which the Irish Government had addressed to the Irish magistrates. Indeed the right hon. gentleman had every reason to be proud of his ability in letter-writing. However, he might now congratulate himself that, as his celebrated manifesto was hitherto unparalleled in absurdity, it could not longer boast of that distinction, for it had got another to match with it. What he complained of was, that this capricious interference with the right of the subject should be attempted by any Government. Where was the safeguard with which the boasted Constitution of Great Britain fenced round the right of the subject, if the right of petition could be thus capriciously interfered with? Had he not a right to complain—had not the people of Ireland a right to complain of this arbitrary despotism to which they were surrendered? The meeting in the county of Meath was dispersed without there appearing the least pretence to say that it was likely to produce any breach of the peace, or to create any disturbance. This meeting, thus assembled to petition this House, was arbitrarily dispersed. He would ask, if the right of petition were once taken away, was there not an end to the British Constitution? What guarantee had the subject for his liberty?—what guarantee was there for freedom, for justice, or security, if the inalienable rights of British citizens could be thus wantonly, capriciously, and arbitrarily interfered with? The hon. and learned gentleman who had last addressed the House had talked of legality and illegality, and of rebellion in Ireland. He did not think it necessary to follow the hon. and learned gentleman throughout his observations; but he could not fail to notice some expressions which had fallen from

him. He had talked of violent and intimidating language having been held out at the tithe meetings in Ireland. Now, he would give a challenge to the hon. and learned gentleman, and he defied him to point out, in any authentic Irish newspaper, one single passage of the description. On the contrary, the advice uniformly held out at these meetings was, "Obey the law, procure redress peaceably and constitutionally, take the advice of those who have always advised you wisely, do not commit any breach of the peace, or put yourselves in the power of your enemies; seek redress by the only constitutional means, and in a manner that will prove your anxiety to obtain it. Seek it not by occasional petitions, but by the voice of millions, peaceably expressed before Parliament." This is the advice that was given; and he challenged the hon. and learned gentleman to point out any expressions or any passages different from that. Let the right hon. gentleman be assured that this transaction would not end here. It would be heard of again and again; it would be revived in a Reformed Parliament, and it would never cease to be renewed, until the result of its repeated discussion would be, that the people of Ireland would be as free to meet in any numbers they chose, to exercise the right of petition, as the people of England were at the present moment. When the people of England met in hundreds of thousands, and held their glorious meetings, exhibiting their strength and their combined moral energy, they were not only not dispersed or resisted, but they were cheered and encouraged by that House. Aye, but it might be said that these meetings were not for the purpose of refusing to pay tithes; but he would remind the House, that if they did not refuse to pay tithes, they refused to pay taxes. And why was not it as fair to meet in Ireland to refuse to pay tithes as it was in England to pay taxes. A noble lord opposite of the highest station and character (Lord Milton) had given a noble example to the people of Ireland. That noble lord, in his place in this House, had declared, that he, for one, would not pay taxes until the Reform Bill had passed. That declaration was cheered by the House, and by those hon. members who

usually sit around the right hon. gentleman. Now, he would ask, did the right hon. Secretary for Ireland think he could impose upon him by telling that noble lord that his declaration would produce a combination against rents? The people of England refused to pay taxes. The glorious people of Birmingham declared that they would discontinue to pay taxes until the Reform Bill was passed. As well as the people of England refused to pay taxes, in like manner would the people of Ireland refuse to pay tithes; and they would find no law to compel them to pay tithes. The Quakers did not pay tithes, and they were right. The people of Ireland would not pay tithes—they would commit no violence. Let the right hon. gentleman and his supporters feel assured that they would not put themselves in the power of their enemies. There was no law nor no Star Chamber decision of judges which would say to the people that they must not meet to petition the Legislature. They would continue to meet; if the magistrates came to disperse them, they would quietly disperse, but no attempts to put down the mind of Ireland would prevent the people from coming before Parliament with their complaints. The right hon. gentleman had made many attempts to extinguish public discussion, and suffocate the people of Ireland. He had failed—signally and egregiously failed. There was a recuperative energy in the mind of Ireland which would baffle every attempt to suppress it; and however the right hon. Secretary might lay the flattering unction to his soul, he never would extinguish the public mind of Ireland; and until he had first done that, he would find all his attempts to re-establish tithes in Ireland end in futility and disappointment.

Subject, ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH;

Date, JULY 5, 1833.

Mr. O'Connell said that it was impossible, in his opinion, for the representatives of the people to agree to such an Address.

He thought it was a bloody and brutal Address (*laughter*). Yes, in spite of that laugh, he was sure that it was a bloody Address. It was exactly what he expected—a declaration of civil war; and that declaration would be echoed by many a wail and many a lament throughout Ireland. It was such an Address as this that was put forth to America, when England sent her secretaries there to write her history in blood; but that attempt terminated in the utter disgrace and discomfiture of this country. He repeated, that the Address proposed was bloody, brutal, and unconstitutional; and when he heard the talk in that House as to the deep interest which it felt for the welfare of Ireland; when he heard the gallant officer and the newly-returned member for Leeds speak of the attention which the situation of Ireland would receive in that House, he could not avoid telling them, with indignation, that this brutal Address showed but too plainly what sort of system was intended to be acted on towards that unfortunate country. He called it a brutal Address, for it was nothing else. He had told the right hon. Secretary last session that his measures would increase the evils of Ireland. He prophesied it at that time, and his prophecy had proved to be a true one. He should now beg that the part of his Majesty's Speech at the conclusion of the last session, which related to Ireland, might be read. [The Clerk accordingly read the following passage:—"I have still to lament the continuance of disturbances in Ireland, notwithstanding the vigilance and energy displayed by my Government there in the measures which it has taken to repress them. The laws which have been passed, in conformity with my recommendation at the beginning of the session, with respect to the collection of tithes, are well calculated to lay the foundation of a new system, to the completion of which the attention of Parliament, when it again assembles, will, of course, be directed. To this necessary work my best assistance will be given, by enforcing the execution of the laws, and by promoting the prosperity of a country blessed by Divine Providence with so many natural advantages. As conducive to this object, I must express the

satisfaction which I have felt at the measures adopted for extending generally to my people in that kingdom the benefits of education.”] Mr. O’Connell continued—Here Ireland was described “blessed by Divine Providence with so many natural advantages!” It was, indeed, so blessed. Had Scotland, he would ask, so many advantages? Had even England so many advantages? How, then, did it happen, when they talked of the natural advantages of Ireland, that that country was in so wretched a state? He might be sneered at, but he would assert that there never was so fruitful a country presenting so much misery; there never was, in the history of the world, so poor a people with so rich a Church. How was it that, after seven centuries of oppression, there was still to be a call for blood in that country? If Irishmen had had the conducting of Irish affairs, and the country was found in its present state, then the Parliament of England might have reproached them. But such was not the case. The work of evil was perpetrated by others. It was unnecessary to speak of what the noble lord and hon. gentleman said the Government meant to do for Ireland. If after seven centuries, during which Ireland was subject to this country; if, after that long lapse of time, a territory so blessed by Providence and so cursed by man, was still in a state of wretchedness and misery, he threw the blame on those to whom the Government had been intrusted. He would tell them that their schemes of domination and of oppression could not succeed; and he would say that there was but one remedy for the woes of Ireland, and that was to do justice. He had asked, on a former occasion, why it was that Ireland was plunged into such a wretched situation? but he received no answer. Oh, yes, he did! The noble lord, the member for Devonshire, made a speech at him; the noble lord emptied on him the phial of his wrath; but how did that affect him? He felt it not. He very well knew that there was not a scion of English nobility that did not think himself better than an Irishman; and, because he stated the wrongs of Ireland—because he argued that his country should not be left a spoil to

the right. hon. Secretary, he was sneered at, and even accused as the author of the evils by which his country was weighed down. Was Ireland, he demanded, more peaceable now, after the measures of the right hon. Secretary, than it was at the time to which he alluded? Had not crime increased? Why had it increased? That was the only subject of inquiry originating where it did, and spreading as it had done. These points properly considered would show what sort of care was entertained for the welfare and happiness of Ireland. It was very well to talk of what was meant to be done for that country; but neither he nor those who thought with him would be content with the lip-service and mere professions of any set of men. He asserted that crime had increased. Then came the question, why had it increased? There were two modes in which it had been accounted for. The noble lord accounted for it by saying that it was produced by agitation; and it appeared from the manner in which the statement was cheered, that many gentlemen entertained the same opinion. But the gentlemen on the other side of the House forgot, when they thus expressed their hostility to agitation, that it was only last year that they themselves were reproached with the crime of being agitators. Those gentlemen were told that the people of England wanted no such Reform as these agitators contemplated; that they wanted none of these changes and innovations which ministers proposed and carried; and the charge of agitation was then advanced against them infinitely more strongly than it had ever been directed against him and his friends. So far as he was himself concerned, he treated with contempt this charge of agitation. The question was, whether the increase of crime was caused by agitation or by misgovernment? He would prove that the latter was the cause; crime had not been increased by words but by deeds. This was the question at issue between him and the noble lord.

The noble lord, after having called him "a bird of prey," and after having made use of several similar metaphors, had, in the end, the singular modesty to request his co-operation in supporting certain measures. What co-operation

could be expected from a bird of prey he certainly could not conceive. They had heard much of what was to be done for Ireland. The right hon. Secretary had been for two years in Ireland, and what had he done for that country? What measures had he given notice of to-night? Why, his rodomontade alteration in the Grand Jury Law, which he had introduced the session before last, and another measure for increasing the constabulary force in Ireland. Those were the only projects they had heard of. Now, really, whether he was a bird of prey or an agitator, he did not think it was worth while to call on him for his co-operation with reference to such measures. When the noble lord had done so much for Scotland as he (Mr. O'Connell) had done for Ireland, then perhaps the noble lord would be justified in speaking so confidently. Did the noble lord find his countrymen trampled under foot? Did he raise them by his exertions from that state of degradation? If he had done that, then he might have raised his voice as he had done.

But in the absence of any such claim let him not, whatever his rank and station might be, assail men better than himself. What a curse was it for Ireland, that every popinjay you met in the streets, who was capable of uttering fifteen words, was sure to lard his sentences by sarcasms against Ireland. The terms which the noble lord applied to him he rejected with indignation and scorn. They proved the noble lord's disposition to be injurious, but they proved nothing more. Looking back to his past career, he recollected the time when the reproaches directed against him that night were multiplied tenfold. The epithet, "bird of prey" and other angry expressions were light and idle compared with the reproaches which were cast on him when he agitated the Catholic question. He agitated then efficiently, and the conduct of the King's Government that day would enable him to agitate still more effectively. The Government agitated for him. They were forcing Ireland into a situation from which it could only be relieved by due concession, or by a sanguinary convulsion. In his

opinion, then, the Repeal of the Union was necessary for the preservation of the throne to the King and his successors; it was essentially necessary for the peace and the prosperity of Ireland; and he thanked the Repealers of Ireland for having, by their conduct, raised that question to the dignity and station which it at present held. It was the habit last year to sneer and laugh at that question; in short, to talk of it as a subject which never would be agitated in that House. But now what was the case? All parties in Ireland were nearly reconciled by the conduct of the right hon. Secretary, and all men agreed that the question was one which demanded, and, must have, a public, a distinct, and solemn discussion; and, moreover, that it was a question which was not to be put down by the force of the bayonet, but, if possible, by the moral force of proof, and that he was certain could not be adduced, for those who supported Repeal had right and justice on their side.

He would now return to the original question. It was said that agitation had led to the present state of Ireland. He asserted that those who thus argued were totally wrong. He, on the contrary, would aver that agitation had reduced crime. The history of the country proved it, and it was a great pity that men could not read their own history correctly. If those who opposed his opinion were right, then agitation ought to be put down; but if wrong, then justice should be done to Ireland. He claimed justice, and nothing but justice, for Ireland; but the ministers proclaimed civil war for Ireland; theirs was the system of bayonets and bullets. They called for additional force. In this mode of government there was no ingenuity, no talent, no discovery; for seven hundred years England had governed Ireland in the same way. In the time of Henry VIII., when only a portion of Ireland contained King's subjects; in the time of Elizabeth, when only a part of the Irish were Queen's subjects, the Government was carried on in the same way; and here he could not refrain from remarking that, so very ignorant were Englishmen in general of the

history of the sister country, as it was sometimes styled, that he never yet met the Englishman who knew that it was not until the year 1614, in the reign of James I., that all the inhabitants of Ireland became King's subjects. Having thrown forth this observation, he would next remark that more blood had been shed in Ireland during the administration of the right hon. Secretary than during that of the Earl of Stafford. The peasantry were slain by day—assassinated by night—openly by soldiers and policemen in the day; at night murdered by the wretched outcast from society, the White-boy—a man most commonly converted by misery and oppression into a monster. The wantonness with which life was every day sacrificed in Ireland was appalling. By a late post it appeared that a farmer in Wexford was shot by the police, in passing a river, because he refused to stop in obedience to their mandate. In Mayo, the other day, peasants were shot for looking hard at the police. In the Queen's County, a man was murdered for singing a song which sounded unpleasingly in the ears of the police. And there was the affair at Kanturk. Really this was worth a moment's consideration from the House. Several parishes, it appeared, had assembled for the purpose of peaceably petitioning for relief from tithes. The right hon. gentleman had since put down all meetings consisting of more than one parish. Well, so be it; but, as usual, the police attended this meeting in coloured clothes, and mingled with the peasantry. The soldiers, too, were of course brought to the ground with guns loaded, bayonets fixed, and all things in a state of warlike preparation.

Now, mark—one of these disguised policemen threw a stone at the soldiers. Fortunately, the people did not follow his example, and the military displayed that temper and forbearance which, in the discharge of their arduous and afflicting duties in Ireland, had distinguished them so often. The man was seized—there were seven witnesses to prove that he had thrown the stone; but there was excessive difficulty in getting a magistrate to receive the depositions, and when the bill of indictment

came before the grand jury of the county it was ignored. That was the way in which justice was administered in Ireland. Hear another story :—A party of police went out lately—one of them was drunk. Hearing the approach of his officer he went into a cabin, and said to the man and his wife, “ For God’s sake, hide me ; if my officer sees me in this state I shall be broken.” The people were not in favour of the police, still they could not find it in their hearts to refuse him ; so the woman laid him in the bed with her children. The party of police called several times, asking for their comrade. The woman said she knew nothing about him. At length she took him out of the house, and, as the country thereabouts was rendered dangerous by the frequent eyes of coal-pits, she walked upwards of a mile and a-half with him to put him on a secure road, and carried his gun for him all the time. When she came home, however, she found another party of police in her house. They insisted that she had concealed the policeman, and, finally, seized and handcuffed the man and woman—actually handcuffed her. There was no doubt here ; yet there was no indignation expressed. A Mrs. Deacle was handcuffed, or said to have been handcuffed—he did not mean to say she was not—and that House, and, indeed, all England were thrown into uproar by it ; but the poor woman to whom he alluded was merely an Irishwoman. To proceed : there was some resistance offered by the people who witnessed these things, and there was in consequence another slaughter. He begged to tell the gentlemen of England this question was one of life and death. If they employed additional force—more military and police—they would only have more blood. In the case to which he had alluded, a coroner’s jury brought in a verdict of wilful murder. Now, he accused the right hon. Secretary of being a party to all the slaughter at the other side of the water—to that of Newtownbarry, for example. Here he would take for granted that the yeomanry were right ; so be it ; still it was the right hon. gentleman and the Government that put into the yeomen’s hands those deadly weapons by which men, women, and children were slaughtered. The right hon.

Secretary had turned Lord Anglesey into Tithe Proctor-General for Ireland. The gallant governor and general had made a right glorious campaign; he had conquered parish after parish; he had confiscated the petticoat of the old woman, and the porridge-pot of the young child; he had converted all the barracks into receptacles for tithes—the soldiers into drivers for them; he had scoured the country with cavalry—aye, and marines; and there certainly was no question that wherever he had thought proper to apply force he had been successful. Where, then, was the need of additional force in Ireland? Additional force, he contended, would only be productive of additional crime. He now came back to the question—was crime the offspring of agitation or misgovernment? It was proved by the parliamentary reports, and more especially by the last, that all those crimes were committed by the lowest class of the community, and that there was no connection between them and any feeling of a political nature—nay, more, he would defy any person to point out a time when there was political agitation in Ireland that was not comparatively free from crime. He would give them an instance of this fact. There was no period in which Whiteboyism was more rife in Ireland than in 1821 and 1822. The system had almost assumed the character of actual insurrection; the parties assembled on the hills and committed murders in open day. There was no political agitation at that time. On the accession of George IV., and particularly after his visit to Ireland, relying on his supposed sentiments, the Catholics determined to wait until the monarch expressed his own spontaneous sentiments on the subject of Catholic Emancipation. They, therefore, abstained at that time from agitating the question. In what state was the country then? There were eleven counties proclaimed under the Insurrection Act, and seven more were about to be placed in the same situation. But when the Catholic Association was formed, and when the principle of agitation had been in full force for ten months, then disturbance ceased and every county in Ireland was quieted. That was a positive fact, and he challenged the gentlemen oppo-

site to contradict it. Let those who cheered so loudly when agitation was mentioned as the cause of insubordination, bear this point in mind—that crime was widely extended when there was no agitation, but that it was repressed when agitation prevailed. When he made this statement was he speaking to the deaf adder? Was he addressing himself to men who would not listen; or who, if they did listen, would not take a lesson from the past with respect to the course which they ought to pursue for the future? They might outvote him against Ireland, but they could not shake those truths. He was speaking for Ireland—for unhappy Ireland. They might sneer at or taunt him as the agitator; but, conscious that he was performing a sacred duty, he could laugh at all that now. What became of this argument founded on agitation, when he proved that when they did not agitate multitudes of crime were perpetrated, but when agitation prevailed crime ceased? What was the reason of this? It was because the Irish were a shrewd, a calculating, an observant people. Seven centuries of misgovernment and oppression had taught them to understand the signs of the times; and when they saw any prospect, however remote, of effecting a beneficial change for their country, they seized on it with avidity, and it absorbed every other feeling and sentiment. But why did ministers call for additional force? Had they not already put down every tithe meeting? Had they not dispersed them at the point of the bayonet? Let every reasonable man examine the system which they wished to uphold, and say whether it was a just or fair one. In his parish there were 12,300 and odd inhabitants, of whom seventy-five were Protestants. Now, was it not reasonable that the 12,225 Roman Catholics should resist a system which impoverished them to benefit so miserable a minority? He again contended that increase of crime had followed, and would follow, increase of force. Yet such was the project of this liberal Government. He would say that there never was such a persecuting Government; they had prosecuted the press, the people, and even the priests. They had done nothing to restore

the country to tranquillity. Had Ireland any real grievances was the question which they had to decide. What cared he for their laugh, or their taunt, or their sneer? He boldly avowed, in spite of laugh, taunt, or sneer, that while Ireland had grievances to complain of, he would agitate to redress them. This was what Englishmen did to achieve Reform; and he, pursuing the same course, would agitate as long as he had the power, and found that there was a necessity for such a line of action. An unreformed Parliament had passed two Acts with respect to Ireland which an Algerine Government would not have sanctioned.

A Reformed Parliament, it appeared, would be called upon to pass another to put an end to agitation. But he would tell them that it would be many and many a day before they could frame and carry an Act to effect that object. Almost all the measures adopted with reference to Ireland led more or less to the shedding of blood—the blood of an honest, a religious, a warm-hearted, a good people. More murders were committed in that country than in any other place on the face of the earth. The people here knew little of Ireland. The Whiteboy, driven to wretchedness and desperation, thrown an unwilling outlaw on the common of crime—even his crimes, the offspring of adverse circumstances, could not be advanced as an argument against the general good and virtuous feeling of the Irish people. When that people had so many grounds of complaint, had they not a right to agitate? In the first place, he complained of the magistracy of Ireland. He would suppose that, by conquest or otherwise, the French became masters of this country, and established a religion different from that which accorded with the feeling of the people. The thing, he knew, was impossible, but he used the supposition in order to show more clearly the situation of Ireland. Suppose a magistracy was established here professing a religion different from that of the people at large—armed with arbitrary power—having authority to inflict fine and imprisonment, against the members of which it was hopeless to seek redress—what feelings would such a state of things

generate? In Ireland since the Union, so many forms had been introduced in the law (and they formed some of the blessings which flowed from that measure), that he defied any man, however injured, to maintain an action successfully against a magistrate. He need not weary himself and the House by showing that the magistracy of Ireland was on a bad footing. It was admitted by the noble lord and his colleagues. They had all spoken of the necessity of a revision of the magistracy of Ireland. Even the right hon. baronet the member for Tamworth, had expressed himself in favour of a revision of the magistracy. When application was made to Lord Manners to restore a dismissed magistrate, he observed, "I have made you the best retribution in my power by again placing you in the commission, but the last thing the King said to me when I became Chancellor was, 'My Lord Manners, look particularly to the magistracy.'" A sort of revision took place at the time, and a comical revision it was. A number of magistrates were struck off—all those that had died were struck off—some military officers, not in the country, were struck off—some Roman Catholics were struck off, and several improper persons were struck off. But this did not last. Lord Manners knew nothing of the Irish magistracy, and there was a superior influence at the Castle, by which the old abuses were continued. There was no doubt—the fact could not be denied—that there were a great many improper persons in the commission of the peace in Ireland; the fact was recorded in the evidence of General Burke before a committee of that House. At the time that the present Administration came into power, he and others called for a revision of the magistracy in Ireland. The answer then given to them by the right hon. Secretary opposite was, that six months after the late King's death, the commissions of all the magistrates in Ireland would have to be renewed, and that the Government would then take care that none but proper persons should be put into the commission of the peace. In Ireland that renewal of the commissions of the magistracy had since taken place, and he should like to know what improper person had

been excluded from the commission of the peace there. He could, on the contrary, enumerate instances of several improper persons that had been left in it, and left in it, too, from party motives, and from partisan views and objects. The right hon. gentleman had taken especial care that to such persons the commission of the peace should be continued, while many most respectable, most worthy, and well-qualified individuals were excluded from it in various parts of Ireland. Such was the mode in which the right hon. gentleman governed that unfortunate country. The right hon. gentleman, during his short career in Ireland, had achieved that which had never been accomplished before—he had contrived to make the whole people of Ireland unanimous, for all persons there concurred in considering him most unfit for the government of that country. When Ireland in former times revolted against oppression, Henry VIII. swore lustily that if Ireland would not be governed by the Earl of Kildare, the Earl of Kildare should govern Ireland. Was that the principle now to be enforced? Was that the line of policy that was now to be pursued? Such, at all events, would be the effect of the Address that night submitted for their adoption. The power of the magistracy in Ireland, as regarded the lower classes there, was omnipotent, especially since the introduction of the petty sessions; and they exercised that power with complete impunity. In order to attach responsibility to the exercise of power, you must isolate that power; but the magistrates at the petty sessions in Ireland, by acting together and in a bulk, rendered the exercise of their or otherwise irresponsibly. The publicity of their proceedings established a petty sessions was salutary, but their combination the feeling of it possible for the poor man to obtain redress for the but he used the he might suffer at their hands, and, with the aid situation of Ireland, it was in their power to inflict grievous injuries on the professing power orders in Ireland. They heard a great number of instances that were committed in Ireland, but such rendered it impossible for the justice which or through the means of such Acts of

Parliament as that he had just referred to—they were the wild justice of revenge to which the poor were driven, when all other modes of obtaining redress failed them.

By means of the Trespass Act the magistrates were enabled to determine every right of the poor man—every right of his connected with his land and his property. By means of that Act the magistrates at sessions could even try questions of title. He had known an instance of a man who had a good equitable case—and in a civil bill ejectionment case an equitable was as good as a legal defence—and yet the magistrates fined him £5 as a trespasser. Though the statute said that they should not try rights, yet the effect of their decisions in such cases was actually to try them. He might be told that the poor man, in the instance he had mentioned, had his remedy; that he could get rid of the decision in question by bringing an action; but the expense of such a proceeding rendered that remedy totally unattainable to him. The very cost of a latitat was probably more money than a poor man ever had in his possession at one and the same time in the whole course of his life. In the way he had just stated, the determination of all the rights of the peasantry of Ireland was put into the power of the magistracy of that country. He did not mean to say that all the magistrates in Ireland were open to the accusations which he had thought it his duty to prefer against them as a body; he would not even accuse the majority of them of the malpractices of which he had spoken; but this he would say, that a large class of the magistrates of Ireland, and the most influential among them, too, were swayed by party zeal (the zeal of a party opposed to the mass of the people) and influenced by factious motives in the discharge of their duties. Since the commencement of Lord Anglesey's Administration in Ireland there had been thirty-four stipendiary magistrates acting in that country; of these thirty-four, Lord Anglesey had nominated twenty-six, and in such a country as Ireland, with the large majority of its inhabitants Catholic, especial care was taken that not a single Catholic should be amongst those twenty-six stipendiary magistrates.

There were thirty-two sub-inspectors of police in Ireland; he did not know how many of them had been appointed by the present Administration; but this he did know, that there was not a Catholic amongst them. He would ask them, with such facts before them, could they be surprised at the present situation of Ireland? With such real grievances affecting the people of that country, where was the necessity of attributing its disturbed and discontented state to the efforts of agitators? Before the Parliament was reformed—before the corrupt and borough-mongering House of Commons had been got rid of—many rational and well-disposed men in Ireland, who were equally indignant as the rest of their countrymen at the wrongs and injustice inflicted on their country, refused to join in demanding a Repeal of the Union, saying that they ought to wait to see what the first Reformed Parliament would do for Ireland. Well, they had waited to see what the first Reformed Parliament would do for Ireland, and what would be their feelings when the brutal and the bloody speech which had been that day read found its way to Ireland?

Lord John Russell rose to order. In consequence of the words which had been just used by the hon. and learned gentleman, he, Lord John Russell, rose to request that the hon. and learned gentleman's words should be taken down.

Mr. O'Connell said that if he was out of order in the observations which he had been making, if he was irregular in the words which he had been employing, he would desist from using them. He was determined to give no one an opportunity of acting against him. He would take the noble lord's hint. Strong language was, of course, not justifiable when such topics were under consideration. It ought to be

“ — in bondsman's key,
With bated breath and whispering humbleness,”

that he should speak when speaking of Ireland and her wrongs. It was not a “bloody speech”—oh, no! Did the noble lord object to “brutal,” too?

Lord John Russell said that he did not object to any words which the hon. and learned gentleman might think fit to use respecting the Address which had been proposed in that House, but he did object to the words "bloody speech" being applied to a speech which had been so lately pronounced by his Majesty in person in the other House of Parliament.

Mr. O'Connell said that the noble lord's objection raised a great constitutional question, from trying which he would not shrink; it was a question that concerned one of the most important privileges of Parliament. If he were wrong, he would not persevere in the course he was pursuing; but if he were right, he would not retract a word which he had applied to the Speech, considering it the speech of ministers; for, in doing so, he conceived that he only exercised the constitutional privileges of a member of the British House of Commons. He had spoken of the Speech as the speech of his Majesty's ministers, for as such all King's Speeches had been hitherto, and for obvious constitutional purposes, considered. If he was now to be told that he must speak of it as the Speech of the King, no words regarding it should escape from his mouth but those of the most profound respect for his Majesty's crown and person; but if he was justified in considering it, as such documents had been always hitherto considered, as the Speech of his Majesty's ministers, and for which they alone were responsible, words were not strong enough to express his abhorrence of it.

The Speaker interrupted O'Connell here, and he then continued :—

Mr. O'Connell said that the constitutional question having been decided as he expected, he should, in deference to the admonition of the Speaker, in regard to preserving order in the debates, not proceed further in the course of observations which he had thought it his duty to make upon the ministerial document. He should now proceed to advert to the other grievances of which Ireland had to complain. He would ask the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley), did he think that the Bench of Justice in Ireland was such as to deserve the confidence of the people of that country? Did the right hon. gentleman know

the history of that country, even for the last twenty or thirty years, and the manner in which the judicial situations had been filled up? Did he know that, during that period, the enemies of liberty and the enemies of Ireland were in power, and that it was with their own political supporters and partisans that they filled up the judicial situations in Ireland? Was he aware that persons had been made judges in Ireland for no other reason than because they had voted for the Legislative Union, and with no other qualification to fit them for office? Did he know that during twenty years, promotion at the Irish bar was withheld from any man that signed a petition in favour of Catholic Emancipation? But when the persons which such a system had promoted to the bench retired from it—when Lord Chief Justice Downes, Mr. Baron George, and others of that stamp left it, and when men of business and professional eminence were placed upon it, it was thought by him (Mr. O'Connell) and by others, that justice would at length be properly administered in Ireland. He was sorry to say that such anticipations had not been fulfilled. He was willing to make every allowance; he was not for going too far; but Europe and European civilization should be made aware of the fact, that there existed no confidence in the administration of justice in Ireland. Was it consistent with that unsullied purity which ought to belong to the judicial character, that judges should have their families quartered upon the public purse, and that, as regular as the quarter came round, their applications should be made to the Treasury for payment? His Majesty's present ministers had selected from amongst their most inveterate enemies an individual to fill a judicial situation in Ireland (that of Chief Baron of the Exchequer), and should they be surprised that that learned judge left the bench to go and vote against ministers at one of the late elections? The learned individual to whom he alluded was about as old as the learned judge (Chief Baron O'Grady) whom he succeeded on the bench. He was undoubtedly a man of talent, but of the strongest political feelings; so strong, indeed, that they induced him to go from the judicial bench to vote against the friends of

his Majesty's ministers. They had also appointed Mr. Doherty Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland. It might be said, perhaps, that he (Mr. O'Connell) entertained strong personal feelings against that learned individual. He was sure that no one who knew him would say so; but this he would say of Mr. Chief Justice Doherty, that he had a great deal of common sense, and that he managed himself upon the bench, with only one or two exceptions, much better than any of his brother judges. But, then, Mr. Doherty never had fifteen briefs in any one term during his life; and yet they made him a Chief Justice! He had already glanced at the mode in which judges, and the relations of judges were paid and remunerated in Ireland. The subject was one that he thought was well worthy the consideration of the first Reformed Parliament. It was very well to talk about the independence of judges. It was true that they were independent of fear; but were they independent of hope? They could not take them off the bench, but they might still further reward them; they could not un-judge them, but they might enrich them and their families. Under such circumstances, that House would not be doing justice to the country unless it passed a law (he would not say that such a law was wanted in England, as he did not know the state of things here; but he would assert that it was absolutely essential in Ireland, to restore a confidence in the administration of justice there), enacting that there should be no such mode as that which existed for paying judges. They should not see the Government giving briefs to judges' sons, who had no other clients—they should not see the Government employing a judge's sons and relations, when no other person thought them worthy of employing in the most trivial causes—they should not see judicial independence thus bartered for at the public expense.

There was another branch of the administration of justice in Ireland that he thought the people of Ireland had much to complain of—he meant the jury system in that country. Did they think that the people of Ireland should be content with the jury

system that existed there? The noble lord (Lord Althorpe) had promised him in the last session, that the Government would support the Jury Bill in the House of Lords; but the Government broke their word on that occasion; the promise was not kept. And what was that Bill to give to Ireland? It merely went to extend to Ireland that which had been the law in England for the last seven years. They talked of the Union, and of the benefit it was to Ireland; but why, he would ask, did they refuse it the benefit of the Union in that instance? Why did they not make the same law in Ireland that they made in England? Was he to be told that such a law was not necessary in Ireland—that it was not required there—that the administration of justice in that country was so absolutely pure, that party passions and political feelings interfered so little to corrupt its source or impede its progress, that such a fair mode of selecting a special jury as that of the ballot, which had now been in existence for seven years in England, had not been demanded, on account of the excellent mode of selecting jurors at present practised in Ireland?

But the law of last year, which was indeed a poor boon, for it was not to come into operation for another year, was rejected. Poor, however, as it was, and though the remedy which it would afford was at least but a prospective one, it would, had it been passed, been productive of beneficial effects, for bad jurors would have ceased their malpractices, seeing that the time would be near at hand when they would be responsible to the public for their conduct. But, spite of the promise of the noble lord, that law was thrown out in the House of Lords. He had another object to urge against the jury system in Ireland, as it affected the administration of justice in that country; he alluded to the power which the Crown had of regulating the selection of juries there. He had been himself a living witness of the abuse. He knew of a case where, out of a panel of upwards of eight hundred names, not above twenty could be taken to find the simple fact, that in the instance of a man who had been ridden down by twenty lancers, and who then was taken

prisoner and committed to prison because he had been so ridden down, twenty could not be found, he repeated, to find that in such a case a common assault had been committed. The hon. and learned gentleman then complained of the great power enjoyed by the Crown in the selection of jurors. By the ancient statute law the Crown could peremptorily challenge a juror; but the judges soon arranged this. The Crown could set aside a juror; and in Ireland, at least, this was in practice equivalent to a permanent challenge, because it was the custom, supposing the panel to be exhausted, not to read over the names of those set aside, but to order the sheriff to enlarge the panel. The practice of packing juries on this principle was carried to an amazing extent in Ireland. They all, he said, read with affright of the crimes committed by the peasantry in Ireland; but were they to be astonished at it when they knew of the mode in which justice was administered in that country? Who did they think was the foreman upon the jury in Dublin, who the other day there tried Messrs. Costello and Reynolds for an alleged offence in regard to the tithe system? The foreman was a gentleman who had not very long since figured before a committee of that House—a Mr. Long, a coachmaker in Dublin, a furious partisan of that faction in Ireland which hated the present Government, no doubt, but hated the people still more. He would quote as instances, in corroboration of his arguments of the Crown's challenging jurors, the practice at the late assizes at Mullingar and at Cork. These were, he said, the complaints that he had to make on the part of Ireland. They had no confidence in the Bench there. The juries were selected from the bitter enemies of the country, and the present Government had instituted the greatest number of prosecutions that any Government had ever instituted in that country. He might be accused of agitating Ireland, but the agitation and the discontent of Ireland were to be laid at the door of that Government which had instituted such countless prosecutions, and that had conducted them in a spirit worthy of the Star Chamber itself. Was it not enough

to send the proprietor of the *Waterford Chronicle* to gaol for twelve months, together with the imposition of a pecuniary fine, without sending the printer of that paper, for the same offence, to prison; thus consigning to punishment the man who had only acted as a mechanical agent in disseminating the alleged libel, and who would have been as ready to set up, in the way of his trade, an eulogium upon the Church in Ireland as he had been to set up an attack upon it or upon the Irish Government? Was it just that such a man should have been sent to rot in a prison? It was the Government that had commenced the agitation with regard to the tithe system, by endeavouring to put down the public meetings on that subject. They had endeavoured to do so by a construction of the law of conspiracy that would never have been endured in England. There was, as all good lawyers knew, nothing so doubtful as the law with regard to conspiracy. The words of one of our writers on the subject was that there were few things so doubtful as that portion of the Common Law under which the combination of several persons together became illegal. In fact, the thing was so exceedingly doubtful that it was laid down by the late Lord Ellenborough that nothing but the evidence of something false—false, of some falsehood, would render a combination of the kind illegal. It was true that that decision had been since overturned, for, in this country, the judges made the law, but at all events the circumstance showed that there was nothing more doubtful than the law as it related to conspiracy, seeing that the first judge in the land differed as to what it was; and yet this was the law that the Government of Ireland strained to the most unwarrantable extent to achieve its purposes! Would it be believed that the Government of Ireland preferred under that law indictments against persons for exciting to conspiracy? Would it be credited that the printer of the *Tipperary Free Press* had been arrested three times in the same day, and held to bail for articles “tending to excite to conspiracy?” Conspiracy was itself a constructive crime. The exciting to

conspiracy, the second construction of it, under which the Government indicted, was carrying such a crime far enough, one would think; but the third construction of it, namely—"tending to excite to conspiracy," was carrying to an extent that had never been heard of before, and that assuredly would not have been borne in this country. It was, however, good law enough for Ireland, perhaps, and it was well worthy of the Whig Reforming Government of that country. Another of the evils of which Ireland had to complain, was the Grand Jury system.

They were told that that system was revised, but it was not until it was loudly called for that a remedy was about to be applied to that monstrous evil. They had yet to see whether the remedy to be proposed would be an efficient one. The power possessed of imposing taxes by that self-appointed body was immense—a body, the majority of which generally consisted of the agents of absentees; and it was well known in Ireland that there were good roads in the neighbourhood of grand jurors' residences, while it was generally the reverse elsewhere. The taxation imposed by that body reached the enormous amount of £940,000 a-year, the sixteenth part of the entire landed revenue of Ireland, and 1s. 5d. on the entire rental of the country. It was in the hands of such men—men connected with one party in Ireland—that such enormous power was vested. It was from amongst that body that sheriffs were generally selected; and here he had to remark, that there was but one Catholic sheriff appointed this year. The grievance of the grand jury system as it existed was acknowledged by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley) himself, he having already stated that he had a remedy to propose; it was, therefore, a grievance that could not be attributed to the agitators in that country. The right hon. gentleman, he believed, intended to bring in a Bill to remedy that system, but unless that Bill was founded on the principle of representation, the proposed remedy would be inefficient. He was ready to maintain that no man ought to be taxed, unless through his representatives; and upon such

grounds he would contend that the office of grand juror should be made elective. No doubt they would vote this Address to-night by a large majority, and then, forsooth, they would tell the people of Ireland to look to that Reformed House of Commons for justice and protection. Corporations constituted another great grievance in Ireland. He was sure the right hon. member for Cambridge (Mr. Spring Rice) would not deny the fact—he was sure that he would not deny that they possessed enormous and unjust monopolies. The Reform Bill had, no doubt, done much to remedy the abuses of corporations, but to reach the root of the evil they must go still deeper. The Corporation of Cork, for instance, one of those close corporations, possessed a revenue of upwards of £70,000 a year—a revenue greater than the cost of the general government of the United States of America. The bigotry and intolerance of those corporations were well known. Though Catholics had been for years admissible to them, few had been admitted in Cork, and none had ever been allowed to discharge the duties of any of the officers. The Corporation of Dublin, too, continued a close monopoly, from which Catholics were systematically excluded. They might taunt Catholics with intolerance and bigotry, but he would defy them to produce any instances of either intolerance or bigotry in a Catholic assembly, under a Catholic constitutional Government. True it was, that in Catholic States, where the Church was wedded to the State, the natural offspring were intolerance and exclusion; but under Catholic Liberal Governments, no such intolerance as that exhibited by the Corporation of Dublin was to be found—into which Corporation, though Catholics had been admissible for forty years, not one had been admitted; bigotry thus proving itself superior to law and Parliament. It might be said that it was wasting the public time to talk of corporations; but let it be remembered that corporations elected sheriffs, and in Dublin the sheriffs had the selection of jurors in the Four Courts there, for the trial of the most important cases, civil and criminal. Now, no man was appointed sheriff in Dublin who did not give a pledge to the cause of bigotry by

giving publicly a toast that was considered the watchword and the party pledge of the factious supporters of that cause. He had himself drunk that toast, it was true, and he hoped that it would be universally drunk throughout Ireland. He had drunk it for Repeal, and he was ready to do so again; but the members of the Corporation of Dublin drank it as the shibboleth of a party. He drank it as a pledge for Repeal. He did not, in what he had said, mean to assert that the right hon. gentleman was entirely answerable for the present state of things in Ireland—of course he would not make him answerable for the sins of preceding Governments—but this he would say, that all the crimes which were now being committed in that country must, in justice, be laid at the door of the Whigs. The Whigs had always proved the bitterest enemies of Ireland. It was the Whigs that violated the Treaty of Limerick. The Whigs of the present day were only treading in the steps of the same party which had gone before them. To the Whigs he would say, that, by the course they were now pursuing, they adopted and rendered themselves answerable for all the crimes which might take place in Ireland. Instead of doing justice to that unfortunate country, they were now calling for increased powers to enable them to still further sink it down and oppress it. Let them but do justice to Ireland—let them put down the cry for a repeal of the Union, by showing that it was unnecessary—let them show by deeds and not by words, that they meant well to that wretched country. Why did they not do that? Why did they not propose such measures, instead of calling on the first Reformed Parliament for more bayonets and more guns, for the cannon and the musket in order to crush the people of Ireland to the earth? The next thing he had to complain of was the armed police of Ireland. It might be right that the police there, as in this country, should, for self-defence, possess some species of arms, but was it right that they should go armed with deadly weapons even to fairs and markets? Were they to go about with arms in their hands, with which, when the least resistance was offered to them, they could spread deadly slaughter

around them? Such a police force, so armed, would not be endured in this country. He protested against the principle of arming them with deadly weapons. The Government made them do so, but the result would be, that the slightest resistance—even an accidental opposition—would be punished with death, for the only weapons they had were deadly ones. Why did they not in England, instead of a staff, put into the constable's hands a musket and a bayonet? Why not arm him with a loaded carbine, so that, in case of any resistance, or even accident, which might occur in a crowd, he might inflict death not only upon those who opposed him, but also upon those who happened to come within his reach.

But he was talking to little purpose. He knew how little the Government cared for the blood of the Irish. He knew with what sovereign contempt they listened to those who taunted them on that subject. But he put it to every man of feeling and humanity, whether the constabulary ought to continue armed, so that every offence, instead of imprisonment or capture, should be punished on the spot with death? When the Government put the police thus armed in the way of resistance, they promoted crime. Another was arming the yeomanry. There had been an increase of crime in Ireland since that had taken place; but crime was not yet at its acme. The people still had confidence—they still placed reliance upon those calumniated agitators, who were more anxious than the Government to put down crime. The Government had armed the yeomanry in Ireland, and had increased them from 22,000 to 31,000. He knew what had once happened, and he cautioned the Government that the people of the north of Ireland were to a man armed. The north was the quietest part of Ireland, yet it was a sleeping volcano. There was a tremendous force there, ready to enter into a civil war. The moment that the Government distributed arms the Catholic population thought it necessary to arm themselves for their own protection. The slaughter of the Catholics by the Orangemen had ceased two years ago; but he knew, and said that it would increase on

arming the yeomanry. What was the consequence? The people established penny clubs, and, as soon as five-and-twenty shillings were collected, a musket was purchased. This process of arming was going on to a frightful extent, and a magistrate (he was ready to give his name if necessary) had told him that he had within the last six weeks seen 1,000 of the Catholic peasantry perfectly well armed. What could all the powers of the Government do to prevent this species of arming? What Act of Parliament could they pass that would discover the secret of an Irish peasant? Nothing was so much hated in Ireland as an informer, and no money would induce the people to become such. But the Government would take more power. They would prevent the agitators, who sincerely desired to put down crime. He did not ask them to believe him; they might believe him if they pleased; but he scorned to ask them; they might gag those agitators with Algerine Acts; they might immure them in prisons by a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; they might shed their blood upon the scaffold, but, under that very scaffold, they would see the peasantry of Ireland display those very arms which the Government had been the means of putting into their hands. He warned the Government by the instance which he gave them of the north of Ireland. They might depend upon it that the spirit which prevailed there would pass elsewhere, and the combination of ignorance and crime would be better organized. There would be, not a moral revolution, or a political revolution, but a revolution of the sword in Ireland. In the meantime, the Government was suppressing the legal channels of discussion. The tithe meetings were suppressed, and yet were any of those meetings half or one-third so numerous as the meetings of the Birmingham Political Union? With one exception, he had never heard a word which could be construed as threatening language. But, at all events, whatever interpretations might be put upon words, he defied any man to show a single instance of a breach of the peace, a single assault, or a single person threatened. He defied any man to show him an example of anything of the kind;

and yet the Government suppressed all those meetings. He would ask the hon. gentleman who had seconded this Address, with a degree of modesty which he had always observed to accompany talent, what he thought of suppressing meetings which assembled, too numerous perhaps, for he was not an advocate for too large assemblages of the people—but at which no breach of the peace occurred, and which separated quietly as soon as they had accomplished the object for which they had met? More power the hon. gentleman wanted; but if the hon. gentleman knew as much of Ireland as he did, the hon. gentleman would be a greater agitator than he was. Although he knew it was in many cases absurd to say *post hoc, propter hoc*, yet it was an undoubted fact, that whenever agitation ceased in Ireland crime had extended itself, and that whenever agitation was extended crime had ceased. Some great and crying grievances in Ireland remained to be enumerated. Was the Vestry Cess no grievance? Was it no grievance that seventy-five Protestants in a parish should have the power of punishing by taxation 12,000 Catholics? Was it no grievance that the Catholic inhabitants of a parish ten miles from Waterford, in which Lord Duncannon was the only resident, should be thus treated? Was it no grievance that the vestry might impose upon the Catholic parishioners whatever tax it pleased for the Communion wine and other purposes? He would mention a flagrant instance of this imposition. In the parish of St. Andrew, in Dublin, the Protestant inhabitants voted £300 to the two curates in addition to their salary. This was in direct contradiction of the law, and as no person could appeal against the assessment without giving securities to the amount of £100, two gentlemen gave the necessary securities, and brought forward an appeal, which was tried in the King's Bench, and the assessment was quashed; of course, it would be supposed there would be an end of the matter. No such thing. The costs of resisting the appeal were charged upon the parish; the parish very wisely thought it best to submit quietly to the imposition, and not to contest the matter further. Was that no grievance?

Was there any other country in the world where there would be no redress for it? Before the Government asked for more force let them remedy that evil. Why should the Catholics pay for the sacramental elements and other articles for the worship of the Protestants? Why should they pay for the building and repairs of Protestant churches? There was a parish called Cappalla, in the neighbourhood of Dublin, where there was but one Protestant, and a church was forced upon him in spite of himself, at the expense of the Catholics, although the Protestant presented two petitions to that House, stating that his Catholic neighbours and himself were on excellent terms, and that he had a pew at Maynooth Church, which was near enough, and there was no necessity for a new church. Such were the Acts which his Majesty's Government required additional powers to enforce. Let them first do justice. Why should the Catholics be compelled to pay Protestant clergy? Why should the Catholics be compelled to build Protestant churches?

Before the ascendancy of the Protestants in Ireland there was a superabundance of churches in that country; but the Protestants had sold them, or let them go to ruin; and now they called upon the Catholics to repair the consequences of their neglect and misconduct. Was there any agitation equal to this? Look at the temporalities of the Church, and say if anything could be more monstrous—if any effect of agitation could be so pernicious as this system? The living of the brother-in-law of Earl Grey had been estimated to bring in nearly £30,000 annually; there were nearly 96,000 acres of ground belonging to it. Was this paid by members of the Church of England? No; the Presbyterian and the Catholic-worshippers in a different form—were compelled, by this most monstrous system, to pay this divine. There were 8,000,000 of Catholics, and there were 1,000,000 of Protestants; at least it was said so. Well, there might be 1,000,000, but he did not believe it. Was it to be borne that they were thus to be treated? What he wanted to know was this—was the Church to be cut down? They were agitators, it was said, but their

agitation was of a clear character; it was of a different sort to that which was the real source of the distress and the insubordination, and the what-not. He did not know that it was distinguished by two epaulettes, or by troops to cut down the people. Force was the cry. This had ever been the Government conduct. For forty years, let it be remembered, force had been unceasingly talked of to Scotland; but Scotch broadswords were unsheathed—Scotchmen knew their rights—they rallied—they united—they struggled—and they succeeded. He did not ask for supremacy; he wanted no supremacy then, and if talked of hereafter, he would resist it; but he did strongly contend against the present unfair and harassing system, and insisted on its abolition. The Irish wanted that tithes should be extinguished, as the Government had said they should be. He knew they afterwards added that they did not mean it, but he wanted them to do what they said. He wished to know whether tithes were to continue, or whether any mitigation was to take place? Was it to be a '74 or a ruse? Were the Catholics to continue to pay the bishops and clergy whom they never saw? There was no weapon for agitation like this grievance. The Government treated the Catholics worse than the Turks treated the Greeks. The Turks even, cruel and harsh as they were, despised such oppression towards the Greeks; they never insisted on their support of the Mahometan faith. The ministers, however, of England, were worse than the Turks. He meant to detain the House a little longer on the subject of absenteeism. When speaking of crime, he wished they would look to absenteeism—to the rents that were constantly going out of the country. Would they mitigate that? He would tell them they could not. Did ministers wish to push them on to a servile war; would they compel them, with the devotion of a Falkland, to join criminals because greater criminals were arrayed against them? They called out "force." Why not begin? Why not postpone the threat, and do justice to Ireland; and then, if agitation continued, if insubordination showed itself in midnight plunder and outrage, call

out for "force." Wait for this—try it, and then, if it failed, take the excuse and he would support the cry. He wanted nothing but justice for Ireland, and justice this country had never rendered to her. The speech which had been delivered was a prototype of one in the reign of Elizabeth, when Raleigh slaughtered the garrison of Youghal. The cry for power had ever been the cry of the Government of this country, and under it were committed those English crimes which were written in the blood of Ireland. Stafford, the prototype of the right hon. gentleman, acted no otherwise; he confiscated the property of two entire provinces in Ireland, and when juries refused to convict, he sent them for two years into Dublin Castle. In the reign of James II., 8,000,000 acres of land were forfeited in defending the right of his father. In the present day the same part was acted; the scene was somewhat changed—the actors were different—but their conduct was substantially the same. There was no real amelioration—no change, nor any intended, as was proved in that Address which he had designated as bloody and brutal. What he wanted was, a general committee, that that Address might be duly considered and discussed line by line. If that were really a Reformed House—if justice to Ireland were really their object, they would not refuse it. Justice had not been done to Ireland by the Reform Bill. He strongly doubted if he had acted rightly in supporting so strenuously the English Bill. He had received hints from several quarters upon the subject. But he had supported it, and that unflinchingly. Ireland, in her Bill, was not used anything like so well as England. The blunders were solely attributed to Government. The Duke of Wellington took away the franchise; the ministers found that injustice when they came into office, and they sanctioned it. It was no idle motive which made him anxious to introduce so many of his family into that House. He too well knew the incurable ignorance which there prevailed on the real state and wants of his country, and he was determined to tell them trumpet-tongued to all. The number of Repealers returned would at least give the

Government some insight into the sentiments of the people on that subject. He wanted a committee of that House—he desired that that declaration of war against the people of Ireland should be modified. Let the ministers give them a strong and emphatic declaration of intended justice to Ireland—and if then they applied for force, he would support them. But the speech promised nothing. There were still several points untouched; there were the prosecutions, to which he would not then advert, and twenty other topics on which he could say much, but he would abandon the intention. He knew he spoke in vain—he felt he made appeals which would fall unheeded on their ears. He should now know of what that Reformed House was composed—he should see the high and independent members for England voting for “more power.” It was of no use his pleading before a Reformed Parliament in behalf of Ireland—it was vain to lift up his voice in her cause—for he was sure his answer would be a laugh at himself, and a laugh at his country. Were, then, the grievances of Ireland not real? It was well known they were real, heavy, and intolerable; and if so, was it not the duty of the Government to redress them? He would defy any one who had heard his words—who had taken notice of his statements—to instance one case in which he had exaggerated a grievance; and he would defy any one to find a people, look where he might, who had agitated, or who had been guilty of midnight outrage, of insubordination, and of reckless crime, without real grievances. He had done; he thanked the House for the patience with which they had listened to him—they were the last hope, the last refuge of his country. To them he could only look for relief from the autocracy of the right hon. gentleman; from that *sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione coluntas* to which his country was subjected. Whether Government was to be administered by the right hon. gentleman alone—whether all was to continue to be concentrated in his self-sufficiency—they must decide. Seven centuries of misrule had been endured by Ireland—Government had been carried on on no other plan than that of Tamerlane; and the most outrageous

cruelties had been inflicted on a prostrate people. For himself, he laboured under one calamity—that of a supposed personal hostility to the right hon. gentleman opposite. Had he—could he have—any such feeling towards him? They had never come together, and no such feeling was in existence. Heaven knew that he had no personal motive. There was no pursuit of his in which the right hon. gentleman did, or could, or he presumed, would wish, to impede him. He spoke of him merely as the enemy of Ireland. He looked at the accumulation of crime—at the quantity of blood, increasing as it flowed, in his unhappy country, and he still found that right hon. gentleman, the Lord of the Ascendant, dictating to the ministry the measures to be pursued. These things he wanted altered. He asked for the real grievances of Ireland to be redressed, and then he would go any lengths the ministers might require. The learned gentleman concluded by moving, as an amendment, for a committee of the whole House to consider his Majesty's Speech.

Subject, ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH ;

Date, JULY 11, 1833.

Mr. O'Connell said, that he would not allow any man to dictate to him what his belief was to be. If he had taken the oath in a sense in which the House did not understand it, he ought not to be one of its members; for if he considered the oath to be different to the construction which he put upon it, he would not have taken it at all. He was aware that an oath ought to be taken in the sense of a person administering it, if the words would at all bear out that sense. When, therefore, he had, as a Catholic, suffered twenty years in consequence of his respect for an oath, he could not bear to hear it said that he had taken an oath equivocally, much less that he was one of those who held an oath lightly; and he thought that, if he had been guilty of any unpleasantness the other evening, when an insinuation was thrown out, that any Catholic member voting

for any alteration in the Church Establishment was doing so in violation of the oath he had taken, such unpleasantness was not altogether inexcusable. The interpretation which he had put upon the language of the oath was this—that the Roman Catholics were bound, as were the Protestants also, to support the Church Establishment, so long as it continued to be the law. But, as a legislator, he considered it perfectly competent in him to make any proposition for, or to be any party in altering these laws. That was his understanding of the construction of the oath, and if it was not that of those who administered it, he would not stay there to be taunted as one who would lightly profess the name of God, believing, as he did, that he must answer for his conduct in eternity.

He (Mr. O'Connell) and his colleagues, the representatives for Ireland, had been taunted for not having brought forward the question of the Repeal of the Union; it had been looked upon as a sign of cowardice, and as a proof that they had abandoned the project, to accomplish which they had been returned to Parliament. Did the hon. members who had thus amused themselves, suppose that this hanging back was because they (the representatives of Ireland) had not arguments to support the call for a Repeal of the Union? They were mistaken if they did. But he would ask the House, of what use the bringing forward of that question, or rather of the arguments in support of it, would have been when the very mention of the subject as one of debate was interdicted by the Address, against which he was now protesting. To show, however, that the question had not been abandoned from weakness of argument, he would say a few words to the House on the subject of this Repeal of the Union. The Union itself was but an Act of Parliament, and the repeal of it would be but an Act of the Legislature also. So far the question came under the cognizance of that House. If the question came before them as one of dismemberment, he would be as averse to it as any hon. member could be, for no man could be a more ardent lover of his country and advocate of her welfare than he was; but he need

hardly repeat, that he did not look upon the Repeal as a measure of dismemberment. An hon. member, somewhat too philosophical in his reasoning, had declared, in speaking the other evening on this subject, that there could not be two Parliaments—that there could not be two legislative bodies and one executive; but he (Mr. O'Connell) appealed to the facts, and declared that, with some exceptions, the Parliament of Ireland had practically refuted the hon. member's reasoning. That Parliament had been charged with rottenness; but had it ever been more rotten than the English Parliament, even than the Parliament which had last sat in that House? The object of the ministers in the Address was to put down the discussion of the important question of a Repeal of the Union, and their conduct had been of a piece throughout their political life. Who enacted the Penal Laws? Who prepared the Insurrection Act? The Whigs. When, and when only, was the venerated name of Grattan called into question? When he joined with the Whigs in that same Insurrection Act. But to return to the charge of the keeping back of the question of Repeal. He (Mr. O'Connell) had been told by an hon. member that he had suffered judgment to go by default; but what was the fact? He had commenced the agitation of the Repeal question in 1801, and had advocated it in every place and at every meeting since that period. He continued until he was offered emancipation; but he refused emancipation, unless it was to be followed by a Repeal of the Union. The right hon. member for Tamworth had asked why he did not bring forward the question last year. He had no doubt the right hon. baronet would have been well pleased had he adopted that course, and he should have been as much lauded as the hon. member (Mr. Hunt), whose seat he now occupied, had been lauded on another occasion, when he pursued a course somewhat similar. The excitement in Ireland had continued until the question of Reform began to be agitated in England. We had then been promised a sufficient Bill for Ireland, and a redress of grievances; and on this, much against his own judgment, he consented that agitation should cease. Accordingly, he used what influence he

possessed with his countrymen—and he possessed none which did not appeal to their good sense and good feelings—and agitation was given up. Scotland had a good Reform Bill extended to her; but what was vouchsafed to Ireland? A miserable, insulting, paltry, degrading measure; one that was dastardly and mean, and told the people in what ignominy and contempt they were held by their rulers. The question of the Repeal of the Union was abandoned, or rather left to slumber until the sitting of the Reformed Parliament, in the expectation, as it would appear, of justice being by its efforts done to Ireland. He would, however, tell the House for himself, that he never, for his own part, placed reliance on the promises that were made. He never did really think that justice would be done.

The end had fully justified his forebodings, for he had come over from Ireland with the list of her grievances; he had declared them aloud to that House, and he had been met by the clause in the Address which called for the means to add to those grievances immeasurably. Had the ministers and that House listened to the earnest petitions of Ireland for redress? If they had redressed her grievances, he need not tell the House how they would have been requited by the feelings of the people of Ireland, nor how they would have stood before that country. They would have fixed the waverers and have confirmed the loyal. But as it was, he (Mr. O'Connell) knew not to what extent the feelings of those people would carry them. When he heard the Speech from the Throne he nearly lost his senses, but he was determined not to be shaken or to be turned from his purpose. Not one of his forebodings—not one of his expectations had been denied by that Speech. If they called changing the form in which tithes were to be paid enough to satisfy the nation—if the Church was to be kept up in the same state, with the same staff and the same emoluments, it was but a repetition of the miserable joke of "Joe Miller" about the soldier and the drummer. What did he care—what did it matter—whether they flogged high or flogged low, if they flogged the people of Ireland at all?

He had stated the grievances of Ireland, and called for redress. Redress was denied, and the Repeal of the Union was looked to. There were many men in Ireland, rational thinking men, who had not hitherto joined in the cry; but who, after reading this Speech would do so. Were the people of Ireland so degraded that they would attend to no reasoning, that argument must have no weight, but that they must be checked and put down by the 'witchcraft of unconstitutional warfare? The right hon. Secretary called upon the Repealers for their arguments which were to draw down the fire from it. He thought much might be said in favour of the Repeal; and though he would not enter at length into his own opinions, he would state to the House the opinions which some eminent men had delivered respecting the Union:—

“I cannot forget,” said one, “the unprincipled means by which the Union is promoted. The measure tends to degrade the country, by saying that it is unworthy to govern itself. It is the denial of the rights of nations to a great country, from jealousy of her 'prosperity!’” Who said this? It was no mean authority. It was a Lord Chief Justice of Ireland. He would next prove, by the highest authority that there was no legal right to establish the Union:—“You make the Union binding in law, but you cannot render it obligatory in conscience. Obedience may be enforced as long as England continues powerful, and during the same time resistance will be a question of prudence!” Who said that? No less a man than Mr. Saurin, who was for twenty-five years Attorney-General for Ireland. “I deny,” said another great man, “the competency of Parliament to effect this Union. I warn you, that if you pass an Act for that purpose, no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it. I make this assertion deliberately; and I call upon any man who hears me to take down my words. Yourselves you may extinguish, but the Parliament you cannot. It is enthroned in the hearts of the people, and is as immortal as the island in which it exists. It is as vain for us to think that we can destroy the Legislature of Ireland,

as it is for the frantic maniac, who destroys his body, to imagine that he can extinguish his eternal soul." Who said that? A man who was afterwards Attorney-General, and who is now Lord Chancellor of Ireland. Let hon. members not imagine that the Union was not a subject which rankled in the breast of Irishmen. The Union was brought about by the foulest means ever employed in political jobbing; and he would read to the House a few short sentences in support of this assertion.

"The basest corruption was resorted to, to produce it. All the worst passions of the human breast were set in motion; all the worst acts were employed to bring it about." This was the language of Chief Justice Bushe. He hoped he had now established his proposition by the extracts which he had read. But he was told it was impossible that the Union could be repealed, because another regency question might arise. What weight was there in this objection? Was not the regency question a new one? There was a king insane, his successor of full age; the Ministry opposed the claims of the latter, and the Opposition supported them. It was possible that the Irish Parliament might have taken a different view of the question from the English Parliament; but what great embarrassment and danger would have arisen from that? The king *de facto* of England would necessarily have been the king of Ireland. He had merely alluded to this point in order to show the miserable grounds on which it was attempted to obtain a triumph over him.

Some financial details were introduced into the discussion of last week, and the hon. member for Knaresborough had given the House some admirable specimens of vulgar arithmetic in comparing the Irish imports in 1800 and 1825, with the view of giving the balance in favour of the latter year. If he (Mr. O'Connell) wished to enter into this subject at the present moment, he could show the hon. member that the difference in the official value, between the two periods, amounted to ninety per cent. He could prove that the imports of Ireland

were greater in 1800 than in 1827, whilst those of England were much greater in the latter period than in the former. Take, for instance, six articles, namely, tea, tobacco, rum, brandy, wine, and sugar. In 1790, the value of these articles imported into England amounted to £37,000,000; in 1800, to £47,000,000; and in 1827, to £71,000,000; exhibiting a regular progressive increase. The value of the same articles imported into Ireland in 1790, amounted to £7,000,000; in 1800, under her own Parliament, it was £12,000,000; exhibiting an increase of one-third, whilst in the case of England during the corresponding period the increase was not one-fourth; in 1827, the importations fell back to £9,000,000.

If he were wrong in his facts he hoped hon. members would show that he was. He would yield to the argument, but not to brutal force. If the law be infringed in the prosecution of the question of Repeal, let that infringement be punished, but let no attempts be made to suppress discussion. He would refer to another point on which injustice had been done to Ireland. According to the Treaty of Union, Ireland was to pay only £67,000,000 of the debt. Three years of domestic peace, under a domestic Legislature, would have enabled her to pay off that sum. In 1817, however, the Imperial Parliament passed an Act which repealed the protection that Ireland had derived from the articles of the Union with respect to the debt, and all the lands and industry of Ireland was mortgaged for the payment of the National Debt. And why did they do so? Because they had the power. And what was their justification? Oh, it was irresistible. They were right—"parceque les plus forts ont toujours droit." Therefore, when the present Government spoke of coercing Ireland, there was something in it which might be directed to the sympathies of Englishmen. Their pockets might be touched—a quarter in which they were particularly sensitive. He spoke this in no disrespectful mood towards the English character, which might proudly compete with that of any other nation, but he submitted that what he stated was a

fact which could not be controverted. Well, assuming this as a fact, all he wanted was to be allowed to argue this same question with the people of England. Were they to be coerced because they talked of their own affairs?—because they sought for means to better their own condition, and save that of other people from getting worse? Who, in Scotland, lowered the condition of her people by working almost for nothing? The wretch flung from Ireland. Who filled the factories all over England, and reduced the already too low rate of wages? The outcast of Ireland. Who made the poor-rate so burdensome? The Irish, not casually, but, he confessed it, designedly. Who brought such misery and ruin on the agricultural labourer? The forlorn Irishman, coming even from the wilds of Connaught, a distance of 500 or 600 miles, and slaving for that which an English labourer would turn from with disgust. This was extending day after day to town after town, as it were reproaching England with her injustice to Ireland. What gentleman would introduce a plan for getting rid of this growing curse? There was no remedy but a Repeal of the Union, or, as some persons thought, the enactment of Poor Laws. And when he ventured to express an opinion on this subject, he had been taken to task by the noble lord (Lord Elrington). Now, the noble lord was the last man in the House from whom he should have expected such an attack. And when he heard him reproach him, he (Mr. O'Connell) felt convinced of the absolute necessity of a local Legislature. The hon. gentleman opposite contended that Ireland must be devoted to Poor Laws; but, for the sake of the rich, he resisted them. A Poor Law in Ireland would be a sort of agrarian law. It would be a confiscation of property to every rich man. This system of plunder might, indeed, enable the poor to exist for a couple of years; but what was to follow? there was no need of a reply. When, therefore, he said he resisted poor-laws for the sake of the rich, he did so really for the sake of the poor, for the safety of the State, for the maintenance of civil society. Aye, but they were not going to give Ireland their own system of Poor Laws; the system was to be

changed—to be improved. Yes, but would they first take the trouble to improve their own Poor Laws? They knew right well that they could not be improved. In Ireland, he repeated, they might, by confiscating the property of the rich, maintain the poor for a year or two. Let them, therefore, throw Ireland their admirable Poor Laws; but let them expect first the destruction of the capital of the rich and the employment of the poor; next a regular servile war; and lastly, the ruin of Ireland. And touching agitation—they deprecated agitation—they detested it—they fulminated proclamations, and instituted prosecution after prosecution to put it down. Were they so blind as not to see that agitation would increase a hundred-fold after the passing of the Poor Laws for Ireland? And what had the Government gained by those proclamations and prosecutions from which they promised to refrain? In a letter of my Lord Anglesey's, dated November, 1830, that noble lord declared he would govern by no such means. In January, 1831, he used them. Lord Anglesey possessed, no doubt, all that chivalry which was the glory of a British soldier. All men gave him credit for it, and, at the same time, all men knew that, according to the high code of military honour, the word of a soldier was as binding as the oath of a civilian. And yet, mark the facts. Lord Anglesey had solemnly promised—Lord Anglesey had deliberately broken that promise. He might attempt to equivocate out of the trammels of this charge; but if he did so the attempt would be regarded in the same light as if it occurred in the case of a civilian. It would be treated with contempt.

The noble lord, too, had prosecuted the Press with unexampled fury. For one instance, there was the case of the *Waterford Chronicle*. Not only was the proprietor imprisoned, but the wretched mechanic who printed the paper. Now he would give them a warning. Let them attend to what he said—for he meant it, and he would give them the advantage of a warning. If they assailed the Press, there should be a run for gold. He gave them that notice. He denied that he had

ever hitherto recommended such a course, though the contrary had been asserted—but let them assail the Press, and a run should commence on the Bank. The maxim on which the Government seemed to go was, that the country was to be ruined for its good. The Government was to be feared first before it could be loved. Were they quite sure of this? Were they sure their measures would have the effect of inducing Ireland to fear? Did not they know that there were Irishmen in all quarters of the world, awaiting the calm and happier hour which might permit them to return to their native country; and would not the hateful words of the right hon. Secretary be borne wide as the winds to them wherever they might be? Were they so secure, he would ask, of trampling Ireland under foot? Would English Reformers sanction the Robespierrian atrocities which they meditated? Besides, were they quite tranquil and free from care at home? Had they no starving manufacturers, no unemployed labourers—no unquiet spirits in England? He bade them pause, and consider well before they commenced their system of coercion upon Ireland. Would the Government put forth a proclamation of war, and slaughter, and devastation against the people of Ireland? Were their passions to be roused, and their terrors to be excited for the safety of wives, and daughters, brothers, sons, and husbands, and all their nearest and dearest kindred? There were 100,000 Irish persons in the city of London itself. He was able to prove it. He menaced not—he merely stated facts (*laughter*). He believed, after all, that it was a menace in spite of him. He had detained the House at considerable length. He did not regret it, because it was one day more of liberty for Ireland. He had only to say that there had never been an instance of so deep ingratitude as that of the Reformers of England becoming the persecutors of the Reformers of Ireland.

Subject, COERCION LAWS FOR IRELAND; Date, JULY 18,
1833.

“Though an Irishman—a mere Irishman—the iron of despotism had not so eaten into his soul that he did not bitterly hate slavery and dearly love liberty.” O’Connell was frequently interrupted during this speech.

Mr. O’Connell rose to address the House. Often as he had endeavoured to direct its sympathies towards the wrongs of his country, unhappy, ill-fated Ireland, he never felt so painfully anxious as at that moment. He would most carefully avoid all vehemence of expression—indeed he felt far too deeply to vent his feelings in mere vituperation. He had, on a former occasion, made use of the terms “brutal and sanguinary” in reference to the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne; that Address having since obtained the sanction of that House, he would no longer apply to it the language of reproach. His present object was far other than attempting to characterize by strong language the proceedings of ministers towards Ireland. No; the injuries were so deep that to denounce them in mere abusive language would deprive grief of its dignity. He could wish to address the House in reference to the threatened measures of ministers so as to be known to belong to the country menaced, by his accent. He would speak, as he most certainly should feel it his duty to do, if ministers threatened to deprive the people of England or of Scotland of the benefit of the laws, substituting in their stead the most iron and remorseless despotism. He would speak as he should feel if the liberties of Englishmen were threatened with destruction, as he should feel if outlawry were declared against the whole people of Scotland—as if either were about to be handed over, like his unhappy countrymen, to the tender mercies of two or three English military officers, provided they “have been two years in the service, and have attained the age of twenty-one.” In this comparatively tranquil temper would he address them, hoping to obtain the ear, in pointing out, in their true features,

in all their hideous deformity, the measures with which his country was threatened by the King's ministers—measures to which a freeborn Englishman must feel that death would be preferable, depriving him, as they would, of all the rights of one not born in the veriest slavery. Yes, though an Irishman—a mere Irishman—the iron of despotism had not so eaten into his soul that he did not bitterly hate slavery, and dearly love liberty. As a lover of liberty he denounced the cruelty—the madness—the wickedness—of the policy pursued so long towards Ireland, and which it was now endeavoured to crown by a measure depriving it altogether of the protection of the British laws. He had been taunted by the right hon. Secretary for Ireland and another hon. member, and the taunt had been loudly cheered, with having, by his speeches and writings, instigated meetings in Ireland, from the personal consequences of which he had ever shrunk. Never was their assertion more destitute of foundation in fact, and he had a right to expect that such would be the understanding of the House. All the great anti-tithe meetings were held not only without his suggestion, but when he was actually absent from Ireland. Indeed, were he not absent from Ireland at the time, the more than probability was, that these meetings would not have been held at all, and, so far was he from being the originator of them that he would have undertaken to prove before the Committee of Inquiry, which he demanded the first night of the debate on the Address, that the suggestion of anti-tithe meetings originated wholly and exclusively from a friend of Lord Anglesey, and one who had received many marks of his favour.

Then, as to his shrinking from attending these meetings—no matter whence they had originated—why, the fact was, that he was in this country, fully three hundred miles from the nearest of them; and the Castle circular prohibiting them, after the issue of which not one was held, was in full operation before he left England on his return to Ireland. That showed the truth of the right hon. Secretary's taunt, and he mentioned the facts only as an appeal to the humanity of those who were so ready

with their cheers whenever he was the object of calumny; but enough of self. He had said he wished to invite their attention to the mad and wicked measures of coercion with which they were threatened in his unfortunate country. And, good heavens! what a pretext was put forward by the individual who, in another place, was represented to have originated them. Was there a case made out with even the semblance of plausibility? Were they reasons worthy of a statesman to whom the destinies of a great people were entrusted? Reasons, did he say? Why, the drivellings of old, doating senility—the ravings of antiquated womanhood were more dignified than those gossiping stories so garrulously put forth as reasons for the measure he alluded to. They were told that the ministers stood so well with that House that they could count on a strong majority; so undoubting was the confidence in the uprightness of their intentions that ministers, who had already done so much for Ireland, would not seek for such extraordinary powers but with a view to effecting more good for that country. He could wish to see their claim to despotic power rested on their past doings towards Ireland. Let the House see what they had done. They had proposed two good measures—one of Church Reform, and one respecting corporations. He was ready to admit that, so far as the abolition of the Church Cess went, the first of their measures was a boon to Ireland, but no further; besides that its beneficent operations would be wholly prospective, it relieved no other existing burden connected with the monstrous Church Establishment, and it left the tithe war where it now was—in all its ignominious glory. It was true that he had met the announcement of the measure cheerily; he was not disposed to retract a letter of his approbation of its general tendency; it was too seldom that such opportunities of hailing measures of kindness towards Ireland were afforded him. He repeated, that the abolition of the Vestry Cess would be a boon to Ireland. He would go further, and say, that it would be a boon to a greater extent than the noble lord (Althorpe) himself had stated. The noble lord had valued that cess at from £60,000

to £70,000 per annum; it was more—it was nearer £80,000, and was certainly £70,000. But how could the noble lord, with such a fact staring him in the face, have rated the entire Church property in Ireland, with its thousands of acres, and its rents and its tithes, so low as from £700,000 to £800,000 per annum? What, only ten times more than the Vestry Cess? The supposition was absurd; so much so, that he need only thus point it out to prove its base delusion. But no other burden or grievance would be relieved by the proposed Church Reform, and the war against the poor man's pigs and his tenth potato would not be even suspended by it. Then why, it might be asked, did he the other evening so warmly approve of it? Because it established a good principle—because it admitted what had been so often denied in that House and elsewhere—that the Irish Church Establishment was far too massive and costly for the wants—aye, the spiritual wants of its members—according to the noble lord, at least twice too large. Hitherto the monstrous abuses of that Establishment were bolstered up by the assertion of the spiritual wants of its members—that is, that the tithes and Church cesses and episcopal rentals were justifiably collected, in order to reward those who ministered to those spiritual wants for their labours. But the noble lord's measure recognized an admirable principle, from which he could not shrink—namely, that where there were no spiritual wants there was to be no spiritual receiver of tithes and Church rentals, and he therefore hailed it with satisfaction; indeed, ministers had already acted on that principle themselves: they had kept the vacant bishopric of Waterford just like a dummy hand in whist, not filled up by any actual person, and yet open to an occupant. Of course, the spiritual wants of the bishopric were not very pressing, otherwise they would not thus have made a dummy of it; and, as there were no spiritual wants, of course there was no spiritual administrant to be rewarded. On this excellent principle of no work no pay, the noble lord promised them, then, other dummies in the Irish Church; and thus the property of these ten do-nothings would be available for the purposes

of the State. To say otherwise, and to maintain that the overplus Church property should be applied only to ecclesiastical purposes, was a fantastical assertion which every honest and intelligent man in either country should scout with scorn. Having made the admission of these excellent principles of Church Reform, they might invest their ecclesiastical commissioners with as many forms and injunctions as they pleased; that admission could not be eluded, and the measure would produce much more benefit (and he was anxious that this should be understood elsewhere) than might be apparent on the face of it. But if prospective benefits might arise from the measure, it did not afford any present relief to the distresses of Ireland. Would the wretched peasant have one potato more to eat, or would a day's more employment be given to the starving labourers of the present generation? Was there anything to mitigate existing suffering, or to conciliate towards a Government the affections of a population driven to extremities by its misconduct? He entreated the noble lord to look at the present turbulent state of Ireland.

He would not enter into the measure of Corporate Reform for Ireland, though he was quite ready to give ministers full credit for intended benefits. No man should find him stingy in his praise of anything which would promote his country's good. Before he proceeded further, he thought it but due to the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, to declare that he had heard his declarations the other evening, of regard for Ireland, with heartfelt satisfaction. He gave him full credit for their sincerity; indeed, the right hon. gentleman's expressions were "music to his soul," and he begged the right hon. gentleman to understand, that he should deeply regret if any expression directed against the statesman should have, for a moment, sounded like a want of courtesy to the gentleman. It was also but justice to the right hon. gentleman to mention, that the right hon. gentleman had clearly fixed the responsibility of the policy pursued towards Ireland on the Government of which he was only a member, and that his colleagues were as responsible.

as he was ; indeed, judging by what had since taken place elsewhere, more so. That declaration was but justice to the right hon. gentleman, whom, in future, he would not hold more responsible for the acts of the King's Government than his colleagues. But, to return to the measures of coercion with which ministers threatened Ireland. The House might, perhaps, laugh at what he was about to calmly state concerning those measures, nevertheless he would not hesitate to declare, that he hoped to see the day when the head of the Government who had dared to bring forward such an outrageous violation of all law and justice, would be made to answer for his conduct to the justly indignant Commons of the United Empire. It was for that House, that evening, to tell the minister who had thus insulted a Reformed Parliament, and in a voice, too, that could not be mistaken, that a Reformed Parliament would not sanction the suspension of all law, and would indignantly spurn coercion, where a peaceable and constitutional remedy was practicable. Such was the object he then proposed to himself, for he was much more anxious to elicit the sentiments of the English and Scotch members respecting the proposed despotic policy towards Ireland of ministers than express his own. He had been taunted there and elsewhere with thwarting the views of ministers by premature and uncalled-for objections. He ought to have awaited, it was said, the promulgation of their measures, confident that a Reformed Parliament and an enlightened Press would not sanction any measure of unnecessary severity, and unaccompanied by measures conciliatory and remedial of the grievances of Ireland. He was not angry that he had been thus taunted ; indeed, he hailed it as a pledge that he should be supported on the present occasion. The supporters of the Address had distinctly stated that, by voting for it, they were far from pledging themselves to unconstitutional measures of coercion. No, they were not pledges for drum-head courts-martial, for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, for the Insurrection Act, and the other mild and constitutional measures of conciliation and remedy promised them by ministers.

Those who, in a spirit of loyalty, which, even in its excess, was to be respected, had voted for the Address, did not pledge themselves to the measures of ministers; and if they did not violently oppose the ministers, they, at all events, had then the opportunity of calling upon them to halt in their mad and wicked career, by telling the noble head of the Government that it was not so certain a matter, that the people of England, speaking through their representatives, would aid him in coercing Ireland into a state of utter degradation and slavery. They might tell the noble lord to stay his despotic proceedings, because they were, moreover, quite opposed to the declarations of his colleagues (*No*). No? Pray did the House forget the recent speech of the right hon. Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. S. Rice), when, after proving, in an elaborate speech, that Ireland was the most prosperous and flourishing country in the world, he ended it with the "lame and impotent conclusion" of an admission, that its population was in a state of the utmost poverty and wretchedness? The right hon. gentleman on that occasion taunted him (Mr. O'Connell) with having on former occasions praised the Whigs, and yet now denounced them. But where was the inconsistency? Did it follow, that they should hold up to praise, the feebleness of eighty for the firmness displayed by the same man at forty? Because he had justly praised ministers for their excellent Reform Bill, was he, therefore, not to reproach them for their atrocious policy towards Ireland? The right hon. gentleman taunted him—and that was what he wished to direct the attention of the House to—with having, without any proof or foundation whatever, thus denounced their policy towards Ireland as atrocious, asking him, with a tone of triumph, was such an epithet applicable to men who had not done away with trial by jury in Ireland, or who had not suspended the Habeas Corpus Act? Pray, how would the right hon. gentleman himself answer the questions now? He, a member of the Government, and as such received by the House as expressing its views and intentions, thus a very few days ago told them, that they whose ranks he had joined, were

incapable of such monstrous propositions; and yet, but all in good time, was it, he would ask, fair to the House in ministers, who cheered their right hon. colleague, to thus permit him to deceive the House into a belief that no such coercion was intended? Was there no friendly hand to pull him back when he was thus committing himself and the Government?—no colleague to set the right hon. gentleman right, when he was denouncing him as a calumniator, for charging ministers with designing measures, which the right hon. gentlemen himself must now support?

It was true he (Mr. O'Connell) had more than once taunted the Whigs as the worst enemies of his country, and for doing so had been blamed by the right hon. baronet (Sir Robert Peel) among others, for ripping up old stories of national wrong, the very antiquity of which proved their inapplicability to the present state of public affairs. But he would ask, if he found the deeds of the present rulers of Ireland not only as mischievous and unjust, and as fatal to its welfare as any of by-gone times, while they were supported by falsehood more glaring, were the Whigs of the present day to escape the reproach of the crimes of their predecessors? He owed it to the several hon. and ingenuous persons who, though lovers of liberty themselves, yet respected the character of Whig, to remind the House of the great debt of gratitude which Ireland owed to that party. When he told them that the grossest violation of a solemn compact in history—the violation of the Treaty of Limerick—was the act of the Whigs, those gentlemen might, perhaps, be less ardent in their admiration and less certain in their confidence. Yes, that, the blackest spot in the annals of English rule in Ireland—the violation of the Treaty of Limerick—a black spot yet unwashed, was an eternal record of Whig perfidy. The Irish army in Limerick was numerous, confident, and well equipped, when that treaty, which pledged the Whig King and his Whig ministers to granting equal laws and liberties to his Catholic subjects, was signed. Scarcely was the seal annexed, when a strong French force arrived almost under the walls of

the town. What did the Irish army do under these unexpectedly favourable circumstances? Why, unlike their Whig opponents, men of honour, they had plighted their word; they refused the succour of France; they abided by their treaty. And what was their reward?—the most shameless violation of the treaty, in the first instance, by William himself, and the still more atrocious “No Popery” Acts of the Whigs of the days of the Marlborough victories—the Waterloos of that time, when the Whigs were, not merely strong, they were rampant in power. Those “No Popery” Acts were all violations of the Treaty of Limerick. Well, but all this was obsolete. Be it so; let them come down to modern times, to the very Whigs now in office. In 1807 the Whigs were in office—certainly for a short period; but, short as it was, long enough to inflict irreparable injury on Ireland. They then fabricated the Insurrection Act for Ireland, which was carried into operation by their Tory successors, with the entire assent of its original parents. In most meet sequence with this mild and conciliatory measure, the same party, and almost the very same men, now came forward with a measure, compared with which, in atrocity and despotism, all their preceding acts sunk into insignificance—a measure which unites all the harshest features of all former tyrannies with some peculiarly their own; containing, among its minor provisions, the curfew tyranny of the Normans, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus of the Tory misrule, and their own Insurrection Act and Martial Law, along with the rather novel propositions of unlimited imprisonment, by persons entirely irresponsible to any legal tribunal, with a total abolition of the right of petition, making the chartered right of every British subject a mere dead letter, so that no man in Ireland should in future dare to complain of any grievance, there being no tribunal to appeal to, no Parliament for the oppressed Irish to look to for protection, and the unhappy complainant being liable to imprisonment and loss of freedom, property, and perhaps life, at the suspicion or caprice of the Irish Government. These were parts of the accumulation of favours which the Whigs

were about to confer on Ireland. Now, let it be understood, that if that atrocious measure passed into a law, the people of Ireland would be liable to a loss of property and personal freedom—might be imprisoned at the mere pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant or the Irish Secretary, without any redress whatever, thus imprisoned unjustly for merely meeting together to petition for redress for their grievances! Nay, it depended on the mere caprice of the Irish authorities; and this to religious minds was well worthy of consideration—to pronounce a strictly religious meeting as incurring the censures of this law. But even these provisions were not all; there was one, if possible, still more atrocious behind—he meant the Bill for changing the venue.

SAME DEBATE.

After different interruptions, and some remarks on the suppression of disturbances in Ireland,

Mr. O'Connell continued.—When a country happens to be disturbed, what does the Government usually do? They increase the police force. That may be a very wise and prudent precaution; but it would be much more judicious to increase the military force; for, by increasing the police, you give an influential class a direct interest in promoting disturbance. [The hon. and learned gentleman then read a letter from the Rev. Mr. Fahy, of Tullough, describing the efforts made by spies in the pay of some persons not known to seduce the people from peaceable habits, and prevail upon them to take unlawful oaths.] One of those persons, the letter stated, was arrested, and the peasantry found the greatest difficulty in prevailing on the police to remove him to the county gaol. The acts of the police are arbitrary, and their authority is all-powerful, as may be proved by their conduct in the case of Paddy M'Hugh. His father is suspected by them; they enter the house of the son, a respectable person and a freeholder, a rusty gun-barrel is found, and

the police drag him, without remorse, nine miles from his dwelling, and lodge him in the gaol of Tullough. In this instance, neither the house nor the gun-barrel belonged to the father. No magistrate is consulted; no committal is signed. Why should there? It would be loss of time—unnecessary—the police are all and everything—their authority is sovereign! I remonstrated with them in this case, and promised that I would bring the affair before a Reformed House of Commons, where I could prove that this same prisoner—or rather this victim of police outrage—deserved to be remunerated by the present Government, if it wished to reward those who laboured for the pacification of Ireland. During the reign of Terryaltism, this maltreated individual risked the loss of his life in defending his father, who refused to take unlawful oaths. I could bring before this House many more examples of loyalty given by men who are now to be put under martial law. I am ready to produce, at the bar of this House, evidence that will show whether the coercive measures proposed by Government be expedient or not. And I say to you, when I am prepared with such evidence, can you, ought you, to legislate for a country or a people without the most deliberate inquiry into it and them? What, are the people of a whole country to be outlawed upon the mere *ipse dixit* of a minister? Their crime—see what it is: they interfere with the acts of a bad Government by petitions, and they are guilty of the most heinous of offences—political agitation. Oh, what folly in ministers! They do not wish for a Repeal of the Union, yet nothing shows more of the infallible necessity of that Repeal than their measures. They are contributing more to hasten a Repeal of the Union than all the agitators put together. And why should it not be so? Let us reverse the case. Suppose an Irish Parliament, legislating for the English people, and passing such laws for them as the English Government are now endeavouring to pass for the Irish, what would be the consequence? Birmingham would rise and send her determined thousands to remonstrate at the very doors of the senate-house; Sheffield would instantly give

proofs of the spirit of her inhabitants; and the very stones of London would "rise and mutiny," until the spark that animated them was extinguished in blood. Englishmen would never allow themselves to be debased by such a measure; then why should Irishmen? For my own part, I have been accused of intentions that I never dreamt of; and if I feared calumny I should long since have quitted the arena of politics. I care not how much I am calumniated when the vials of defamation are poured upon me on account of my exertions in behalf of my country. I deserve not calumny, and the English people will see that I do not, when I say, in my justification, if justification in my case be necessary, that I have ever been, and still am, most attached to a British connection. Such an avowal may be turned against me in Ireland, but I risk everything rather than abandon truth. Yes, as long as I saw the utility of the connection—and an immense utility may exist—I should prefer seeing this House doing justice to my countrymen rather than it should be done by a local Legislature. I repeat that this avowal is likely to be turned against me in Ireland, but I adhere to it, for it is my decided opinion. If I thought that the machinery of the present Government would work well for Ireland, there never lived a man more ready to facilitate its movements than I am. The only reason I have for being a Repealer is the injustice of the present Government towards my country. That Government must be unjust so long as it lacks proper and impartial information; and this House must legislate, as it were, hoodwinked, until the necessary inquiries are made by it.

I have been accused of selfish motives when I agitated and cried out for a Repeal. I can be liable to no such agitation now, when I declare that this projected measure of His Majesty's Government is more conducive to a Repeal of the Union than all my agitation, though it were a hundred-fold greater. You may put down meetings, repress associations, smother public harangues; but tell me how can you gag private conversation and private communication, which, when resorted to, must be still more dangerous than open proceedings? The truth is—

and I will out with it—that ministers, in wishing to pass this Act of Parliament, have an afterthought. It is not directed against those who are Repealers, for nothing can be less calculated to prevent Repeal. I'll tell you what it is directed against—and I only tell you what I in my conscience believe—its direction, its real intention, is to enforce the payment of tithes. When this Act of Parliament shall have passed, let any parish resist the payment of tithes, and let a corn-stack or a hay-stack be burned in that parish, by any—the merest—accident, and then will it be seen to what the accident is attributable. Woe to such a parish, and woe to the man in it that dares refuse tithes. For them there will be no other mercy than the tender pity of dragoons and marines. Let the Reformers of England mind what I have just said. They will find the truth of my words—this measure is intended to effect the payment of tithes, and nothing else. When I say this, I know that I am only widening the accusations of selfishness with which I am constantly taunted; but I will again tell my accusers that I solemnly protest against every shade of midnight crime—that I detest and abhor as much, most probably more, than they do, the very mention of murder and blood. I stand here the sincere but humble advocate of my country, and I am most ready to adopt any additional enactment with respect to it, provided it can be shown that such enactment will prevent the crimes complained of—will punish the guilty, without making the innocent suffer. I am for preserving the Constitution, for I wish that ministers would have recourse to no means but constitutional ones; and I offer them—if my profession gives me any superiority over laymen—I repeat, I here publicly offer them, to the full extent, my services and cordial co-operation. I suggest that constitutional law should be adhered to—that criminals, or those supposed to be so, should be brought before a jury of their countrymen, that the judges of the land should try them, and that they should not be subject to the sentence of military officers. For the crimes of a few, why should a whole country be put under martial law? The only

persons the Government have to fear, and the only persons I fear, are Whiteboys and Whitefeet. They, and such as they, are the only portion of the Irish who are enemies to the amelioration of their country. They alone oppose resistance to the execution of the laws; and it is against them alone, and not against the innocent, that severe measures should be directed. It is a calumny—a deep, false, and foul calumny—to dare aver that the political agitators of Ireland are in any way connected with those infringers of the law. I have now, I perceive, trespassed for a long time upon the patience of the House, but I make no apology for having done so, since my voice has been lifted up in the pure cause of freedom and of constitutional liberty. I have a few remarks more to make—a few questions to put to ministers. Why do you want extraordinary measures? Have you not already a watchful and most subservient police? Have you not reporters and shorthand writers in your pay? Do they not attend every meeting? Does not every word that is uttered reach you? Are not all public proceedings detailed in the newspapers? Have you not in your power—at your beck—a ready machinery to detect all that may be libellous and dangerous to you—to put a stop to all that you may object to? Why, then, demand coercive powers? You have juries which try and punish. Ah! but your excuse is, that then there would be witnesses. You want none—you want no witnesses—no juries. Yes, you do; you want those juries which will convict without testimony. I again beseech the House to demand that information be given it. I entreat it not to be biassed or led away by idle tales or by the authority of any set of men—ministers though they should be. I supplicate the House to insist upon a full, ample, and detailed inquiry into Irish affairs; for it is only after such inquiry that crime can be met with punishment—that it can be effectually obviated—and that relief can be afforded to the grievances which exist. But, no; you are called upon to legislate without having obtained any certain and satisfactory information. Will you grant the powers that are asked of you? Will those powers—will mar-

tial law, think you, tend to relieve the peasant or render him more tractable? Will they tend to do away with the evils of absenteeism? Will they make the landlord exact less? Will they render him less grinding?

To these questions I distinctly answer, no. On the contrary, this is the very process—this savagery of legal war, if I may use the expression, is the very way to make the evils complained of increase to the most aggravated height. Let those measures be adopted—let tyranny be exercised, and to the troops of the Government that exercises it will be presented the same image that struck Ludlow when he marched for three days through the now fertile and populous county of Louth—an image of desolation—not a vestige of cultivation—not a trace of human being! But this image will not be confined to one county; it will meet your troops at every step in their progress through the nation. I once more implore Englishmen to have recourse to inquiry, and not to find my countrymen guilty on the strength of the mere assertions of Government. I solicit inquiry; and if the result of it should be unfavourable to us—if Englishmen should think we ought to be governed by such measures as those now proposed, why then I shall be the first to say: Let Ireland submit. She will submit if she be found guilty; for never was a nation so willing to acknowledge her errors, and stoop to the penance that may be imposed for her faults. She has always given proofs of this spirit, though she has been told by Sir John Davis and Lord Redesdale that, with respect to her inhabitants, there was always one law for the poor and another for the rich. In the face of a Reformed Parliament I call upon its English members to justify the expectations that not only the Irish nation but the whole of Europe have in them. I call upon them not to give their sanction to these measures—not to condemn unheard, and confound every civil and political right. Before they act unjustly towards Ireland, I bid them be cautious, and reflect upon the monetary and commercial system of their country. I bid them think upon the powers of Europe. Let injustice be done to

Ireland, and you will see what weight England will have in the congress of nations! Let insurrection and rebellion be created in Ireland, and you will soon see the value of your Three per Cents. upon the Stock Exchange! Be unjust to Ireland, and your measures of economy will go for nought. You must have an increased standing army—you will have thousands of other mercenaries, under various denominations, to support, and the taxation you complain of must be kept up, if not increased. Besides which, you will have its moral consequences—you will be accused in the face of Europe of ingratitude; and it will be said that Ireland hates you, as she ought if you sanction such measures to be passed against her. England, your country, is at this moment powerful, for she is compact, and, as it were, coiled up. If she is so, she owes it in a great part to Irishmen, who aided her in her political agony, saved her from the weakness resulting from the distraction of party; and restored her to the vigour that, when contented, she possesses. I sit down with the hope that the glad tidings will ere long reach my country, that independent Englishmen and Scotchmen will prove, by their resistance to the passing of those measures, that they prefer the inviolability of the Constitution to all other considerations. Their vote upon this occasion will not only preserve the Constitution, but render the union of the two countries durable. I mean if that vote be, as I trust it will be, against the enactment now projected by Government. May they, in the event of their resistance to injustice, ingratitude, and oppression, have their reward. There is one that I can promise them—their names, how uncouth soever their sound, will be re-echoed in the valleys of my country, and, at the mention of them, blessings will be poured upon the heads of those to whom they belong.

Subject, SUPPRESSION OF DISTURBANCES, IRELAND—ADJOURNED
DEBATE; *Date*, MARCH 4, 1833.

The next evil of the Bill is, that it takes away the right of personal freedom. If this Act pass, I assert that personal freedom in Ireland is at an end. Considering the excessive looseness of the framing of the Act, it might be a question with some gentlemen how far its provisions went in this respect; but with me it is no question. However, supposing that there should arise a question on the subject, on a nice comparison of the various provisions of the Act, oh, what a competent tribunal has been selected to decide the matter! Military officers were well qualified to deal with legal niceties. From the moment this Act passes, no man in Ireland will dare to offend a powerful neighbour without having occasion to tremble at the probable consequences; no woman in Ireland—but I will not follow up the subject. Let me call the attention of the House to another fact. It is a sufficient answer to an application for a habeas corpus to show the return under this Act. Its next great feature is, that it takes away the right of complaint. If two men in any part of Ireland talk together of their misfortunes, that will be a meeting under the Act, and the Lord Lieutenant will be able to seize and imprison them. What right of complaint can there be when it is so fettered and manacled? A man may, to be sure, complain to himself—that will be no offence; but what is the use of complaint unless you can pour it into the ear of another? But if you attempt that, you will be at the mercy of the Lord Lieutenant. The Bill, then, takes away trial by jury, personal freedom, the right of complaint; it does more—it annihilates the liberty of the Press. Let me see the person who dare to speak out the truth in a newspaper. If, for instance, a writer should touch on the question of tithes, by the Whiteboy Act any publication tending to excite a combination or conspiracy against the collection of tithes, subjects the writer to prosecution for a transportable

felony or a serious misdemeanour. But by this Act there is left no room for interference. The appearance of a newspaper in a disturbed district is conclusive evidence of its publication there.

Are you not acquainted with the case of the hon. baronet, the member for Westminster, in which it was solemnly decided that dropping a letter into the post-office at Derby was evidence of its publication there? But this Act left no room for construction, because the appearance of the paper was proof of its publication. The next evil feature of the Bill is, that it takes away the right of petition—that right which has always ranked next in importance to trial by jury. Why had the English people superseded one family and placed another on the throne? Was it not to secure trial by jury and the right of petition? Why are we assembled here? Why has a Reformed Parliament been called into existence with so much toil and difficulty? Was it not because the former Parliament were supposed not to listen to the prayers, and from a corrupt regard to their own individual interest, to neglect the petitions of the people? This Reformed Parliament is constituted to attend to the petitions of the people. Will its first Act be to annihilate the very right to petition? No doubt, if meetings are held to laud the character and demeanour of young officers, to hold them up as miracles of discretion, justice, patience, or for any other purpose pleasing to the Lord Lieutenant and the authorities, permission will readily be granted for such; but woe to the man who presumes to ask for redress of grievances. What absurdity to give the very man whose conduct is most liable to become the subject of complaint, a right to quash all complaint! Well, then, this Bill destroys trial by jury, personal freedom, the right of complaint, the liberty of the Press, and the right of petition; all this is done by it. I hope that every gentleman, as he wishes to be able to clear his conduct before his constituents, will weigh this fearful catalogue. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley) shakes his head; but I repeat it, and defy contradiction, that no meeting can be held in

Ireland without the permission of the Lord Lieutenant. Petition! Why, what mode remains to a man but to get up his petition in a coffee-house, to hawk it about from street to street, and beg for signatures? But, Reformers of England, how do you petition with effect? Is it in that manner? Is it not your first object to get a public meeting, to collect and declare the general opinion? As soon as a petition is presented, what is the first question asked in this House? Is it numerously signed? But some one gets up, and says, "that may be; but it is a hole-and-corner petition." Another bad feature in the Bill is, that it expressly cuts off the power of actual discussion and deliberation; it does not prohibit a meeting, because the professed object is something different from the real—that poor defence it has not; its open declaration is, that it was designed to prevent meetings for the *bona fide* object of real petition and complaint. Woe to the man who should dare to hold a meeting, the objects of which were not approved by the Lord Lieutenant! I have now briefly touched on the general features of the Bill; it has been a tedious, irksome, unpleasant duty; but I was bound to make the Reformed Parliament aware of what law it is they are about to pass. In the first place, then, the language of this cruel, ensnaring Act is exceedingly loose; I never met any so utterly untechnical and indefinite in its phraseology. From the high opinion I entertain of the profound knowledge and legal accuracy of the hon. and learned gentleman opposite (the Solicitor-General), I feel a perfect conviction, though I admit grounded on nothing more than that opinion, that the hon. and learned gentleman never saw this Bill. I do not know; but if he has seen it, I confess my astonishment. The looseness of the language is surprising; in the fourteenth section it is declared that "every person charged with any of the offences hereinafter mentioned or referred to, may be, and such persons shall be, summarily tried by courts-martial." Any of the offences hereinafter mentioned! What a specification in so dangerous a statute! The same vagueness prevails in the seventeenth section. But I come

to the twenty-seventh, which takes away personal liberty, by which any person may be arrested, committed, or detained in custody, and the sole return to a writ of habeas corpus is, that the act was done under the Bill. This section further empowers the prisoner to be confined wheresoever his gaoler or keeper pleases. What! the man is not to be imprisoned in the King's gaols, where sheriffs, magistrates, or responsible officers may see him. He may be flung into the black-hole of a barrack, or into its filth-hole (*a laugh*). You smile, but you cannot deny the fact! You might have protection if confined in an ordinary gaol. The sheriff is a responsible officer; the man's relations would have access to him; but, by this inhuman and tyrannic Bill, any place in Ireland, which any one delegated by authority chooses, may be the gaol of the victim of private malice or of Government vengeance. Can I be blamed if my temper does not always exhibit perfect equanimity, when such laws are to be enacted for Ireland? But, is it possible that a Reformed Parliament will grant the power of dragging a man from his home to be imprisoned wherever and however his gaoler pleases? Surely this provision, this admirable clause, can proceed from no other than a distinguished equity lawyer, whose whole life has been devoted to those ennobling studies that purify and soften the heart, and who has equally cultivated the means of discriminating guilt from innocence, and securing the latter from oppression. Some mighty genius certainly was required; for no ordinary intellect could have invented such a section. An honourable member said he would prefer living in Algiers to living in Kilkenny. But this Bill comes from no other meridian than that of Algiers! There are such prisons as I have mentioned in Algiers; in England they were never before heard of. If it be necessary to have a severe Bill enforced, what mischief would it do if common gaols were employed? How does this clause tend to put down crime? The present law gives the power of removing a prisoner from one gaol to another. Is not that sufficient, without giving a military subaltern the power of imprisoning a man where he chooses? And,

mark the terms of the Act; any person authorized under this Bill, whether justice, constable, peace-officer, all commissioned officers in command of any portion of his Majesty's troops, or any person whom the Lord Lieutenant may think fit to empower, can exercise this terrible right, and confine the prisoner wheresoever he pleases.

This Bill is the great triumph of the Tories over the Whigs. When did the former bring in such a measure? When did they dream of it? I bore a political enmity once to the right hon. baronet the member for Tamworth; at one time it deepened into personal hatred; but I was wrong, and I acknowledged it in person. In my political animosity, also, I begin to see cause for regret, when such—I will not say diabolical measures, for words are wasted on them—are introduced by the Whigs. But if such a Bill had been brought in by the Tories, what flaming orations would not the present ministers deliver against it—how they would protest against imprisoning the meanest of the King's subjects. They would declare themselves the protectors of the people; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the honest dignity of his nature, would have openly and fearlessly arraigned this oppressive law. I hope, then, that some things I hear are true, and that there is to be no coalition between such discordant materials. One circumstance I shall notice as an admirable specimen of legislation. The *Dublin Gazette*—of which it is said, if you wish to conceal anything, advertise it in the *Dublin Gazette*—is to be evidence that a district has been proclaimed. The people are charged for publishing illegal notices, and this, I suppose, is to correct their taste in that respect. Now, when the Reform Bill was to be put into execution, it was necessary to post notices on the church and chapel of the parish; but the *Dublin Gazette* is sufficient when the district is to be put under martial law. If the Act was not to be consistent in all its parts, what harm would there be in giving the same notice? To come to the question of courts-martial, I think they will be found ineffectual for their purposes. The army I have no wish to disparage; a braver

body of men I know never existed. The officers also can claim merit, which I am ready to concede to them. Some are men of superior minds, some of plain capacities, and others are not distinguished for any shining talents; but—good, bad, and indifferent—take them altogether, they are the worst judges in the world. The case of Somerville supplies evidence enough on that point. In the course of my professional duties I have met three or four cases in which paymasters were involved, and I saw that the major's party pulled one way and the colonel's party another (*no, no*). I say, yes, yes! Am I to mince the matter—to fritter away my case, when I speak of facts which I have myself witnessed (*name, name*)? I will not mention individual names; but I repeat that officers are not fit to be judges of the land. I say that the gallant officer himself has not been fitted by the course of his education for discharging such duties, and that he has not acquired that delicate discrimination of the motives and characters of witnesses or prosecutors which is necessary to a judge. I cannot adequately express my contempt for courts-martial as tribunals to try the people. Well, then, five or nine ensigns or lieutenants, with one field officer, are to form the court, and the presence of this field officer is the first guarantee of impartiality. There is another precaution, to be sure—the subalterns are to be twenty-one years of age; but, on the other hand, they must be two years in the army, in order to learn that obedience is the first virtue of a soldier. The Reformed Parliament turns the judge out of the box—the judge who had studied human nature for years, by experience had learned to distinguish the clashing diversities of guilt and innocence, and to pour the drop of mercy into the prisoner's scale when it is wavering in doubt. His *viginti annorum lucubrationes* are thrown aside as useless, and he himself is removed to make way for the field officer. If a British subject commits an offence he is tried by twelve jurors, and he may object to any twenty-one on the panel if he only dislikes their countenances; but let an Irishman utter a word against any of the four ensigns! They are to decide the case; they were ordered to come, and

they are there; their business is to obey orders, and the prisoner must be content with them. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley) triumphs; he may well do so. Ireland is his domain; he rules her with uncontrolled power: Woe to the man that will dare to sneer or smile at him: Three ensigns may, under his Bill convict any man; but Ireland has an experience of courts-martial? All their acts certainly were not wicked, but dreadful atrocities were committed by them, the most prominent of which stared out and caught public attention; still, only the grossest were remembered. Need I allude to the notorious case of Grady, who refusing, or, as he said, unable to identify a prisoner, of whose person he had, on a former occasion, given a description, was instantly led out and whipped for this offence? He was called on a second time—a second time he declared his inability, and a second time he was flogged. He was called on a third time—a third time he refused, and a third time he was flogged. Has the House also heard of Sir Edward Crosbie's case? I have mentioned to the House already the case of that unfortunate gentleman, who was tried in 1798, before a court-martial, at which a major of dragoons, a field officer of rank, presided, and has any one ventured to contradict my statement with regard to it? Since I referred to that case I have received a letter from the son of Sir Edward Crosbie, and I am sure the House will, in justice to the writer, as well as in justice to the memory of his respected father, suffer me to read to it a passage from that letter. The writer, after expressing his thanks to me for having brought the case before the House, enclosed to me a letter, written by a nephew of his father in the year 1826, which I shall, with the permission of the House, now read to it.

The hon. and learned gentleman then read the following extract from a letter addressed by the Rev. Archibald Douglas, to Edward Crosbie, Esq., and dated Glebe House, Kilcullen, August 1, 1826:—"I am glad to communicate a fact which came to my knowledge but a few days ago, and which gives decided confirmation of the generally received opinion of your lamented father's innocence; indeed there can be but one

opinion on the murder of your father. Mr. Dundas, who lives near me, was, in the Rebellion of 1798, aide-de-camp to his father, General Dundas, who had the command-in-chief in Ireland. When the report of the court-martial was laid before him, he saw at one glance that the conviction of Sir Edward Crosbie was against justice and truth, unsupported by any evidence; he instantly sent off an express to stop proceedings, and even to release my uncle; but the general who commanded at Carlow anticipated the reprieve he knew must come, and had my dear uncle executed at torchlight, about twenty minutes before the dragoons arrived." Shall I now be called upon, as I have been called upon, to name a court-martial that had grossly abused the powers confided to it? I have stated the instance of two that have done so, and if that will not satisfy the House that such tribunals are liable, under such circumstances, to be perverted into engines of tyranny and oppression, I will, for its satisfaction, mention a third case that occurred during the disturbances in 1798. That case was this:—In one of the southern counties there was an attorney who had privately inherited, and, in the course of his practice, partly acquired considerable landed property; part of this property was subject to a judgment debt to a lady—not an uncommon mode at that time amongst Roman Catholics of providing for their families. The lady had three sons—one of them living as a country gentleman, another at college, and another at school. The attorney was what was denominated a loyal magistrate of 1798. This attorney caused her three sons to be arrested and thrown into gaol. The attorney then wrote to the mother, who, it seemed, had commenced proceedings for recovery of the judgment, to inform her, that unless she immediately released the debt, her three sons should be hanged in Limerick? If the right hon. Secretary would ask the cursitor of the Court of Chancery, he would inform him that the lady was his own mother, that she was thrown into prison, that he also suffered a long imprisonment, during which he was treated with much cruelty, and manacled with irons, sixty-eight pounds in weight.

The court-martial, however, did not take place. From day to day the mother was threatened, but her affection for her son was strong, and her firmness was equal to her affection. She inflexibly refused to yield her rights. I feel great respect for that mother; few would act like her; she was not tried by the court-martial, but was brought up to the assizes and discharged by proclamation; but the following day she was sent back to gaol. Thus you have these features in the Bill—the Habeas Corpus is suspended, offenders may be imprisoned in any place that may be thought proper, all meetings are put an end to, courts-martial are universally instituted; for, let not the right hon. gentleman tell me that they are not universal. I am aware that the right hon. gentleman has denied that this Bill rendered the jurisdiction of courts-martial universal; but I will maintain that it does. There is one section that seems to qualify the power, but there is another and an antecedent section that appears to render it universal; and I beg, as a lawyer, to tell the right hon. gentleman, that a particular affirmative does not diminish the force of a general precedent affirmative. One of the clauses empowers the Lord Lieutenant to send persons charged with offences under this Act to trial before courts-martial; and the House will find, by the seventeenth section of the Act, that there is no limit placed upon the exercise of that power thus intrusted to the Lord Lieutenant. The fourteenth section of the Act runs thus:—“And be it further enacted, that the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, or other person duly authorised by him or them, is and are hereby empowered to order that every person charged with any of the offences hereinafter mentioned or referred to, may be, and such persons shall be summarily tried by and before such court-martial; and the sentence of such court-martial, when duly confirmed by the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland, or by any officer by him or them authorised to convene such court-martial, and to confirm the sentences of such court-martial, shall be carried into execution, and shall have the like effect as if the trial of such offences had been had

before, and the sentences had been passed by any court of oyer and terminer, or general gaol delivery or sessions of the peace." Now, here comes the question that I wish to raise. If the seventeenth section does not specifically define, as it does not, the powers of the Lord Lieutenant, I will affirm that, under the fourteenth section, which I have just read, anyone may be sent by the Lord Lieutenant to be tried before a court-martial for anything, or for any offence which he might have committed in any place, and which the Lord Lieutenant might consider to be a matter that should be adjudicated before such a tribunal.

Mr. Stanley asked across the table, if Mr. O'Connell had read the tenth section.

I have read the tenth section as attentively as the fourteenth. The tenth section certainly does not describe the places where courts-martials shall be held, and I am ready to admit, that under that section courts-martial must be held for the trial of offences within the proclaimed districts; but, then, the fourteenth section empowers the Lord Lieutenant to send any persons for any offences, no matter in what district committed, before such courts-martial for trial; and then comes the seventeenth section, in which it is enacted that persons shall be sent for trial before such courts-martial for offences, whether the offences so charged, having been committed subsequent to the passing of the Act, shall or shall not have been committed before the issuing of any proclamation under this Act. Here, therefore, is a clause with a manifest *ex post facto* operation, and this is one of my great complaints against the Bill. From the moment of the passing of this Act, in a district which, perhaps, is now perfectly tranquil, but which the Lord Lieutenant may proclaim six months hence, individuals will be liable to be dragged before a court-martial, and made to answer for offences alleged to have occurred six months before. I shall not detain the House longer upon this portion of the Bill; but I cannot avoid referring for a few moments to the fifteenth and sixteenth sections of the Act. Under those sections (the objects of which are, perhaps, not very distinct) there is not a single man in England who may not be carried before those courts-martial in

Ireland. For let it be observed, that this Bill is not limited to Ireland; it contains not the usual clause that it "shall be in force in that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland;" it has no such words in it, and, therefore, I do affirm that under the sixteenth section those courts-martial could summon by warrant any one in the British dominions to attend them, and under that section any man in England might be dragged over as a witness to attend those courts-martial in Ireland, and when they had him there they might try him for what they pleased. Oh! there is another feature, which I must not forget. It is for the first time declared in the history of legislation, except in the instances of offences under the excise and the revenue laws, that where a man is charged by an indictment he is not to be considered innocent till he has been proved guilty. I ask how it is such a change is now contemplated? How is it that the first Reformed Parliament can propose to take away this safeguard? Even the Insurrection Act, or the Arms Act, was not equal to this. Under these Acts no man was to be convicted unless it could be proved that he had a guilty knowledge of the possession of arms; but under the present Act, all that is necessary to prove is, that a man has arms in his house, and he must be convicted unless he can do that which is most difficult to prove, that he was ignorant of their being in his possession; so that were they hidden for that purpose by an enemy, the probability is that the man must be convicted. As to signals, also, this Act is most remarkable—all signals by smoke are declared to be illegal. The Bill indeed is as ludicrous as it is atrocious. It is as great a compound of absurdity and atrocity as ever was perpetrated by a Whig Government. What poor man was there whose chimney did not send up daily a signal of smoke, if he had anything to cook for his family's dinner? But here was the absurdity of the Act, that a party of police may see the smoke rising from a poor man's cabin on a hill, which they may fancy to be a signal, and three months after will call on him to take his trial before a court-martial, and call on him to disprove the fact that the smoke is a signal, taking it

for granted that it is a signal unless that fact can be disproved. Reformers of England, I hope, will look to this Bill. You talk about confidence in the Government; and you say that you will pass the Bill on account of your confidence; but I hope you said that, not being aware of what this Bill really is; and I hope, now that you are aware of it, you will feel that it is a Bill which ought not to pass this House. It is a Bill which places innocence in the situation of guilt; which gives the Government the power of throwing us into secret dungeons; which takes away all ability of resistance, and suppresses the power of complaint. I fear I weary the House in describing the Bill, but I feel it to be my duty to do so. And this is the composition to which the noble lord opposite is about to lend his name; this is the Act which is to have his sanction! I ask you whether this Act is to be taken as a proof of the union between England and Ireland? It is, indeed, just such a union as that which some of the tyrants of old instituted between a dead body and a living man, though it not unfrequently happened that the putrescency of the dead body destroyed the life of the other. I beseech the Reformers of England to consider this, and also to consider how it is likely to affect England itself. Let but this Act once take place in Ireland, and let a successful court manœuvre or intrigue throw the power of the State into the hands of some who do not belong to it, and with such an Act in operation in Ireland, schedule A will be revived, and you will have one hundred and fifty members for Ireland ready to back any ministry, however corrupt or despotic. Ministerial machines might soon be put in motion, and ministers might have just as good an unreformed Parliament as you had before. At all events, if they have not, it will not be from want of power or inclination, but from want of dexterity. I ask on what evidence you are about to pass this measure? Such a Bill as this ought to be grounded upon the most irrefragable, complete, and absolute evidence of its necessity. It is not sufficient to talk about confidence. We must not consent to see the Constitution abolished, without the strictest and most irresistible evidence of its necessity. This evidence can-

not be obtained without a painful, deliberate investigation and inquiry. It is not sufficient to prove that there are crimes; we all admit that crimes exist. It is not sufficient to say that crimes must be down; we all admit that crimes ought to be put down. But is it necessary, in order to do this, to annihilate the Constitution? Everybody admits the necessity of putting down crime; but in order to do this, must we put down the Constitution? I shall notice but very briefly the observations of hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side during the course of this debate. I shall refer to the speech of the noble lord, the member for Devonshire; to the speech of the hon. and gallant general; of the hon. and gallant naval captain; of the hon. and learned baronet; of the hon. and learned member for St. Albans; the noble lord, the member for Nottingham; the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth; the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and the right hon. Secretary for Ireland. With regard to the noble lord, the member for Devonshire, the only argument that I could collect from him in favour of this Bill, and the only reason why he would support it, was, because he was friendly to Ireland.

If this be the case, all I can say, and I say it with great sincerity, and unaffectedly, "May God preserve us from our friends!" As to the hon. and gallant general, he did not do much more than describe several conversations which he had with the peasantry in Clare and the north of Ireland; but he also bore testimony to the hospitality with which he was received. All I can do in return is to present my compliments for the manner in which he has thought proper to evince his gratitude. The gallant naval officer stated that he had disported himself by hunting in the county of Kilkenny, and he also spoke in warm terms of Irish hospitality. I must say that I do not think he should have allowed his apprehension to prevail so far as to lead him to utter calumnies against the people of Ireland. ("*No*" from Captain Berkeley.) I say yes (*no*). I say yes, and I tell the gallant captain I can prove it. It seems that, from some apprehensions—I do not use the word in an offensive sense—the gal-

lant captain went about armed. He stated that he followed the example of the gentry. (*Captain Berkeley*—"I did not.") I beg pardon of the gallant captain. I certainly so understood him; but it appears I am mistaken. The hon. and learned baronet (Sir George Grey) favoured us with a dissertation upon agitation, and his reasons for supporting the Bill, and, amongst other things, he commented upon some observations of my hon. and learned friend the member for Tipperary. I think the hon. and learned baronet induces me to become a most incurable Repealer; for when I find a gentleman of his great talents legislating in such utter ignorance of the state of Ireland, I cannot but feel more strongly than ever the necessity for a domestic Legislature. The history of agitation which he gave betrayed the most complete ignorance of the subject. But what I was more particularly surprised at was his ignorance upon a subject more peculiarly connected with his own profession. To a remark respecting the trial of capital felonies by special commissions, he answered as though it was said they should be tried by special juries. It would cause much amusement in Ireland to hear of capital felonies being tried by special juries. The hon. and learned baronet also said that Repeal of the Union was brought in as soon as the Reform Bill came into this House, in order to meet it. There never was a greater mistake—there never was greater proof of ignorance in point of fact. Repeal of the Union was agitated in 1830, when the Tories were in power, and they issued proclamations to put it down. It was agitated in 1831, when the Whigs were in power, before they brought in the Reform Bill, and they also issued proclamations against it. It had been the subject of agitation from the year 1810 to the year 1817, and its postponement was publicly avowed. Indeed, I myself publicly avowed that the question would be postponed till we had gained an equality of civil rights in Ireland. Instead of its being brought up to meet the Reform Bill, it was, in point of fact, suspended by the Reform Bill; and I have little doubt that it would have been totally given up when the Irish Reform Bill was brought

in, had that Bill been equal to the English Reform Bill—had its provisions been framed in a spirit of fairness and equality. So far, therefore, as the hon. and learned baronet is about to legislate on the accuracy of the facts which he stated, he is about to legislate under an erroneous impression. The hon. member for St. Albans declared that his support of the Bill was founded on the intimidation that prevailed in Ireland; and, in proof of that intimidation, referred to the case of the trial of the murderers of the Rev. Mr. Going. I wish very much that an inquiry could be instituted into the trial of that case, as I am sure I could prove that no intimidation did exist, and that a very exaggerated and erroneous impression has gone forth to the world on this subject. The murder of Mr. Going took place about ten years ago, and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that his son-in-law was not a material witness, and that he was not absent through intimidation. What would have been the conduct of the Solicitor-General, or of those who attended to prosecute on behalf of the Crown, if he had been a material witness; more especially if threats were used to prevent his attendance? Why, they would have caused the trial to be postponed, and have detained the prisoners, or at least placed them under strict rule. The hon. gentleman is totally misinformed. The son-in-law was not a material witness, and three or four witnesses were produced. The case was a doubtful case; the judge expressed doubts; the jury gave the prisoners the benefit of the doubt, and acquitted them; the judge approved of the verdict; and nothing ever happened to any of the witnesses who came forward to give evidence against the prisoners. I have great respect for the talents of the hon. member for St. Albans; and when I see a man like him legislating for Ireland under such ignorance of her real state, it adds another circumstance to strengthen the conviction of the necessity for Repeal. I trust, however, that the mistake into which he has been led will not be suffered to operate to the injury of Ireland, but that he will review his opinion, and not take part against Ireland, at least without previous investigation.

As to the noble member for Nottingham, who came forward with much of that diffidence which is frequently to be found united with an excellent character and a mind not altogether unconscious of its own powers, he certainly made a very important statement respecting the state of crime in the county of Carlow. He said there had been 400 crimes in that county within the last two months; but he did not take into consideration that all the assaults which had happened at two contested elections, which were contested with peculiar animosity, were included in that list; and I do not doubt that, at least 200 cases of that description are included in the 400. And what was the proof which he brought forward to show that the sheriff could not obtain a sufficient number of jurors through the intimidation practised—that he was obliged to furnish them with an escort? No; but that he had raised the fine on absence from £20 to £50. I do not see the hon. member for Leeds in his place ("hear" from Mr. Maccauley). I am glad to see that the hon. member is present. He said that he had read many speeches of mine which induced him to vote for this measure. I defy him to produce any authentic production of mine possessing the character that he has attributed to those speeches. He might have read speeches attributed to me in the newspapers, but he has read incorrect reports of them. I will tell the hon. member where to find my speeches. He will find them in the *Dublin Morning Register*, in *The Pilot*, and *Freeman's Journal*, with sufficient accuracy as to the sentiments, without giving the exact phraseology in which those sentiments were delivered. Very probably, the hon. member has read the reports of my speeches in a Government print, and I will just give him a proof of the accuracy of such an authority in Ireland. There is a paper recently established by the Government in Dublin. Connected with that paper there is an individual who informed against me at the period I was prosecuted under the Administration of the Marquis of Wellesley, and with whom I have not exchanged a word since. An accurate report of a speech of mine having been published in that paper, the individual in question, who

was one of the reporters of the paper, rose in my presence in a public meeting, and declared that he would not be responsible for the report as it had been altered by the editor after he gave it in. Such was the conduct of a newspaper in the pay of the Irish Government. If the hon. and learned member wishes to read misstatements as to Ireland, let him look to the *Edinburgh Review*; he will there find calumnies enough in relation to Ireland. There never was a composition containing more falsehood. Let him refer to one article in particular, on the subject of elections in Ireland, and he will undertake to prove it to be full of calumnious assertions and falsehoods on the popular party in Ireland. I will, however, dismiss much of incidental observation and remark, and come at once to the consideration of the measure immediately before the House. The first thing that is said of it is, that it is so unconstitutional—so foreign from every principle of that Constitution which has been so long our boast—so utterly destructive of every principle of civil liberty, as to find particular favour in the eyes of its framers. This, they say, constitutes its great merit, as there is no danger of its ever being brought into a precedent. Ridiculous assertion! It is as a precedent that its greatest danger consists. The courts-martial have already formed a precedent for it, and it, in turn, will form a precedent for future invasions of the Constitution. Hereafter, when a minister brings forward an unconstitutional measure, and when he shall be opposed by those who may call themselves Whigs, he will refer to the measure with triumph, and will say: "You have five judges only; I give nine, and they must be unanimous. I send my prisoners to the common gaols; you to some private and secret dungeon." And when he falls short of you in the slightest degree, instead of blushing for his infraction of the Constitution, he will feel himself entitled to boast of his liberty in bringing forward a measure less arbitrary and despotic than yours. Oh, how I fancy I hear the cheers which will ring from those benches, when he shall taunt the minority with this measure. This Bill goes to the very furthest limits of unconstitutionality, and leaves a wide bound within

which to range. I know that I am wearisome to the House, and what is worse, I have only begun. You have two things to establish the necessity of this Bill as applied to predial agitation, and the necessity of coercion as applied to political agitation. In order to do this, you must first pursue an investigation as to the causes of predial agitation. No man can legislate for the removal of this evil without perfectly understanding the cause. I did expect the right hon. baronet who supported this measure would have given us some statesmanlike dissertation on the cause of its agitation. It was his duty to have done so. He did not, however, think proper to enter into this subject. It has been admitted by some members that tithes are one of the causes. The right hon. gentleman denied this; but the noble lord, the member for Nottingham, who is well acquainted with the state of Ireland, said that Ireland would never be tranquillized until the system of tithes should be put an end to. The Vestry Cess and Grand Jury Cess, the rack-rents, and the conduct of the landlords, have also borne their part. But if these are some of the causes of predial agitation, in what manner does this Act provide a remedy? It gives more power into the hands of the clergy; and do you think they will not use it? It gives more power to the collectors of the cess of various kinds, and gives more power to the landlords; it gives them more dominion over their tenants.

The right hon. baronet spoke of a parliament of landlords, and referred to the improbability of landlords entering heartily into a reform of those abuses. But the right hon. baronet himself has done much, no doubt unintentionally, to increase the distress of Ireland—I mean by the change of the currency. I know that many a family has been ruined by that change—a change which has increased their rent and their burdens, but diminished the value of their commodities, and driven them from comfort to distress, and from distress to the commission of those crimes which this law is to put down. I have often deliberated whether it was not my duty to use my influence for the purpose of driving the Government to a bank restriction and to

a cheaper currency. I have not done so yet. But I am quite convinced that much of the distress which exists cannot possibly be alleviated without a cheaper currency. My hon. colleague has rather unceremoniously introduced the name of the Rev. Mr. Dwyer; that man was proved to be a persecutor and an extortioner. A poor widow obtained a decree against him for exacting too much tithe; she went with a bailiff to enforce the decree, and point out the tithe, and he actually took advantage of an Act passed for very different purposes, summoned her before a bench of magistrates, who fined her £2 under the Wilful Trespass Act, though she was merely seeking to enforce a legal decree. This is a fact which is supported by a letter that I have seen from Mr. Staunton Lambert, late member of this House for the county of Galway, and a most respectable gentleman. It is the duty of ministers to show, before bringing forward a Bill for authorising unconstitutional measures, that all legal means of remedying the evils of which they complained had been exhausted. It is also their duty to show that there exists no other constitutional means, not going beyond the law, which they had not exerted. On this ground, too, I shall be able to show that there exists no necessity for having recourse to the present coercive measures. If his Majesty's ministers, after having used all legal and constitutional means, had applied for any such measures, there is not a single man who would not have been ready to support them. The House would have voted them unanimously. Now some such measures were suggested by the Committee on the Queen's County; and they must have known of their existence and of their efficacy. This is why I arraign them; this is why I accuse them; because they know that there exist effectual means, and because they do not use those means which they have ready; for there is the evidence before the committee of last year. My accusation is, that they have not used the means which have been tried before, and tried successfully. They have never tried special commissions in Ireland in any instance in which they have not been successful. They have tried them also successfully in England.

The report stated that the special commissions in the Queen's County had been eminently successful for the time. His Majesty's ministers ought not, therefore, have recourse to such steps as they now propose, unless they have already tried, without success, those means which have been found successful both in England and Ireland. If we are to be suffocated—if the liberty of Ireland is to be trampled upon—if we are to be taunted as the protectors of crime—let, then, the Reformers in the House require the ministers to show that they have tried all the means which have been suggested in the Report; for whose is this Report? Though the right hon. Secretary, who was a member of that committee, did not attend—I also was a member, and was able to attend only one day—the right hon. Secretary must at least have read the Report. He had the power of exercising his judgment with respect to it. If he had objected to any parts of the Report, would Sir Henry Parnell have made such a Report without carefully listening to his suggestions? The committee tell this House that the Queen's County was quieted by a special commission, and give as their authority the evidence of the Lord Chief Justice, which states that such has always been the case in Ireland; and that of Mr. Barrington, for seventeen years Crown Solicitor on the Munster circuit, the largest in Ireland. A more intelligent, more honourable man, or one more entitled to credit in point of integrity, does not exist among those whom I now address, or one more entitled to the character of a gentleman, and there is none his superior for trustworthiness. I implore the House to hear, before it proceeds, the testimony of this man—that special commissions, whenever they have been tried, have succeeded. That was the case in Cork, Kerry, Limerick, and last of all in Clare. With what face, then, can the ministers pretend that they have not already sufficient powers, when with these powers, such as they are, they have succeeded in quieting that county at a time when it was in a state of actual rebellion—at a time when the peasantry were actually in possession of the county; when they dug up the potatoes, took possession of the tolls on every turn-

pike road in the county, and were, in short, in military possession of the county.

I wish the Reformers in this House to weigh dispassionately the evidence and Report upon the subject, before they venture to give their sanction to the suspension of constitutional law in Ireland. It is proved that special commissions have produced their effect in England and Ireland; and in the name of justice—in the name of the Constitution (and you may sneer)—in the name of liberty, I summon you, Reformers, to call on ministers to retrace their steps, and tell them they ought not to presume to ask for unconstitutional powers until they prove that there exist no constitutional means adequate to the occasion. I differ from the opinions of my hon. friend, the member for the University of Dublin, with respect to the assizes. The assizes have civil business to perform. The special commissions have nothing to look to but the object for which they were sent—the putting a stop to the outrages in the disturbed districts. It has been triumphantly shown that special commissions never were unsuccessful. I can prove that by various extracts from the Report and evidence on the Queen's County; they all show that ministers already possess adequate means for the suppression of disturbance. If a case such as that which I have now made out had been addressed to an impartial jury (I mean nothing offensive), I should be stopped on my evidence, and the jury would have hurled the plaintiff out of court. But the ministers take care not to have recourse to these constitutional methods, because they would not then have it in their power to treat the nation as they please. You have heard their own confession, that they had these means; but they have thought this act preferable, because, by using constitutional means, they would have destroyed the grounds which they had for claiming such measures as the present, and would have disturbed progress to the authority and despotism of this measure. That despotism and that authority which now they claim would not have existed if they at first had recourse to the constitutional expedient of special commissions. I utterly deny that any evi-

dence whatever has been adduced to show the necessity of ulterior measures. The noble lord and the right hon. Secretary have made, it is true, some particular statements. They have mentioned a threatening notice against Parson Dwyer, and I do not know how many Parson Dwyers may be in that red box. The right hon. Secretary told us of a number of lord-lieutenants who had written to him on the disturbed state of their respective portions of Ireland, and urging the adoption of measures of coercion; but he did not mention the names of those lieutenants; so that with respect to us who are called upon to legislate according to their evidence, their evidence is evidently anonymous.

I will tell you a little of the history of some of these illegal notices. In the county of Wicklow, a number of these notices were sent to ladies and their husbands. Among others, one was addressed to the son of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; he could not call him one of the young Hannibals, but the Vicar of Bray, for he was the Vicar of Bray. He possessed something of his father's shrewdness, and observed, I think I know that hand. He set to work, and traced it to a Protestant, a poor Orangeman, who was soliciting a place in the police. Thus the Rev. Mr. Plunkett served to show a little of the nature of these notices. It always happens that, when the number of these notices is great in any district, that district is considered disturbed, and the number of the police is in consequence increased. It is, therefore, the interest of all who are desirous, and have any hopes of being so employed, to make the number of such notices as great as possible. The ground for the adoption of these measures is agrarian crime. But I have stated that, during the last twenty years, special commissions have put a stop to that sort of disturbance. The right hon. gentleman spoke of the murders which had been committed, and mentioned the base assassination of the Rev. Mr. Houston; and he seemed to think that it originated in a private quarrel, in which all were drunk, and that this was a palliation of the murder. I cannot agree with him; the act was equally atrocious, whether it was the

fruit of a private quarrel or of the system of tithes. Who would consider it otherwise? I have thus said enough to prove that the House ought to be satisfied that there exists a necessity for having recourse to unconstitutional measures, and should proceed only on the evidence of the necessity. But, now, I will take up the other side, and demonstrate that the measure is not necessary, on the evidence of members on the other side itself. I am sorry to be obliged by my duty, at this late hour of the night, to trespass on the patience of the House.

I will demonstrate, on their own showing, that the passing of this Bill is not necessary. First, the disturbance is merely local, and confined to particular districts. There is no disturbance in Ulster, or even in Munster, nor is it universal in Leinster. I deny the existence of any in the county Louth. Then it is alleged that there exists a deceitful tranquillity. In Dublin county and in Dublin city there is no disturbance. In Drogheda, in King's County, in the county Longford, and in other counties, the people are tranquil. In Meath several persons were convicted lately of assaulting the police, the persons who so assaulted them being drunk at the time; when the chief of the police observed that, as the people of Meath behaved so peaceably, he thought it would be best for the police to forgive them. Only a small portion of Ireland is actually disturbed—only a population of about 500,000 out of 8,000,000. And is that trifling portion of disturbers to afford sufficient reason for outlawing all the rest? The disturbance is nothing to what it has been in former times: in 1824 it reached to sixteen counties. I would ask the member for the Tower Hamlets, if the Union between England and Ireland be really complete, whether it would be equally just to extend the same measure to England and Wales on account of these particular disturbances? Well, if the extent of the disturbances is small, let the House see what are the grounds the measure is placed upon. In the first place, witnesses, it is said, have been intimidated. The answer is, not one. That has been the answer of the noble lord himself.

[Lord Althorp was understood to deny that statement, and observed that he had referred to the Queen's County.]

Mr. O'Connell—All I can say is, I have taken down the noble lord's words, and that he stated, when reading from a document, that "no witness had been injured." But it was said they had been intimidated; but the House has not heard the name of a single witness who has been injured. Witnesses allege that they have been threatened, for they have a deep interest, as it is the invariable practice in the case of such threats being used, to remove the witness from the abode of wretchedness to a place where he can live in plenty. One instance has been brought forward by the right hon. baronet, which occurred nineteen years ago, of two witnesses, husband and wife, of the name of Delain. The barony of Collaugh was much disturbed, and these persons came forward as witnesses on a Crown prosecution. I defended the prisoners. The husband, Delain, gave a very good and a very consistent account of what he wished the jury to believe to have been the nature of the transaction in question. But his wife, on being subjected to cross-examination, and not having heard her husband's testimony, betrayed the whole plan, although she agreed perfectly with her husband's evidence on all those points which they had settled between them. Baron George said: "Mr. O'Connell, here's a capital indictment. You need not take up the time of the court with it, for no jury could convict in such a case." What was my astonishment when I was informed that the prisoners had, notwithstanding this, been condemned? The Whiteboy Act gives the power of trying an offence of this nature either as a misdemeanour or transportable felony. The same facts had been laid as a misdemeanour, and the four prisoners suffered the full severity upon this conviction. Delain and his wife returned to the country. They were assassinated. The husband and wife were both assassinated; but the child, whom the mother had held as a protection, was taken away and kindly treated. What grounds does that afford for having recourse to any unconstitu-

tional methods? Eight men were executed for that crime. One innocent man was executed, who was proved to have had no other connection with the murder than that he had walked for a short distance along with the murderers before the commission of the act. He had served in the navy, and was returning home. If juries commit these mistakes, with all their inclination to do justice, and judges are anxious to assist the prisoner by every means in their power, what can be expected from the tribunals which it is now proposed to set up, consisting of five military officers, of whom three are to decide the sentence of the criminal to transportation—to the horrible passage by sea, and to the removal from their friends and families. It is evident, therefore, that there is a sufficient protection in the already existing laws for the safety of the subject. Mr. Barrington, who has directed his attention to the point for seventeen years, asserts in his evidence that these crimes uniformly arose from local causes. But I will drop the subject of witnesses. The next point to which I have to allude, is one from which I cannot be shaken. It is that with respect to juries. The assertion that jurors have been injured for the purpose of intimidating others is most unfounded. Nothing can be a greater calumny. The crime which has been alluded to was committed many years ago, and the party was no juror. It was on account of his conduct under the Insurrection Act that he had become obnoxious. If his conduct as a juror had been the objectionable part of his conduct, when acting in that capacity at the special commission the August preceding, the parties to whom he had become obnoxious had opportunities of effecting their purpose before the time of the murder.

As to the subject of the injury done to jurors, we have heard a story of a horse belonging to one of them dying in a ditch; and are these old women's tales, these foolish stories, to be considered sufficient to cause the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, of the trial by jury, and of constitutional liberty? Am I in an English assembly? Can I believe that it is an English House of Commons, which is willing, for one moment, to en-

ertain the idea of doing away with constitutional liberty in Ireland? Am I not sure to stand triumphantly in its defence? If it can be believed that Ireland can ever be enslaved, or that she will ever crouch to any despot, let them send for the Dey of Algiers, who is disengaged. I thank the member for Leeds for the suggestion. I will give up all that I have said, if it can be shown that I am incorrect in these assertions. Do you think that this forbearance with respect to jurors was accidental? Listen to the evidence of Mr. Barrington, on the point. He states that he knew no instance of hostility to jurors on the part of the people. This is the evidence of a man who, for seventeen years, had the best opportunities of judging on the subject, and the business of whose life, during that long period of it, had been to attend to these things. At the same time, his evidence had certainly proved that persons acting under the Insurrection Act had frequently been attacked and suffered injury; but there was not the slightest hostility against jurors. English Reformers, this is the evidence of a man in the confidence of his Majesty's Government. If he be not so, why do they not dismiss him? Why; because all Ireland would laugh them to scorn? He is possessed of that honour and integrity which is deserving of confidence. I do not say so because I can boast of the honour of his friendship, but because he is known to me, and to the public of Ireland in general, as an intelligent and upright man. Think, Reformers, think a moment of the existence of this atrocious measure, and see whether it be fitting that this should be the first Act of the first session of the Reformed Parliament; that Parliament which contains the men who struggled through good report and through evil report; who struggled against hope in the cause of freedom; is it fitting that that Parliament should open with such a measure as this? It depends on the spirit of the patriarchs of Reform to prevent the people of Ireland from being fettered by ministers, on the ground of foolish, false, and I would say lying (if it were not too undignified a word) calumnies. Because jurors dare not, it is alleged, do justice, in consequence of intimidation, it is pro-

posed to abolish trial by jury. It has been argued against a domestic Parliament that, although, indeed, it would restore the absentees, yet they would never equal the generous noblemen and gentlemen of England. Here is the occasion to show their noble-mindedness and generosity,—here it is. I will not believe, I cannot credit that this will ever become law; that they will refuse to yield to argument, that they will allow to be supposed they have no inclination to redress the evils of Ireland—that they will let injustice swelter at the hearts of Irishmen. Think not that they are not an intelligent—that they are not a shrewd people. Think you that they will not see that the law possesses the means of redressing wrongs or crimes committed by law, and that your measures are therefore uncalled for? Think you that they will not remember that you have had special commissions, and, therefore, are not called upon to destroy the Constitution? Think you that they will not recollect that you have no right to pretend that jurors cannot act from intimidation? You cannot say that justice cannot procure convictions; for the Attorney-General himself has stated, that in thirty-nine prosecutions which he instituted, he procured thirty-eight convictions. I defy them to show an instance of failure in obtaining a conviction where that was at all warranted. As to witnesses—it is known that sixty of those who appeared for the Crown were fed and well clothed in a barrack, in Dublin, one of whom having stated he had gone into a shop to purchase something, declared, on his cross-examination, that he did not know who furnished him with the money. The Carrickshaugh trials (nobody could doubt that these were murders) were said to afford an instance of jurors being intimidated. I defended one of the prisoners on that occasion. The matter is of so much importance that I cannot omit this opportunity of mentioning the grounds on which I did so. I defended the prisoner, not because I considered the act not to be murder, but because there was a doubt about his identity. The first Crown witness did not identify him. In that case I can speak from my own knowledge, that no intimidation took place; and the

jury who acquitted the man consisted of seven Protestants and five Catholics.

I can state a number of other cases, to show that juries have not been intimidated. John Ryan was put upon his trial, on the 5th of July; thirty-five of the jurymen were challenged by the Government. The trial came on; a beggar-boy was put forward dressed, not as a beggar-boy, but in such a style that he looked like a little gentleman from Merrion-square. He was interrogated as to the nature of an oath, and found to be so ignorant that he was put down. A man named Ross was indicted; he was proved to be a kind-hearted man, and one quite incapable of committing such an offence as that which was charged against him. He was acquitted, though 132 jurors had been put on, on the part of the Crown, forty-five of whom were Protestant gentlemen. Ross was again indicted, and again acquitted. Was either of these an improper acquittal? Is there a gentleman now present who will say that any one of them was? At the end of the assizes one juror was excused, on the ground that his wife had dreamed that something would happen if he attended. There is no pretence for saying that there had been a failure of justice in the Carrickshaugh case. You do not show that any of the witnesses had been injured, nor any of the jurors, nor that there has been a failure of justice. Why, then, do you claim these extraordinary powers? Instead of looking to special commissions, which would quiet the country, what have you been doing since August last? What, but enforcing your new Tithe Act; going from parish to parish with horse, foot, and artillery, to collect tithes; and turning the Lord Lieutenant of the country into a tithe-protector-general. You say you have not fabricated these insurrections, nor the evidence of them. I believe you are incapable of doing it; but if it was your intention to fabricate evidence, you could not have acted more completely for such a purpose than you have done. You want to get up a case to put his Majesty's subjects in Ireland at your disposal; and what do you do? You avoid the means of putting down the disturb-

ances, and at the same time you stimulate us in what you know is our most sensitive point. That is what you have done—without the intention, perhaps, of exciting us; but seeing what you have done, are you surprised at the result? You may well be surprised, that it is not worse than it is. You have done your best to make it worse. You have done all that it was possible to do. I should like to know, when you talk of these murders by the people, how many of the people have been shot by the police in this tithe campaign; I know that the number is exceedingly great. It was great in Mayo. I should like to have the accounts from Mayo. It was great in the Queen's County. Many have been shot in Kilkenny—many in Waterford—and in Cork multitudes! Four of the last verdicts I knew of before I left Ireland were against police or marines for wilful murder. To show the system of provocation with regard to tithes, I will state the case of Wallstown. There is a statute of 7th George III., c. 21, by which the people are enabled to serve notices on the clergyman, that they will set out tithes by a particular day, in order that he may come and draw them off; and that statute makes it necessary for them to leave the tithes on the land, secured and protected as long as they leave their own crop on the ground. A trick was resorted to by the people. They did preserve the tithes as long as their own crop was on the ground; but they availed themselves of the absence of the clergyman; they kept off his tithe proctors, and having removed their own crops, they destroyed the tithes. The clergyman had his remedy under the 27th of George III., which makes it a penal offence to obstruct a clergyman or impropriator from valuing and setting out any tithes to which he may be entitled; but, not content with that, he would insist upon going upon the land whilst the crops were growing, which no lawyer would pretend to deny was a trespass. Outrages were the consequence. Dr. Fitzgerald, a physician, who had been turned into a stipendiary magistrate, hearing that the people had attacked Archdeacon Cotton's men, applied to the Castle for advice about calling out the military. The case was

laid before the Crown lawyers, and their opinion was, that the question was so doubtful that they would not authorise him to employ the police to protect the valuers under the circumstances I have here stated. This is the evidence of Mr. Fitzgerald before a Committee of the House of Lords, given on the 18th January, 1832. He stated that the matter occurred in August, 1831. Notwithstanding that opinion of the Crown lawyers, the Irish Government sent horse, foot, and artillery. Since August last, while you have avoided special commissions, you have employed the police and military, and at Wallstown no less than four persons were shot. Are you surprised at insurrections after this? Let me be answered on this, and I shall be able to reply. I have been of necessity longer than I anticipated in making these observations; and yet I have not gone through a part of the case which most interests myself, though I would do so, if I could feel an interest stronger in what relates to myself than in what concerns my country.

I care not for personal attacks. If I had not the consolation of knowing that my intentions are pure and disinterested, and that I am anxious only for peace, good order, and freedom—if I had not the comfort of my own feelings in this respect—if my conscience did not approve, not of every expression, perhaps, but of my motives—if I did not feel that my motives are only the warmest wishes for the increase of human happiness and liberty, wherever the slave is oppressed, or the oppressor can be found—if I had not these things to console me, I might feel the attacks that have been made upon me; but, having them, I care not for the taunts of those who

“ See all things clear
With fifteen thousand pounds a-year.”

And who might see otherwise with a different income, or if that income were taken away. But, sir, the wrongs of my country have been mixed up with attacks on me. Why not banish me for a year and a-half? I tell you what, I will consent to it. You shall banish me; but do not thus oppress my country.

What is this Reformed Parliament—the representative of the great and generous people of England—what is it doing? Disguise it as you will, you are legislating against a single individual. I really pity you. You do this because my name is made to rhyme with a line of a miserable ballad. Oh, it was excellent wit—it was superabundant cause of merriment. You may delude yourselves with this, but you will not delude the sensible people of Ireland or of England. They will see that this atrocious Bill of Pains and Penalties is passed against me. There are many men existing who think I am one who say that if you cannot do without such a measure you ought to abdicate. If you cannot govern Ireland without it, it is most necessary that you should abdicate. The advantage of England calls for your abdication. What will become of your national debt and its interest if you oppress us till you drive us into a civil war? Do you think you can preserve Ireland in the teeth of this injustice? You come for these measures; you do not tell us of what effect they will be after you get them. I have shown you that stillness may be produced by the special commissions. If I advise you, it will be said I threaten; if I prophesy, I shall be taunted with provoking what I prophesy. Such is the miserable condition I am in that I cannot tell you of your danger without having it said that I am creating that danger. I abandon giving you advice. I know what is its value; but I avoid giving it. I will say nothing more of the consequences of this measure—of what will be its effect—for take notice you must, that it is not sufficient for you to have shown that, in order to put down the Constitution. If the special commissions are to be at an end—if murder is still going on—still you are not warranted in trampling on the Constitution; you must show that by doing so you can cure the evil. You must not pass such a measure merely to gratify your own idleness, to enable yourselves to sleep in your beds of down. You must show that what you propose is a cure for the evils you have been talking of. You cannot show it. The measure may produce temporary tranquillity, but it will be followed by

greater rancour. Now, poverty struggling to maintain a miserable existence—then, both judgment and reason entering into the contest, and fortifying the despair of distress. Labour in Ireland has, at present, no certainty of hire, nor any reward. It does not get a bounty of 6*d.*, nor 2*d.* a-day out of land producing £4 an acre on green lands, and sometimes £8 an acre for potato land; and yet this is all that the miserable wretch who cultivates them has to subsist on. These are the evils; and then the tithes! Did not one noble lord tell you that, unless you abolished tithes, this measure would not be sufficient? There is not an individual of more honour or honesty in this kingdom than the noble lord the member for Nottingham. I know that he is opposed to opinions that I hold to be most true; but he is so conscientiously; he is a man of high mind; he is a member, too, of the Government; and what does he say? That you must abolish tithes. The right hon. gentleman does not agree with those opinions; he would flog not high but low. The noble lord tells him that, until you change the destination of tithes, till you take them from a hostile and unnecessary clergy, you gain nothing. What will your bill do without this? It will make the breach more wide; it will make young men cry out for justice, and make the old exclaim that manly vigour is gone, and the country is no longer able to vindicate its rights. Why do you deal with us thus? For your own sake I would impress it on you—it is for your own benefit that I give this advice. What were the grievances of America when she left you? Had you dared to trample on her as you have trampled on Ireland; yet you did enough to make the Americans separate themselves. You spurned their petitions—you taunted their messenger, Franklin. I will not venture to compare myself with him. You accused him of being the forger of a letter, which was as genuine as the heart of the man was true. You sent him from your House with insult; and what was the result? There was no party in that country, as in Ireland, clinging to some measure of despotism, and supporting you in it, with a view to ruin your

character and give itself strength; and so, the people being united, they successfully resisted you. But, do you think you have a party in Ireland which will assist you in your undertaking? By whom, I ask you, will you execute this measure? By the Orange party—by that magistracy which every ministry has promised to reform and correct—by that magistracy whom the right hon. gentleman instructed Lord Manners to revise, and who would have been reformed, but that, by the influence of a member of the Government, the bad men were restored again to power?

This is the effect of the evidence of General Burke—they are, in fact, the instruments named in this Bill—they will be the agents, the hosts, the entertainers of those who are to execute this offspring of the spirit of their party. Lord Cloncurry—what does he say of them? He says he has known the debtor magistrate transport his creditor. That is the administration of justice in Ireland. I have not heard it—it is no idle rumour—I have known it; I have known, too, the admirer of female beauty transporting the father or the brother of the female! These are not the only instances of abuses under the Insurrection Act. Are these the men to whom you will again give such power?—is that the intention of this Reformed Parliament? If you do not give them the power, but suppress the Orange lodges, as you will suppress the Political Unions—if, in truth, you act impartially, they will be against you to a man. You must bring them to your bosoms, or this will be the consequence. I know that others know it—one especially whom, though he differs from me in religion, I respect most sincerely for his honesty and for his talents. If you will not rule by them, they will not act with you. You may execute your measure, and what will it produce? The tranquillity of the grave—a death-like silence, and a dreary repose; but not peace—not quiet—not confidence. You may bury ashes, but they will not burn again: you may sow dragon's teeth—take care they do not raise armed men. I say that, in the first place, you have not made out a sufficient case to justify you in calling for this measure. In the second you have not

shown that this is the proper remedy for the evils of which you complain. In the third, you have given nothing like legal evidence for the measure. In the fourth, you have not shown, that one witness or one juror has been injured since the special commission in the Queen's County. As to the danger to the witnesses, the county of Clare was quieted by two special commissions. Witnesses were examined before the judges—where are those witnesses? In thatched cottages in the very district itself. One of them, on whose evidence five men were convicted, lives in such a cottage in a dreary part of the country. He has resided there ever since. A Catholic clergyman wrote to inform me of the fact; in order that I might state it to the Government, to let them know where the man was, and to persuade him not to tempt his fate. He was an informer; on his evidence five men had been executed on charges of murder. If any man can be supposed to be in danger from giving evidence, that man is. If the precaution to protect witnesses be not superfluous, protect him. If it be, this measure is not wanted; but because I suggest the possibility that such precaution would be advisable in his case I am met with a taunt and a laugh. The man has resided there for two years. I show you that your witnesses are safe; that no juryman has been injured; that special commissions have not been resorted to; and having shown this, I say that I have established the non-existence of any necessity for this measure. I say that till you have tried constitutional, you have no right to introduce unconstitutional measures, and that this House ought not to adopt them until then. I know it is said, that if the powers thus given be abused, the ministers will be responsible, to a Reformed Parliament. But who will complain here or elsewhere? You stop all complaint—you stop even petitioning, and that in the most efficacious way—and then you mock us with scorn, and talk of responsibility. I now come to another part of the subject. You say, that this measure is necessary against predial and political agitation. How do you show the connection between them? Has there been any direct allega-

tion of their connection? Is not the offence already provided for by a punishment of transportation for life? If that be not enough, you have the general law of conspiracy to meet every case. When there were public meetings, which you deemed improper, at the end of last year, you put them down by those Acts; you prosecuted and you never failed of a conviction. But I deny, with the most indignant scorn, that political agitation is in the slightest degree connected with predial agitation. You cannot deny us inquiry on this point. Separate, in committee, this measure into two Bills, and let us have an inquiry. Let us not be tried on scraps of newspapers, containing, one of them at least, a gross falsehood—that which attributed to me the creating of Arbitration Courts, and holding up to the hatred of the public those who would not attend them. The fact is, that political agitation is calculated to stop predial agitation. This is proved by the fact, that as political agitation has been extended, predial agitation has diminished. The Catholic Association was established in 1824; and in that year it was, that Sir Thomas Lambert circulated at his own expense, 30,000 copies in the south of Ireland of an address written by me to tranquillize the country. Let us see what the effect of establishing the Catholic Association was. The number of persons charged with treasonable offences was, in 1823, 106; 1824, one; 1825, one; 1826, one; 1827, none; 1828, none; 1829, none; and the greater number of these years were “years of political agitation.” Offences with violence decreased as political agitation spread. There were accused of seditious practices—in 1822, 499; 1823, 424; 1824, 121; 1825, 17; 1827, 4; and whereas, for robbing of arms, in the year 1822, sixty-four men were arraigned, in 1828, the number came down to seven. I here show you six years of the greatest agitation, during which predial crimes have gradually decreased in Ireland. How, then, can you say that predial and political agitation are concurrent? What do I ask for upon these facts? Nothing but inquiry. All I say is, Hold! Do not give us a gagging Bill; do not deprive us of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the trial by

jury; do not condemn us unheard. We are not Whitefeet, and do not carry on our attacks by night, but by day. Why cannot you put us down by day, then? You have the Libel Law, and may proceed against the papers which publish our speeches. What have we done that you should deprive us of the rights of Englishmen—without inquiry? You may insinuate—you may allege—you may say that peace is recommended by us, but that we promote disturbance. If that be the case, you can prove it, and it is an indictable offence for which you may punish us. You cannot contend that you have not the power to convict us, for one of our complaints is, that you can, and do, pack juries. You packed a jury to try me; and might do so to try any other man. When the jury, by which I was tried, was selected, you put off from it Alderman M'Kenna, whom you afterwards made a baronet; you also put off the Chairman of the Bank of Ireland, and others, whom, it was thought, would only act fairly, till you succeeded in obtaining a jury known to be violently against me; for although I have many friends, I have some enemies in Dublin. You can do all this again; and you have no pretence, therefore, for saying that you cannot enforce the law. You tell us, that a multitude of crimes are committed in Ireland, and the circumstance was much insisted upon by the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth. I beg the House will for one moment lend me its attention, whilst I make an observation upon the powerful speech delivered by that right hon. gentleman—a speech which, perhaps, better answered the purpose of its deliverer than any he ever before delivered in this House. Alluding to the period of the year 1798, he instanced a case of the seizure of an individual in Ireland at that time, upon whose person was found several copies of an Address to the United Irishmen, exhorting them to peace and sobriety, to refrain from all kinds of violence, and to be patient and submissive; but with all this apparent desire to encourage order and the authority of the law, a serjeant's oath, and a return of the number of United Irishmen in several towns, were also found upon him. The right hon.

baronet inferred from that fact that others might now be doing the same (*hear, hear*). Let those who cheer listen, and learn how the case stands. What was the peace of the United Irishmen? They suggested military discipline; their peace, among themselves, was military discipline—the discipline of the regiment—of the camp: they were not to get drunk; they were not to commit themselves with strangers; they were to be orderly, and keep the peace; but prepare for the field; the sergeant's oath was one part of it. Their organization was military. What commander of a regiment is there, quartered in Dublin, who does not issue his orders to the troops under him, not to go into public houses, to make no enemies, to avoid all suspicious persons, to shun disturbances, and to conduct themselves peaceably to all men. This is the “discipline of the camp;” it was that of the United Irishmen.

But what are our engines of action? Public and open proclamation of grievances, sufferings and misery; complaints that in the richest land in the world the people are starving; that the Church wallows in wealth, while they want sustenance; that the magistracy is tyrannical; that juries are packed; that the corporations are narrow monopolists, bigoted and exclusive; in a word, that everything is for the enemies of the people, nothing for the people themselves. These grievances have been superinduced by the Landlord's Law. This House has passed five Acts of Parliament increasing the power of the landlord over the tenant, who may now be turned out of his farm and ruined for something less than 7s. 6d.; whereas, formerly, the legal process cost £15 or £16; a cheap mode of killing off the superabundant tenants by Parliamentary authority. I defy anyone to show that I have stated one grievance of Ireland that did not exist, or exaggerated any one actually existing. I repeat the challenge. Show me that I have done so, and then turn your Parliamentary powers against me, if the ordinary law is not strong enough. But until you show me that I have done one or the other, what care I for your charges? The noble lord entered the other night into a calculation of the number of

offences committed in Ireland. He went through a period of thirteen months, and gave us an account of thirteen or fourteen murders which had been committed in that time. The right hon. baronet who spoke subsequently to him, by some strange multiplication, increased the number to one hundred and sixteen murders! as much blood, he observed, as was shed at the battle of St. Vincent. [*Mr. Stanley: "Sixty-six actual murders and one hundred and thirty-three attempts to kill."*] The noble lord certainly did not say thirteen; but he went through that number of individual cases, one by one. That is not, however, what I complain of. I ask why we are to adopt this hop-step-and-jump statement? How know I that it is correct? Where are the cases—where is the return of them? Ought not we to have something tangible? Or shall we remain in doubt? The question is, to take away the Constitution. Let us suppose the noble lord to be right in taking 1,500, as the number of crimes of all kinds committed in Ireland within the last three months. What is the state of crime in England? The noble lord's catalogue includes threatening notices and serious assaults, and the total amount is, he says, 1,500. I beg the House to bear with me, while entering into this calculation. How many of that number were assaults I know not—I care not—it is no matter; but all the assaults are included in it. Several of them were not of a common nature—not cases of the mere lifting up of the finger, but cases in which an actual blow was given. What, however, was the state of crime in the year 1822? There were 738 actual committals for treasonable offences, seditious practices, robberies of arms, assembling armed by night, and robbing the mail. Add to these offences many for which the perpetrators were not committed to trial, and you will have, at least, 7,380 for the total number in that year, considerably more in proportion than the number stated by the noble lord to have occurred in the last thirteen months. Again, in the year 1823, the number of committals was 629, which would give 6,290 for the offences in that period. Let me now turn to England. In the year 1831, the capital offences of the highest nature, not in-

cluding assaults, amounted to 19,646, and in the year following, to 21,000, or 5,000 each quarter. Now, the population of England is 12,000,000, that of Ireland is only 8,000,000. [*Mr. Stanley*: “*The statement was confined to the province of Leinster.*”] It is the province of Leinster alone to which that calculation applies. How know I the correctness of the fact? Would not a court-martial require some more evidence to decide upon than this? How know I that in that catalogue there are not repetitions, many of them regarding the same offence? How know I what faith is to be placed in those who made the returns? How do I know who the accusers are? Take the rest of the offences throughout Ireland—they are not 500 for the other three provinces for the same period. Take the case in the strongest way against me, and they will not amount to more than the number of higher offences, only, in England and Wales. In the county of Kerry there are eleven prisoners; in the western division of the county of Cork there are only ten. Is a country to be outlawed on such a statement as this? Above all, in this miserable country, are we to trample down every right that is dear to freemen—even the right to complain? We are told by the right hon. baronet that agitation has subsisted in Ireland concurrently with these crimes. The fact is, agitation commenced in the month of October; it increased in November, though not rising to any serious height. The elections then intervened and engaged everybody’s attention, and in a fortnight or three weeks we were all here. Agitation has had no time to hold out hope to the people.

The right hon. gentleman assailed Mr. Steele, and read a passage from a speech of that gentleman, in which there was certainly a good deal of ribaldry, and for which, I do not hesitate to say, the Government were right in putting him on his trial. That trial he must abide; and if the jury think that he used the expressions with an intention derogatory to his allegiance in any way, they will convict him; but, if they believe that he used them in order to obtain the confidence of the people, whereby he might be enabled to promote peace—which will be

his only defence—though if the jury should be of the same opinion as hon. gentlemen here, they will convict him, and he will be punished; otherwise, they must be bound to acquit him. I will only say, with reference to that gentleman, that they mistake him much who judge of him from these passages of his speech. He is, it is true, an enthusiast; and a generous enthusiast; but he is, also, a man of science, and an excellent scholar. He has made many scientific discoveries; he has improved the diving-bell, and when a tunnel was projected under the bed of the Mersey, at Liverpool, he was the means of preventing many of the citizens from embarking in a ruinous speculation. I will not speak of the chivalrous manner in which he risked his person, and ventured much of his fortune, in the cause of Spanish liberty; but there does not exist a creature of more true humanity of disposition, though mixed with a strain of occasional wildness, than my friend Mr. Steele. I do assure gentlemen who laugh at Mr. Steele that, if they had the pleasure of his acquaintance, they would very soon learn to estimate him highly. While gentlemen might lament his failings, they would unquestionably esteem his manliness, his kindness, and his many good qualities. I am aware that he now appears before the House in a situation which renders him liable to be misunderstood; but I know him well, and if other gentlemen knew him as well, they would esteem him as warmly as I do. But what has he done? I will here mention a remarkable fact to the House, illustrative of his character. In one of the late encounters in the county of Kilkenny, between some Whitefeet and a party of police, one of the former was shot, and died of his wounds. Mr. Steele attended the inquest, and made a speech to the man's relations, pointing out to them in very strong characters the folly and misery, as well as the criminality, of their conduct. But what I more particularly wish to bring to the attention of the House, is the funeral proceedings on this occasion. The place appointed for the interment of the body was a mountain-pass. At that spot he had the body laid out; he stopped the weeping and wailing of the friends of the deceased,

and then harangued the people in an address, in which, after pointing out the disastrous consequences of their improper behaviour, he said that he thought it his duty to offer his tribute of just praise to Major Browne (of the police), whose humanity and benevolence rendered him the object of the blessings of the surrounding country. Now, who was this Major Brown? The very man by whose hand the deceased had fallen; at least, who commanded the party from whom that individual received his death wound. Such was the conduct of Mr. Steele. See what the Irish peasant suffers without the least reproach! The body of the dead man was there; his wife, children, and friends were there; and upon that occasion, the very individual by whose hand he had fallen, received a tribute of praise for his humanity and kindness from the agitator. I do not think this incident can be an uninteresting one to the House, and therefore I have narrated it. I turn now, however, to another subject, and am drawing to a close. I have omitted many topics, but I will now go to the more direct attack made on me personally by the right hon. Secretary, who, the other evening, read a letter of mine to the House. It is my habit to put my name to everything that I send to a newspaper; and if the matter be indictable, I afford the Government an opportunity of prosecuting, not only the proprietors of the paper, but myself. What was the passage which the right hon. Secretary read? It was that in which I stated that the member for Athlone had voted against Ireland, and I appealed to the people to know whether they approved of his conduct. I also made use of similar language with respect to the member for Limerick. The right hon. Secretary said that I was wrong in having done so; and he was cheered. I assert that I was right, and perfectly constitutional. I have a right to appeal to the public against the vote which any man gives in this house. I say that that is a constitutional principle. I have no right to impute motives, and there was no motive imputed in the case in question. I have no right to say that there was a dishonest intention in the party voting, that he was looking for a place for himself or for a relative; but I do assert it

here, that every human being governed by laws, has a right to complain of the votes of the framers of those laws. There was an attempt made by this House to suppress the publication of the list of divisions (*no, no!*) There was. I appeal to my hon. friend, the member for Middlesex. The publication was complained of in the year 1822, and the House put it down. But the lists are now published. You are the servants of the public, not of any particular place. When elected by any one constituency, you represent the whole United Kingdom; and so every man has a right to know your vote and canvass it. No man has a right to impute motives to you; but I claim a right of stating my opinion as to the mischief which I think any vote of yours may create; and that right I will exercise until you put it down by some Gagging Bill. I am willing that the same privilege should be exercised by anyone else with regard to my own vote. I have not exhausted the subject, nor have I exhausted the deep interest I feel in it. I say, that, as far as political agitation is concerned, there is no such case made out, than any dispassionate man, putting his hand to his heart, can say there is evidence to connect it with predial insurrection. Upon inquiring into the subjects, facts to the contrary stare you in the face. Is not Ireland in distress? Is she not in want, and suffering grievances? The noble lord, the member for Armagh, exclaims that relief must be given; and you promise relief. Oh, yes! If we pass this Bill, you will give us a measure of Church relief. But you are sure of passing that measure of relief in another House. It has little immediate practical benefit, besides the abolition of Church Cess. But to secure it, why not adopt the wise motion of my hon. friend, and keep your hands over this measure until you have steered the other over the rocks and quicksands in another place? I am not entering into any compromise. I say that Ireland requires relief, and I ask how do you propose to afford it to her? You will not apply any part of the rich revenues of the Church to the relief of the poor. What is to become of them? You can give them nothing, and the only thing I can offer them is hope—the hope of

a domestic Legislature. You may think that a delusive hope. How are you to show it to be such? By anticipating me; by evincing that you are a protecting Legislature; that you are a kind and paternal Legislature. Oh, instead of that, you turn away the look of kindness; you turn away all benefits, and leave the grinding evils. You leave the rack-renting absentees; you leave every misery and grievance untouched; for bread, you give them a stone; you raise the scorpion rod of despotic authority over them, and say that "You must be feared before you can be loved." I deny it, sir, I deny that you have made out a case; I deny that you have shown that predial insurrection has anything to do with political agitation; I deny the right upon which you found this coercion; I deny that witnesses have been injured lately, at least to any public knowledge. If they have, I utterly deny that any juror has been injured during the whole period of this political agitation. Predial agitation subsisted for forty years before political agitation commenced. Having thus demonstrated that this measure is by no means necessary, shall I trust the despotic power it confers to hands which I think ought to have no power at all; to statesmen, who mingle miserable personal feelings with their political conduct?

I call upon you if you would conciliate Ireland; if you would preserve that connection, which I desire you to recollect has never yet conferred a single blessing upon that country; that she knows nothing of you but by distress, forfeitures, and confiscations; that you have never visited her but in anger; that the sword of desolation has often swept over her, as when Cromwell sent his eighty thousand to perish; that you have burdened her with grinding penal laws, despite the faith of treaties, and in violation of every compact; and that you have neglected to fulfil the promises you dealt out to her. You have, it is true, granted Catholic Emancipation, but nine-and-twenty years after it was promised, and five-and-twenty years after the Parliament of Ireland must, of necessity, have done so. We know you, as yet, but in our sufferings and in our wrongs; and you

are now kind enough to give us, as a boon, this Act, which deprives us of the trial by jury, and substitutes courts-martial; which deprives us of the Habeas Corpus Act, and, in a word, imposes on a person the necessity of proving himself innocent. That Act you give us, and you tell us it will put down the agitation of the Repeal of the Union. I tell you that, until you do us justice, you can never expect to attain your object. The present generation may perish, your Robespierrian measures may destroy the existing population, but the indignant soul of Ireland you can never annihilate. There was a time when a ray of hope dawned upon that country. It was when the present Parliament first assembled. We saw this Reformed House of Commons congregated. We knew that every man here had a constituency; we knew that the people of England were represented here; we knew that the public voice not only would influence your decisions but command your votes; we hoped that you would afford us redress of our grievances; and you give us —an Act of despotism!

Subject, OATHS OF CATHOLIC MEMBERS; Date, MARCH 11, 1834.

At the conclusion of the debate, which was moderate in tone and temper, O'Connell called attention to the great difference between the temporalities of the Protestant Church, and its ecclesiastical discipline. On the former subject he would vote and debate, on the latter he would avoid all interference.

Mr. O'Connell rose to move for the appointment of a committee to consider the oaths which were taken, and those, if any, which ought to be taken by members of the House. He trusted that the importance of the question would induce the House to comply and allow of the nomination of the committee. He acknowledged that his object was to abolish all religious oaths upon members taking their seats in the House, and if necessary to substitute a declaration disclaiming, in the most unequivocal manner, all species of bribery and corruption at their election. Whether the House were disposed to go so far as he wished to go or not, ought not to influence them in

deciding the question, whether a committee should be appointed or not. He was prepared to lay before the House the strongest grounds for the appointment of such a committee; and they were to be found in the nature of oaths taken, being different in one class of members from those of another. In fact, there were established three different modes of swearing or affirming in coming into that House—the Protestant swore—the Catholic swore—the Quaker affirmed—and the Moravian would have an equal right to take his seat on making an affirmation if elected. He thought that the time had now arrived when the necessity of taking an oath because of the religious persuasion of the person to whom it was administered, ought to be done away. The oath ought to be a universal one, and in such an oath he of course included affirmations. The recollection of the oath only existed while the members were at the table taking it, and for the rest of the period that they sat in the House it was completely forgotten. It might be said that such a form of oath was meant to convey subjugation on the one and domination to the other. An oath founded on such a principle, would be scouted by an overwhelming number in that House. The Catholics in that House ought not to be placed in an invidious light. He wished the distinctive character of the oaths administered should be abolished, and that all chance of equivocation in respect to the oath should be for ever set at rest. He asked, if there ought to be the slightest chance of equivocation existing in respect to any oath that might be taken by members in that House? He felt disgusted as a Catholic, that any one in that House should put a different construction upon the oath which he had taken but that which the oath conveyed, and which he solemnly felt it ought to bear. He contended, that the person taking an oath should be bound by the plain meaning of the oath, and not by the construction he or any other person might give it. The oath taken by the Catholics in this House should not have any other construction put on it than that which it bore upon the face of it. With all the respect he had for the opinions of hon. members in general, he differed from them,

and more particularly from the hon. member for St. Andrew's (Mr. Johnston), when they said that Catholics did not feel themselves bound by the oath, unless upon their construction of it. The hon. member for St. Andrew's was a gentleman of strict integrity, no doubt, and as such would be conscientiously bound by the meaning, and not by his own construction of an oath. Then why, he would ask, should the hon. member conclude that the Catholics possessed not as much integrity, and were not as regardful of the solemn obligation of an oath according to its meaning as the hon. members or other conscientious men? He would wish the House to understand that he (Mr. O'Connell) would not be there if he conceived for a moment that he could take the oath according to the construction which he or any other Catholic might chose to put on it. He would in the most solemn manner declare that he would vacate his seat in this House if he thought that a different construction of the oath from that which the House attached to it, had been by possibility put on it by him.

There was a magazine called the *Catholic Magazine*—one, doubtless, very little known to the members of the House, and, indeed, to the country generally. It was edited by highly talented and learned Catholic clergymen; it was needless to say religious, and, as such, conscientious men. In this work it had been rather a matter of controversy whether Catholics could conscientiously take the oath imposed upon them on becoming members of that House. For his part, he would not hesitate to say that he had taken the oath according to its meaning, and in the full sense attached to it by the House; and he felt that he could do so with a safe conscience, and with the most perfect regard to the religion which he professed, and in relation to the religion of the State, which he could have no desire to disturb. There could be no controversy about the oath as it now stood, because there was nothing in it to prevent a Catholic from acting as he pleased with respect to the temporalities of the Established Church, either as regarded the power, authority, or emoluments of the Church. But it might very reasonably be asked, why

were there any oaths of a distinctive religious nature at all? It was in the reign of Henry VI. that an oath was first tendered to a member of the House of Commons, and for only one year in that reign. The oath was merely to bind the members to keep the peace. It was preceded by no other, nor was it followed by any other, until the distinctions in the religious communities took place at the Reformation. By the 1st of Elizabeth, c. 1, s. 9, the Oath of Supremacy was enacted, but it was not required to be taken by any member of that House. By the 5th of Elizabeth, the Oath of Supremacy was, for the first time, required. However, the great majority of the peers still continuing to be Catholics, there was an express clause that the oath should not be required of the Lords, and it was not required until the reign of James I. From the 5th of Elizabeth till the 1st of William and Mary the law stood in this way; and, in the seventh year of that reign, both Houses were required to take the Oath of Supremacy. The oath distinctly asserted the King's supremacy, not only over temporal matters, but, in the words of the oath, over all spiritual causes and things. This was changed at the Revolution—and why? Because the Presbyterians of Scotland could not acknowledge the king as a spiritual head. To meet their scruples the oath was changed into a negation of spiritual dominion in any foreign prince, prelate, or authority whatsoever. That satisfied both Presbyterians and members of the Established Church, but it was as repugnant to the Catholics as the former oath, for they did acknowledge a spiritual authority resident in a foreign country—viz., the authority of the head of their Church—the Pope. The Act of the 1st of Elizabeth did not extend to Ireland; and, although the Act of the 5th of Elizabeth did extend to Ireland in terms, it did not in terms extend to the Irish House of Commons, so that, throughout the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. there was no obligation upon members of the Irish Parliament to take the Oath of Supremacy. But in May, 1661, the Irish House of Commons, consisting of Cromwellian officers and soldiers, passed a bill to make it obligatory upon

members to take an oath ; but the Bill was subsequently lost, and Catholics sat in Parliament until after the Revolution. In violation of the Treaty of Limerick, the English Parliament passed an Act (the 13th and 14th of William and Mary, c. 2) to compel members of the Irish Parliament to take the Oaths of Supremacy and Abjuration. But that Act was constitutionally void in Ireland until the year 1782, when an Act of the Irish Parliament gave it the force of a law of the land. He was thus particular in going through these details, in order to show that religious oaths formed no part of the original constitution of that House, but that they were invented merely for the purpose of excluding persons professing certain religious opinions from the privileges and seats in Parliament. But this reason no longer existed, and it was absurd and ridiculous to continue the practice. In 1829 considerable alteration was made. In that year an Act was passed which established the oath which was at present taken by the Roman Catholics, and by the same Act another very excellent alteration was made by striking out of the oath taken by Protestants the declaration that the worship of their fellow-countrymen, the Catholics, was impious and idolatrous. That was an excellent alteration, for it would not have been pleasant to have sat and heard the old oath administered. There were, however, some strange anomalies between the oaths taken by the members of that House. On one side of the board he saw three oaths that were required to be taken by the Protestant, while, on the other side, he found only one that the Catholic was required to take. The Protestant was called up to abjure the House of Stuart, while the Catholic was not. Now, he had always understood that, in point of politics, the Catholics were the class of persons who were most likely to have a leaning that way. He should have thought the common sense view of the matter was, that that oath should have been exacted from the Catholic, while the Protestant should have been exempted from it. Protestants were also called upon to swear that they would never bear any allegiance to any descendants of James II. And how stood the fact? Why, no

such descendant was now in existence. Was not that taking God's name in vain? Would it not be more in accordance with the spirit of the present day that all members should be required to take one oath only—that of allegiance to the Crown, which was an oath in which all could join. No Protestant would refuse it, and no Catholic had the slightest objection whatever to it. The Catholic oath, in its former part, was an oath of fidelity and allegiance. He saw no objection to that, though it was certainly different from that adopted by Protestants. He was ready to testify his allegiance to the heirs of Princess Sophia, being Protestants, as if the oath had been administered to him; but there was a part of the oath which he considered a complete insult: "And I do further declare that it is not any article of my faith that any princes excommunicated by the See of Rome may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any person whatsoever."

Why should the Catholic be called upon to swear that he should have no objection to make the declaration? But what right, he would ask, had the House to insult him, by calling upon him to take such an oath? Was it possible for any man to be so destitute of moral feeling as to consider that he had a right to murder any man because the Pope excommunicated him? In his opinion the oath would be no sanction to any man who believed in any thing so monstrous and unjust. He called for a committee to inquire whether such an oath was necessary; if it were, he would bend his neck to the yoke—he would submit. But he denied that it was necessary, and, therefore, he considered it imperative on him to call the attention of the House to it. He had the most ineffable contempt for the doctrine implied in that oath. To that part of the oath wherein the Pope's jurisdiction was renounced, he had no objection. He would pledge his most solemn sanction to that—but, if it were necessary to swear resistance, even unto death, to any foreign interference in these matters, in these realms; there was no Protestant half as anxious as he was to take such an oath. But what dread did any rational person entertain of the tem-

poral power of the Pope? Heaven help the maniac who could imagine that the Pope, who was trembling for his own small dominions, could put the temporal authorities of these kingdoms into jeopardy. Was it not a monstrous thing to think, that these realms should at any time be invaded by a regiment of cardinals, and a squadron of friars turned into riflemen? The oath then went on—"And I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power, the settlement of property in this realm as by law established." That prevented his making alterations in the law regarding property, but it was an undoubted fact, that that law had been frequently altered. He could mention an instance in which, by an Act passed during the last year, a gentleman became the inheritor of property to the amount of £4,000 a year, which he could not inherit as the law previously stood, and which he had not the most remote prospect of enjoying. Therefore, that part of the oath was quite absurd, and the man who took it in that year would have different impressions on his mind from the men who took it the previous year. He only threw that out to show how far equivocation would go as regarded that oath. The argument he used had been used on a former occasion with respect to the Coronation Oath. What millions of pamphlets—what masses of arguments and thousands of speeches had been used regarding the violation of the Coronation Oath, all turning on the mere equivocation of the words, or the different interpretations which different individuals might give them! Did it require the Catholics, any more than the Protestants, to swear that they would defend the state of property? If they did not swear the Protestants, why did they swear the Catholics? The oath then went on—"And I hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the Church Establishment as by law established within the realm." The same solution might be applied to that as to the former paragraph; and here again he would adduce the occurrences of last year, when ministers had passed the Church Temporalities Bill—a Bill which had unsettled the Church Establishment more than any Act that had taken

place since the Reformation. What he (Mr. O'Connell) required, was a committee which should put an end to these equivocations. The oath went on—"And I do solemnly swear that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or may be entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, or Protestant Government within the realm." What was the meaning of Protestant Government now in this country? Was a man satisfied to swear that Government was a Protestant Government; when the whole of it might be Catholic. The whole of the judicial seats might be filled with Catholics, with the exception of the Chancellor; when the navy, the army, and the magistrates might be Catholics. In point of law, all who were admitted into the Government, with the exception of the Chancellor, might be Catholics. Was it safe, then, to swear, that such a Government was a Protestant Government, when there were only two officers—the King and Chancellor—at all connected with it, whom it was necessary should be Protestant? He could not but feel that this was a point of great difficulty. He might be laughed at for his scruples, but he could not help acknowledging his scruples on this subject had been very great. He had been told that it was the Legislature itself had passed the Act, and as the word Protestant had been introduced, must have intended such a Protestant Government as now existed to have been understood—namely, composed only, as it might be, of a Protestant King and Protestant keeper of his conscience, all the other members being Catholics. He trusted he had not done wrong in taking up a strong feeling on this question; but such feeling he entertained. Was it intended to be said that there was not a great difference between Protestantism and a Protestant Government? They certainly were, as far as he was capable of distinguishing between them, most essentially different; and this was a fact which the House ought gravely to consider, when it called upon members who took their seats there to take the oaths which it was considered necessary to administer to them. What was the meaning of the word privilege in the Catholic's oath? He knew that Johnson gave it

two meanings—namely, immunity and advantage. Immunity was here out of the question. Then, as to the other meaning: could it bear that? Was, he would ask, sitting in that House an advantage? Surely not, for he and every other Christian could have a seat in that House. He called on them, then, to define the meaning of the word privilege. As far as he was concerned, he did not wish to vote upon any matters relative to Church affairs—not because the word privilege was in the oath, but, as a Catholic, he did not think he should interfere in these concerns.

The word privilege, then, was equivocal, and all equivocation should be got rid of, so that it would be out of the power of one hon. member to put one construction upon the oath, and another hon. member another. There should, in fact, be no mistake upon the subject; everything respecting it should be intelligible. He thought he had certainly made out a case for an inquiry into this oath in particular, so that it might be put upon a footing which would take away all equivocation in its meaning. But, he asked whether he had not made out a case for inquiry generally, for why should the Protestant be called upon to take the name of God in vain by abjuring the House of Stuart? The thing would be laughed at out of this House; for his own part, he did not know or care whether the Sardinian royal family was nearer to the House of Stuart than our own; but if he were a Protestant, he did not think that he could take the present Oath of Supremacy. Then he came to that part of the oath which declares that no foreign prince or prelate has, or ought to have, authority, ecclesiastical or temporal, within this realm. Now, he could conceive a Protestant denying that there ought to be any supremacy by a foreign prelate in this country, but he could not see how the same person could swear that the Pope had not authority and supremacy in the realm. He did not see how this could be sworn to by a Protestant in the presence of him (Mr. O'Connell), who acknowledged that supremacy. When a college for the education of Catholic clergymen was supported by Act of Parliament, and visitors, Protestant and

Catholic, appointed over it by Act of Parliament, that Act expressly ordering that all matters relating to the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church should be under the control of Roman Catholics, it was most absurd to make a solemn attestation to God in that House that the Pope had no spiritual authority in these realms. He had such authority, and he had spiritual jurisdiction as sure as the sun would rise tomorrow. There might have been some feasible excuse for such an assertion when the Parliament consisted exclusively of Protestants, and when that Parliament, one and all, would not recognise that authority. But of what use was it now, when there was no longer any distinctive reprobation of Catholics, or any distinctive exaltation of Protestants? He thought that in such a case the House, at least, could not refuse a Committee of Inquiry. He knew the Catholic oaths had been framed as a safeguard for the State—a safeguard forsooth! He had read a thousand speeches in which the uniform expression was: “If you let Catholics into the House, you will upset the old institutions of the country; for, though they may be only few—only forty or fifty in number—they will always league together; and, by so doing have the power of injuring Protestantism and the State to a fearful extent.” Now, what was the fact of the case? Since the admission of Catholics to the House, they had never voted together but once, and that once, he was happy and proud to say, was in favour of the Jewish Relief Bill. On the Reform Bill, one Catholic gentleman of high rank and of very large property voted against the country, and on all other questions they were never united. Not only did the English Catholics differ from the Irish, but the English and Irish Roman Catholics also differed among themselves. This was a convincing proof of the absurdity of the prophecies and the uselessness of the oaths. If any oaths were to be taken at the table, let them be respecting the conduct of members in that House. Let them be subjected to the same obligations to do justice as were imposed upon judges and juries. Let each member swear, or solemnly declare, that he would vote according

to his conscience. But, above all, what the people most particularly required was, that their representatives should pledge themselves that no means of corruption or bribery had been used to obtain their seats. These were the topics to which a committee should direct its attention, and upon which the House should afterwards adjudicate. Reform was of little value to the lower classes of the constituency, if the higher classes were to be permitted still to carry on the system of corruption by bribes. He did not press this particular point much, but he claimed it as one of the topics which the committee should take into its consideration. He should not trouble the House further, but, thanking them most gratefully for the patient attention with which he had been heard, he begged to assure the House, that he brought this question forward in full sincerity of a conscientious belief, that it was absolutely necessary a final construction should be put upon this Act, and that if distinctions were to exist between one side of the House and the other, they should be so marked and prominent that no man could be in any doubt as to their force and extent. He concluded by moving "that a Select Committee should be appointed to consider the oaths now required by law to be taken by members of that House, and to report its observations thereon to the House; and also to consider the propriety of altering or abolishing those oaths, and substituting other oaths or declarations in lieu thereof."

Subject, REPEAL OF THE UNION; Date, APRIL 22, 1834.

Mr. O'Connell, having been called by the Speaker, spoke to the following effect: It happened to me, sir, a few days ago, to be speaking to a member in the lobby, when I was asked by another member, who had been in conversation with him before I came up, when the question of the Repeal of the Union was to come on. I was about to give the required information, when the gentleman went on to observe, "The Canadas are endeavouring

to escape from us, America has escaped us, but Ireland shall not escape us." The hon. member for Wiltshire, too, who, I regret to find, is not now in his place, may recollect that last year, when the Coercion Bill was brought before the House, a member of this House said, in the library, with something like an oath, that Ireland should not escape us. (*Cries of "Oh!"*) It is, I think, a little too soon to begin this. Sir, I do believe it is a fact, that this claimed superiority—this general notion of a right of dominion inherent in England over Ireland, has been the great bane of both countries, and the source of all the evil which you have for centuries inflicted upon Ireland. I do not believe there ever existed a greater mistake than the supposition that this country has the right of domination over Ireland, or that this country ever obtained all the rights which the subjugation of the people, of Ireland would confer. I wish gentlemen to recollect that, in treating of the restoration of an Irish National Legislature, I wish to divest the case of every feature which may not be thought important, and to bring before them matters of the utmost national interest; but let not the spirit of domination now so far prevail as to prevent the House from allowing a fair and legitimate discussion of this subject. Amongst the people of Ireland an opinion prevails, that British interests are adverse to those of Ireland. My first and greatest anxiety, therefore, is to demonstrate that the English have no right of conquest, nor any title to the subjugation of Ireland. That observation I mean to apply to the affairs of Ireland, both before the Union and since. I mean to canvass this question. I mean distinctly to assert that Ireland was an independent nation, and we ought to regard her, not as a subordinate province, but as a limb of the empire—as another and a distinct country, subject to the same king, but having a Legislature totally independent of the Legislature of Great Britain. I shall be as brief as I can upon this subject, for it is quite clear that no man ever yet rose to address a more unwilling audience. My first sentence was interrupted; and there are amongst you those who have endeavoured to interrupt me before I could utter

two distinct periods. I feel, however, that a great and an important duty was confided to me, and I am determined to discharge it. I wish to show you that Ireland was an independent nation—that in bygone times she was an independent nation, having an independent Legislature to take care of her own concerns. I may be mistaken in what I seek; but my feeling is, that I but discharge my duty to myself, my country, and posterity, in calling on you to restore her to the station she occupied when I was born. But, in the performance of my duty, I ask those whom I address to give up the reins of power and dominion—the pride of power and dominion, which it is infinitely more difficult to part with than the minor interests involved in their possession. I call upon you to do that, by ceasing to continue the Union upon its present basis. Knowing, then, that I have such an unfavourable auditory, I am anxious to pass over these preliminary and unpleasant topics as quickly as I can, and to dwell as short a time as possible upon matters likely to excite the unpleasant feelings of those who hear me. There are not many amongst my auditory who are aware that from the period of 1172, when, for the first time, a solemn treaty was entered into between some of the inhabitants of Ireland and the British monarch, from that period to the present the only two hundred and forty years have elapsed since Ireland was regarded as a portion of the dominions of the Crown in Great Britain. At no earlier period than that were the Irish recognised as subjects of the king of England. In 1614, and not before that year, the distinction between the “Irish enemy” and “English subject” was put an end to. In 1614 there was a recognition of a distinct nation in Ireland. In 1614, for the first time, the power of the king of Great Britain—the power of the king of England and Scotland—was recognised in Ireland. No title had been acquired by battle previously, nor has any been acquired since. There never existed a right by conquest. No jurist—no writer upon the laws of nations—can say that any such thing occurred to give England any such claim. There was no dominion over the Irish as subjects—there was no recog-

dition by them of any such dominion ; and, above all, there was the distinction between " Irish enemies " and " British subjects." I am bound—for I am not speaking for the present hour—I am not addressing those merely who hear me ; but I am, I believe, making the first step to national independence ; and, in doing so, it becomes me to lay the foundations on which to rest my arguments, broadly, distinctly, and, as I hope, irreversibly.

For this purpose I must have recourse to ancient documents, which will perfectly authorise my statement, that there was neither a submission, as subjects, of the Irish people, nor a recognition by them of the sovereignty of England. The first document which I shall refer to concerns the reign of Henry III., and is dated in the year 1246. I know how unwilling this House is to listen to the reading of documents of any date ; but more especially those certainly not calculated to men to its vanity or gratify its pride. In the reign of Henry III. a number of the Irish people applied for the benefit of the which law and the British Constitution, and they asked to be maintained as subjects. Henry III. issued a mandate under the Great Seal to the Barons in Ireland, that, for the peace and tranquillity of that land, they would permit it to be governed by the laws of England ; but on this point what was the testimony of history ? It was this :—

"The great English settlers found it more for their immediate interest if a free course should be left to their oppressions—that many of those lands they coveted should be considered as aliens—that they should be punished for their petty wars by arbitrary exactions—and in their rapine and massacres be freed from the terrors of a rigidly impartial and severe tribunal. They had the opportunities of making such representations as they pleased to the court of England, and such descriptions of the temper and dispositions of the Irish as might serve their purposes most effectually. They thus succeeded in rendering the mandate ineffectual."

This is my first proof that the Irish were not recognised as subjects, and that the intention of the King to recognise them as such was defeated by the party whose object it was to preserve their own means of oppression and prevent the establishment of a uniform government in Ireland. The second document

I shall quote illustrates this part of the case. An offer was made by many of the Irish to pay 8,000 marks, a considerable sum at that time, to Edward I.—this was in 1278—for the enjoyment of the British institutions, for the protection of the English laws, and for the establishment of a regular government in Ireland. In this instance the King issued his mandate, stating—

“Whereas the community of Ireland has made to us a tender of 8,000 marks, on condition that we grant to them the laws of England, to be used in the aforesaid land, we will you to know that, inasmuch as the laws used by the Irish are hateful to God, and repugnant to all justice, and having held diligent conference with full deliberation with our council on this matter, it seems sufficiently expedient to us and to our council to grant to them the English laws, provided always that the general consent of the people, or at least of the prelates and nobles of that land, well affected to us, shall uniformly concur in this behalf; and having agreed between you on the highest fine of money that you can obtain to be paid us on this account, you do, with the consent of all, or, at least, with the greater and sounder part aforesaid, make such a composition with the said people in the said premises as you shall judge in your diligence to be most expedient for our honour and interest; provided, however, that these people should hold in readiness a body of good and stout footmen, amounting to such a number as you shall agree upon with them, for one turn only, to repair to us when we shall think fit to demand them.”

And the historian says:—

“Here we see the just and honorable dispositions of Edward, notwithstanding his intention to make this incident subservient to his affairs. But his wisdom and rectitude were fatally counteracted, and by those who should have run foremost in the prosecution of a measure which would have prevented the calamities of ages, and which was obviously calculated for the pacification and effectual improvement of their country; but it would have circumscribed their rapacious views and controlled their violence and oppression.”

Again, however; were the people's views frustrated, and they were a second time refused the boon they solicited. Another document I might quote, records a similar application that was made to King Richard II., through Lord Thomas of Lancaster, which received a similar refusal; as well as a later application made to Lord Deputy Gray and Sir Arthur Chichester. The death of the Earl of Desmond afforded an occa-

sion to regulate the affairs of Ireland upon principles of justice and liberal policy; but Elizabeth and her councillors thought otherwise. "Should we exert ourselves," said they, "in reducing this country to order and civility, it must soon acquire power and riches. The inhabitants will be thus alienated from England; they will cast themselves into the arms of some foreign power, or, perhaps, erect themselves into an independent and separate state. Let us rather connive at their disorders; for a weak and disordered people never can attempt to detach themselves from the Crown of England." I find, sir, that Sir Henry Sydney and Sir John Perrot, who perfectly understood the affairs of Ireland and the dispositions of its inhabitants, both expressed the utmost indignation at this horrid policy, which yet found its way into the English Parliament. The Queen was apprehensive, should Ireland have the benefit of good laws, that she would become too strong for mismanagement, and it was thought that the best policy for England would be to keep her weak and divided—a policy which has been followed with unrelenting perseverance, and which is as much acted on to-day as ever it was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Throughout this period, the right of Ireland to a Parliament was not controverted; there was, at first, merely the Parliament of the Pale formed; but in the interval to which I just now adverted, in the reign of Edward III., an attempt was made to take the Irish representatives from that country. The writs on that occasion were made returnable to Westminster. The people returned the members, but they kept from them the power of granting any supplies of money, and doing so, it was useless for the members to come here, and accordingly that attempt totally failed.

Thus there existed, up to the period of the reign of James I., an anxiety on the part of the Irish to be governed by British laws, and on the part of the Government that anxiety was constantly met by resistance and refusal to grant that request. It may be said that I have anticipated the proofs and arguments upon the other side; but this is plain, that, if there was no right by subjugation over Ireland, yet there was an anxiety and a

disposition to submit as subjects, "in order and civility," are the terms used—that is, as subjects of a separate and distinct country, and having a Parliament sitting in Ireland. Why did the descendants of English settlers refuse this? Because they desired to increase their plunder; because they had a land war to carry on, the consequence of which was expected to be, the acquirement of individual territory, and an enrichment by individual plunder, even though there was a lessening of the power of the Crown. During these centuries that I have alluded to, there was another plan formed, the most cruel and the most dishonest, to harass, to annoy, and to plunder the Irish, and it succeeded by means as cruel and as mean as the project was dishonourable. It was the wish of the Irish to become subjects, and of the ruling English powers that they should remain enemies. At length, in the reign of James I., the whole of the inhabitants were amalgamated under the one Government, and that amalgamation was produced by crimes, at which the person hearing of them should start with horror. Divisions were fomented; dissensions promoted; the weak were roused against the strong; the stranger against the native; the insignificant against the wealthy; The O'Donnell was supported against The O'Neill; the illegitimate brother against the legitimate son; and when they had invaded the property of the legitimate, when they attacked and took from him the county of Tyrone, they then declared that the lawful heir of it had forfeited it by his resistance! By this cruel policy, which I am bound to go through and expose, however reluctantly —by this most cruel policy, inroads were made upon the property of the native Irish, and, at length, those who despoiled them obtained a rule over the whole country. But, let me inform the House of this, that this dominion was obtained, as I have said, not by battle, not by the submission of the people, but by the perpetration of the most horrible cruelties that one class of human beings ever yet inflicted upon another. The story of Spanish cruelties in South America is mild and moderate, compared with the dark catalogue of crimes, of cruelties,

and atrocities which were committed in Ireland, and against Irishmen. I hold in my hand extracts, not from Irish historians, not from Catholic historians, after that distinction was introduced, but from writers of the ascendant party, and who charge their own friends with the committal of the greatest crimes that ever yet disgraced humanity. In Morrison's "History of Ireland," we find, in 1577, this fact :—

"The lords of Connaught and O'Rorke made a composition with Sir Nicholas Malby, governor of the province, wherein they were content to yield the Queen so large a rent, and such services, both of labourers to work for the occasion of fortifying, and of horse and foot to serve upon occasion of war, that their minds seemed not yet to be alienated to their wonted awe and reverence to the Crown of England. Yet, in that same year, a horrible massacre was committed by the English at Mullaghmast, on some hundreds of the most peaceable of the Irish gentry, invited thither on the public faith and under the protection of Government."

This massacre is thus described by the Irish annalists :—

"The English published a proclamation, inviting all the well-affected Irish to an interview on the Rathmore at Mulloghmaston, engaging them, at the same time, for their security, and that no evil was intended. In consequence of this engagement, the well-affected came, and soon after they were assembled, they found themselves surrounded by three or four lines of English and Irish horse and foot, completely accoutred, by whom they were ungenerously attacked and cut to pieces, and not a single man escaped."

Sir, in the same year, another atrocity was perpetrated. In 1583, we find this stated by Balase :—

"The garrison of Smerwick, in Kerry, surrendered upon mercy to Lord Deputy Gray; he ordered upwards of seven hundred of them to be put to the sword or hanged; repeated complaints were made of the inhuman rigour practised by his deputy and his officers; the Queen was assured that he tyrannized with such barbarity that little was left in Ireland for her Majesty to reign over but ashes and carcasses."

The mode of accomplishing the destruction of the garrison of Smerwick is described thus :—

"Wingfield was commissioned to disarm them; and when this service was performed, an English company was sent into the fort, and the entire were butchered in cold blood. Nor is it without pain we find a service so horrid

and detestable committed to Sir Walter Raleigh, for which and other such exploits, he had 40,000 acres of land bestowed on him in the county of Cork, which he afterwards sold to Richard, first Earl of Cork."

A great portion of the county Down was obtained in the manner I will now describe to the House, on a better authority than my own:—

"Walter, Earl of Essex, on the conclusion of a peace, invited Bryan O'Niall, of Claneboy, with a great number of his relations, to an entertainment, where they lived together in great harmony, making good cheer for three days and nights, when on a sudden O'Niall was surprised with an arrest, together with his brother and wife, by the Earl's order. His friends were put to the sword before his face, nor were the women and children spared; he was himself, with his brother and wife, sent to Dublin, where they were cut in quarters. This increased the disaffection, and produced the detestation of all the Irish; for this chieftain of Claneboy was the senior of his family; and as he had been universally esteemed, he was now as universally regretted."

The county Monaghan was acquired about 1590, in this manner:

"About this year died M'Mahon, chieftain of Monaghan, who, in his lifetime, had surrendered his country into her Majesty's hands, and received a grant thereof, under the broad seal of England, to him and his heirs male, and in default of such, to his brother, Hugh Roe M'Mahon, with the other remainders; and this man dying without issue male, his said brother came up to the state that he might be settled in his inheritance, hoping to be countenanced and cherished as her Majesty's patentee. But he found he could not be admitted until he promised 600 cows (for such, and no other, were the bribes). He was afterwards imprisoned for failing in part of the payment, and in a few days enlarged, with promise that the Lord Deputy himself would go and settle him in his county of Monaghan; whither his lordship took his journey shortly after with M'Mahon in his company. At their first arrival, the gentleman was clapped into bolts, in two days after he was indicted, arraigned, and executed at his own door: all done by such officers as the deputy carried with him for that purpose from Dublin. The treason for which he was condemned was, because two years before, he pretending a rent due out of Fearney, levied forces and made a distress for the same, which in the English law (adds my author) may, perhaps, be treason, but in that country, never before subject to law, it was thought no rare thing, nor great offence. The Marshal, Sir Henry Bagnal, had part of the country, a Captain Hensflower was made seneschal of it, and got M'Mahon's chief house, and part of the land; and to divers others small portions were assigned; and it is said that these men were all the contrivers of his death, and that every one was paid something for his share."

But, sir, the further progress towards English dominion in Ireland is stained with crimes of the worst character—by plunder, by the wilful creation of famine and formation of insurrection—by the hiring of assassins—by the total devastation of the country. It is a painful and melancholy duty for me to have to recite these facts; but it is my firm conviction that it is my duty to detail them. I bring them now forward to lay down a basis for my arguments, and from which I think the inevitable conclusion in the minds of gentlemen will be, that they are bound to vote in support of the motion which I shall conclude by submitting to the House. Of the period between 1580 and 1590, we are told:—

“Nor were these incessant acts of cruelty sufficient to appease the enmity of the Queen’s officers. That destruction which their swords had left unfinished they now industriously completed by a general famine.”

Mr. Morrison mentions this method of ending the war with a seeming complacency, at least without dislike. But the effects of it were too horrible to be unfeelingly related, even by an enemy. He says:—

“Because I have often made mention formerly of our destroying the rebels’ corn, and using all means to famish them, let me now, by two or three examples, show the miserable state to which they were thereby reduced.”

He then, after telling us that Sir Arthur Chichester, Sir Richard Morrison, and other commanders, saw a most horrid spectacle of three children, whereof the eldest was not above ten years old, feeding on the flesh of their dead mother, with circumstances too shocking to be repeated, and that the common sort of rebels were driven to unspeakable extremities, beyond the records of any histories that he had ever heard of that kind:

“No spectacle,” adds Morrison, “was more frequent in the ditches of towns, and especially in wasted villages, than to see multitudes of these poor people dead, with their mouths coloured green, by eating nettles, docks, and all things they could rend up out of the ground. The Lord Deputy and Council, in a letter to the Lords in England, concerning their receiving the submissions of some Irish chiefs, acquainted them that they had received

their submissions, partly for the good of the service, and partly out of humane consideration, having (say they) with our own eyes daily seen the lamentable condition wherein we found everywhere men dead of famine, and they add, that in the space of a few months above 3,000 were starved in Tyrone. Thus had the Queen's army, under Lord Mountjoy, broken, and absolutely subdued all the lords and chieftains of the Irish; whereupon, the multitude being brayed, as it were, in mortar (says Sir John Davies), with sword, famine, and pestilence, together submitted themselves to the English Government, received the laws and magistrates, and most gladly embraced the king's pardon, and peace in all parts of the realm, with demonstrations of joy and comfort."

There is another document to which I will refer, from the pen of Spenser; it is a feeling and an accurate description of the mode in which this species of warfare was carried on in Ireland. Here are his words:—

"Notwithstanding that the same was a most rich and plentiful country, full of corn, and cattle, yet, ere one year and-a-half, they were brought to such wretchedness as that any strong heart would rue the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them; they looked like anatomies of death; they spoke like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eat the dead carrion—happy were they that could find them, yea, and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and if they found a plot of watercresses or shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast, for the time, yet not able to continue there withal, that in short space there was none almost left, and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man and beast."

Lombard, another writer on Irish history, tells us—

"After Desmond's death, and the entire suppression of the rebellion, unheard-of cruelties were committed on the provincials of Munster by the English commanders. Great companies of these provincials, men, women, and children, were often forced into castles and other houses, which were then set on fire, and if any of them attempted to escape from the flames, they were shot or stabbed by the soldiers who guarded them. It was a diversion to these monsters to take up infants on the points of their spears, and whirl them about in their agony, apologising for their cruelty by saying, that if they suffered them to live to grow up they would become rebels."

Many of the women were found hanging on trees, with their children at their breast, strangled with their mothers'

hair! Recollect now, that the object of all these cruelties was to obtain dominion over Ireland. I am glad that I have but two documents more of a similar character; but they are of great interest; and I think they will show gentlemen how exceedingly ignorant they are of the woes and misfortune of Ireland, and prove to them with what audacity the greatest crimes were committed against my country. Morrison acquaints us that Lord Mountjoy never received any to mercy but such as had drawn blood on their fellows. "Thus," says he, "M'Mahon and M'Artyle offered to submit, but neither could be received without the other's head." But barbarous as these terms of acceptance were, they were sometimes reluctantly complied with.

"I have, it seems, made," says Lord Mountjoy, "some of the subjects already reclaimed, and in these times suspected, put themselves in blood already, for even now I heard that Lord Mountgarret's sons have killed some of Cloncare's and some of Tyrrell's followers since I contested with their father about somewhat I heard suspicious of them. About this time," says he, "Nugent came to make his submission to the President, by whom he was told that, as his crimes and offences were extraordinary, he could not hope for pardon unless he would deserve it by some extraordinary circumstance, which, said the President, if you will perform, you may deserve not only pardon for your faults committed heretofore, but also some store of crowns to relieve your wants hereafter. Nugent, who was valiant and daring, and in whom the rebels reposed great confidence, presently promised not to be wanting in anything that one man could accomplish, and in private made offer to the President that, if he might be well recompensed, he would ruin in a short time James Fitzthomas, the then reputed Earl of Desmond, or his brother John. But the President having before contrived a plot for James, gave him in charge to undertake his brother John. Accordingly, some few days after, Nugent, in riding in company with John Fitzthomas and one Mr. Coppinger, permitted this great captain to ride a little before him, minding (his back being turned) to shoot him through with his pistol, which, for the purpose, was well charged with two balls. The opportunity offered—the pistol bent—both heart and hand ready to do the deed, when Coppinger, at that instant, snatched the pistol from him, crying treason; wherewith John Fitzthomas, turning himself about, perceived his intent. Nugent, thinking to escape by the goodness of his horse, spurred hard. The horse stumbled, and he was taken, and the next day, after examination and confession of his intent,

hanged. In his examination he freely confessed the whole intent, which was, to have despatched John Fitzthomas, and immediately after to have posted to his brother James, to carry the first news thereof, intending to call him aside, and in a secret manner to relate the particulars of his brother's murder, and then to execute as much upon him also."

Here the House must perceive that, to establish English power in Ireland, the basest means were resorted to; and I now ask, gentlemen, is it by such means you claim a title to dominion in Ireland? Are these your title deeds—these the acts which give one human being power over another? The good feeling of the present day will recoil against an assertion of right founded on such atrocities. I, myself, have felt it to be an extremely unpleasant duty to state them, but I give them as a part of history—I put them forward as part of my case, and I challenge my opponents to show that the subjugation of Ireland was brought about by conquest, but that it was effected by the most shameful deceit and devastation, and by means the most horrible and cruel, which were to others woe, but were disgraceful and cruel to the oppressors who used them. This part of Irish history I quote with something of readiness; because it has not in it anything of sectarian distinctions, and there is here no question between one religion and another. The question here is the subjugation of those whom their opponents chose to call rebels, but who never were recognised as subjects. On this account it is the less painful to me to go into these details. I dwell upon them to show that England has nothing by charter—nothing by conquest—to claim from Ireland, or to prove that the Irish should be subjugated. England has no claim unless such crimes as I have detailed be her claim. I know it may be said, that it would be better for me not to mention these matters—and I have considered it much whether I should bring forward at all this part of my case—I know how unfavourable an impression it may produce against myself by at all bringing it forward, but, after the best reflection I could give the subject, I have determined on advancing it, in order that the English and Irish of this day

shall know upon what foundation that connection has been placed. I do not say that any authority is now derived from the crimes I have recited; but they are mentioned to put an end to the possibility of reverting beyond 1614 for claiming any species of domination over the people of Ireland. The period of James I. is, then, that period in history, in the domestic history of the countries, when there existed the two nations having the one sovereign. The sovereign existed as king of England with his Parliament, and he also existed as king of Ireland—a separate and distinct nation with its Parliament. Crimes were then committed, but that is part of the domestic history of Ireland. The story of the reign of James I. in Ireland is a deplorable narrative of treachery, plunder, and cruelty; but that is part of the domestic history of Ireland. Stafford—haughty, treacherous, and abandoned—ruled with an absolute dominion, which was as fatal to his sovereign as it subsequently was to himself—he completely tyrannised over Church and State; but that also is part of a domestic history—it is part of the history of another and independent nation. In the progress of the Cromwellian usurpation, the crimes of the house of Stuart, even when the Duke of York, afterwards James II., took 40,000 acres from the men who had fought for his father—the revolution of 1688—the breach of the Treaty of Limerick—all this is domestic history. These are all features of our own story; and when there existed a Parliament sometimes greatly checked, and at other times partly free, for Poynnyng's law was repealed four times, and the judicial independence of Ireland was maintained, shackled even as the Legislature was, there existed a distinct Legislature—the king of both countries was the same—the Parliaments alone were different.

That was the state of things down to 1778. Ireland continued to have a separate and distinct Legislature. Look from the reign of James I. down to that period; and my case is, that to that time England had not a shadow of a title to a dominion over Ireland, except that the sovereign of Ireland was equally the sovereign of England. During the whole of that

period the title of Ireland was completely perfect to possess an independent Legislature, sometimes fettered by authority ; a domestic Parliament at least, controlled unjustly, because of the weakness of Ireland, and not by reason of any ingredient in the Constitution of Ireland. They were separate and distinct kingdoms—they were separate nations—and the Act requiring that the laws of Ireland should first be sanctioned by England before they were valid, was an act of usurpation. From the end of the wars of William until 1798 this was the situation of Ireland. The Act of 1778 gave some scope to the resources of the country, and upon no country under heaven have so many blessings been conferred as upon Ireland. The opportunity, then, having been given for those resources to develop themselves, Ireland was growing in wealth and prosperity. Let it be remarked, that the wealth of Ireland followed Irish independence. In 1778 the Legislature relieved a great part of the population from those disabilities under which they laboured in consequence of the penal laws. What was the result of that beneficial measure ? The trade of Ireland, that had been unjustly crippled by British monopoly and British interests, righted itself, and free trade was extended by the combination of the people and the Parliament of Ireland. The Act establishing that was recognised by the British Legislature. This is part of my case, for it shows you where something useful was given, something beneficial was also received, and both nations were benefited by a measure of justice. The principle of justice was introduced in 1778, and one of its practical details was a free trade in 1779. That necessarily accumulated and increased the energies and powers of the people—both were directed to the advantage of Ireland ; and, accordingly, in 1782, Ireland worked out the principle of its Parliamentary existence. A Parliament in Ireland was first confined to the Pale ; it was next, in the reign of James I., extended throughout Ireland ; still, however, unjustly controlled. But it worked out its entire development in 1782, when the full legislative and judicial independence of Ireland was attained. Never yet was any change or revolution

in any country so complete, so honourable, so glorious to a people, as the change which was then accomplished. There was not a crime to stain it—not one drop of blood to tarnish it. It was the perfection of human patriotism, and afforded an example which I should be happy to see the world imitate. It was the greatest of political changes, without the smallest particle of crime to deteriorate from its value. And that change, sir, was a treaty solemnly made with the governing powers—it was entered into deliberately by England, and confirmed by her Government—it was founded upon a message of the king—the king of Ireland. It was a wise and generous message. On the 16th of April, 1782, this message was delivered to the Irish Houses of Parliament. His Majesty stated—

“That being concerned to find discontent and jealousies prevailing amongst his loyal subjects in Ireland, he earnestly recommended to the House to take the same into their most serious consideration, in order to such a final adjustment as would give mutual satisfaction to both countries.”

The revolution then accomplished (continued Mr. O’Connell) was no hasty rebellion—it was not obtained even by those circuitous means which, in modern times, it may be necessary to adopt. No; those who were authorised by the Constitution gave their sanction to this great constitutional principle, sanctioning, authorising, and recognising the independence of Ireland. The Irish then said—

“We are a separate nation from you. Ireland belongs to your king, as England belongs to him; we belong to the same king; but we ought to have distinct Legislatures. You have admitted this principle. Our Legislature is nearly as old as yours; both began nearly at the same time, and the records of our Parliament are nearly as old as those of England. When your power was extended all over Ireland, Parliament was co-extensive with the confines of Ireland.”

If ever there was a solemn treaty recorded in history, this was one—sanctioned by the message, adopted by its Parliament, and approved of by its people. It was Ireland’s right to have an existing Parliament; never was anything so broadly and so legibly recognised; it was admitted even though many unjust usurpations had been made in spite of the admission. Many usurpations, I say, have since been made, and not the least of

them is establishing at Westminster an appellate jurisdiction for Ireland. If there were no other reason, the inconvenience of that jurisdiction alone is sufficient to justify the call for Repeal. The vexation and delay of the appellate jurisdiction is intolerable. It is the most cruel of hardships that a client from Donegal or Kerry must have recourse to Westminster Hall and the House of Lords, there to decide that which ought to be determined at home. It may be fine in speech, but it is a cruel mockery to the Irish peasant to tell him to look to Westminster for an equitable decision should he be treated unjustly at home. This is one of the inconveniences of the Union—it is one of the grounds of my complaint against the Union—it is one of the reasons which makes me think that Irishmen should struggle to gain back again the independence of their Parliament. I have read for you the message of the King in 1782. I will now read for you the unanimous, the unqualified reply of the Parliament. The minister attempted to introduce two or three sentences, which would have mitigated its force; but they were rejected by everybody, and, at least, abandoned by himself, and this address was unanimously agreed to—

“To assure his Majesty that his subjects of Ireland are a free people; that the Crown of Ireland is an Imperial Crown, inseparably annexed to the Crown of Great Britain, on which the connection, the interests, and happiness of both nations essentially depend.”

(*Hear*). I adopt every word of it; and truth more distinct and plain was never yet uttered by human lips. The address goes on—

“But that the kingdom of Ireland is a distinct kingdom, with a Parliament of her own, the sole Legislature thereof; that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind this nation, except the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland; nor any other Parliament which hath any other authority or power of any sort whatsoever in this country, save only the Parliament of Ireland. To assure his Majesty that we humbly conceive that in this right the very essence of our liberties exist—a right which we, on the part of all the people of Ireland, do claim as their birthright, and which we cannot yield but with our lives.”

Yes, that was the assertion of liberty; and whenever the

same spirit walks abroad in Ireland again, that moment the Irish Parliament will be restored (with your consent) to my country. A sad and melancholy story is that of English rule in Ireland. Many are the crimes—many are the woes—many the misfortunes of the children of Ireland; and many have been the violations of treaties made with them; and, mark! now: I defy the congregated malignity of the world to show one instance in which the Irish violated any one treaty into which they entered. I could point out—only that I do not choose to burden myself with one hundred documents, which it would pain both you and myself to read—I could show you one hundred instances in which treaties were only made with the Irish to be violated. British writers have openly descanted on the vanity and foolishness of keeping faith with the rebel and Popish Irish; and while they thus brand their own want of faith, I defy any man to show that the Irish ever violated any treaty into which they entered. There was, indeed, a period brilliant in Irish history—a period when the Irish gentry—when the great Protestant families took the lead. That was a glorious occasion; and the names of many of them, which belong to history, live in the affections, and are dear to the recollections of the Irish people. I speak of the great movement in 1782. No matter how different may be their politics, there is not any one of the families of those men who does not boast that his father was a colonel in the Irish Volunteers. Many a dissension has occurred since. There has been the violence of party animosity; and yet, when I have spoken to the son of an Irish Volunteer, he has always insisted that Ireland should be free; that Irishmen should recognise no masters; that no laws should be passed for his country but those sanctioned by the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland. The Act of 1782 was our treaty—it was our charter—and it is not now to be got rid of by any species of special pleading. The Act of 1782 was the Irish charter of liberty; it was not given up by the people. It was their charter then; it is their charter still. You cannot blot it out. You

may create, as you have created, faction. You may continue, as you have continued, dissensions amongst us. You may adopt and feign, as you have done, the most paltry pretences, but the people—the people of Ireland—will still insist on their charter being revived. I insist upon it, that that charter was obtained by the best means, and granted in the most solemn manner; it was a compact voluntarily and deliberately entered into, and it was a compact in which the Irish people endeavoured to follow up the principles of the British Constitution. The Irish Parliament passed that Act; the King of Ireland assented to it; the Lords and the Commons were a party to the treaty; it was perfect, complete, and should have been irreversible. What do we ask for now? The full extension of the principles and the benefits conferred by the final adjustment of 1782. Many of us were alive, and we felt the benefits of that arrangement; and yet we saw ourselves divested of it. I am one of them, and yet I live to tell it. If it were possible to have existed; if it were possible to have survived; it could only be, because of the hope that my country would be restored to all her rights; without that hope existence would not be worth preserving. The improving spirit of my countrymen, the amelioration of their feelings towards each other, prove that they are advancing to that state when the charter of 1782 must be conceded to them. You may be convinced of this. Whether I abandon the question or not is immaterial; but this I tell you, even if I were to abandon it, it never would be abandoned by the people of Ireland. I close here the first topic, and the first part of my argument, and I proceed to the next. I first, firmly assert the charter still remains; and I throw the burden upon the other side to show by what title that final adjustment was evaded, and that solemn compact broken. I proceed to show how the independence of Ireland was obscured, for it is not lost. Before I go to that, I am anxious to allude to a topic upon which I delight to dwell; it is the effects to Ireland of her having an independent legislature. If the form of government be immaterial, as some as-

sert; an opinion in which I do not agree with them; if, as some say,

“ For modes of law, let casuists contest;
Those that are best administered are best.”

Let us look to what were the effects of the independence of Ireland, and we shall soon discover the blessings which good government bestowed upon the country. I am delighted to be able to do this now, because I believe that there will be brought forward multitudinous calculations, by which Ireland will be conjured into a state of prosperity. These documents, too, may be fabricated for the occasion—they may be treasured for the occasion. To be sure, it may be thought a good trick—as “dullness ever loves a joke”—and they, too, may be prepared for the period on which they are used. But the documents to which I refer are not so tainted; there is no trickery, and there can be no fabrication about them. Let it be remembered, too, that the experiment of independence in Ireland was made under exceedingly unfavourable circumstances—that it was not a Reformed Parliament, and yet the prosperity of Ireland followed its independence; besides, its independence was qualified by this—it was a borough-mongers’ Parliament; there were forty boroughs created in one day; it was not the people, but a party, who returned the members, for a considerable portion of the people were excluded from voting. It was impossible that the experiment could have been made under more unfavourable circumstances; but, then, it was an Irish and a national Parliament, and it did much good for the country. It had, of course, its defects. It has often been assailed, and nothing has been more common than to abuse and calumniate it; and yet, abused as it has been, it showed several instances of excellent virtue, and it defied the ministers more than once. With three hundred members, it had a permanent Opposition of ninety—a number quite sufficient to keep any ministry in check; they might be mistaken in their opposition, as one of them, Sir Edward Garry, was, who declared that “he had never voted with the minister,

whether right or wrong." But still it was independent; it did not seek for court favours or treasury dinners; and, notwithstanding all its faults, it was not worse than its neighbours. It certainly never had voted that the Walcheren expedition was wise and expedient.

If the right hon. member for Limerick—for Cambridge, I mean—and I assure him the mistake was unintentional—but if the right hon. gentleman had discovered that the Irish House of Commons had travelled through the multiplication table, and discovered by that or any other conjuring process—aye, and voted it, too—that a pound note and a shilling were equal to a guinea in gold, and yet the moment you walked out of the House it was discovered that a guinea in gold was worth a pound note and seven shillings—if the right hon. gentleman had discovered anything of that kind done by the Irish Parliament, how he would have diverted the House with it—if this had been done by an Irish Parliament, and the same Parliament had, in less than a fortnight afterwards, passed an Act of Parliament settling that the guinea in gold was actually worth twenty-seven shillings. Yet, gentlemen, it was an English, and not an Irish, Parliament did this. Both Parliaments have committed many crimes against the people; but, on some occasions, the Parliament of Ireland was more honest than that of England. On the Regency question, for example, I firmly assert that more honesty and independence were exhibited by the Irish than the English Parliament. The British Parliament then voted that Mr. Pitt should be, in effect, the Regent; while the Irish Parliament considered that, if the King's body were dead, his heir, being of full age, should naturally ascend the throne; and that, if the mind were dead, whether that occurred from age or affliction, that without which the carcase was as dead, they thought that, under such circumstances, the heir, being of full age, should be the Regent. In that I think they acted wisely and properly. I see (said Mr. O'Connell, pointing to Mr. Secretary Stanley) a note taken of that. I wish the gentleman joy of it; and, in order that I

may dispose of the argument to follow from it, let me observe that, by the 33rd Henry VIII., the king *de facto* of England is the king *de jure* of Ireland. Only extend that principle to the case of a Regency, and the Regent of England *de facto* becomes the Regent of Ireland *de jure*. With the settlement of the Crown of Great Britain I meddle not. The Irish Parliament had then, in the first instance, to decide as you had, in whose hands the executive power was to be placed. There was no precedent, no rule to guide them; and, I contend, they acted well. To return, however, to the effects of independence in Ireland. The independent Parliament gave prosperity to the Irish people; and one necessary effect that followed from it was, to check the progress of absenteeism amongst the great and the noble. And I here challenge my opponents to show any expedient so well calculated as a resident Parliament to check absenteeism. It is the means best to be adopted for bringing those who have property in any country to attend to the welfare of the people who reside in it. But was Ireland prosperous under her own Parliament? In this debate I consider myself as counsel for Ireland; and the first witness I shall summon will be Lord Clare. He is one over whom I could not be supposed to have any control. His speech was published in 1798; and he tells you what were the effects to Ireland of an independent Parliament, from 1782 to 1798—

“There is not,” he said, “a nation on the face of the habitable globe which has advanced in cultivation, in agriculture, in manufactures, with the same rapidity, in the same period, as Ireland.”

That is the evidence of Lord Clare, who declared, that no nation had advanced with the same rapidity in agriculture and manufactures as Ireland, from 1782 to 1798—that is, two years before the Union. He was Chancellor, too, in his day. Let me now take the evidence of another Chancellor, who thus described Ireland at the same period—

“As a little island, with a population of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of people, hardy, gallant, and enthusiastic; possessed of all means of civilisation; agri-

culture and commerce well pursued and understood; a constitution fully recognised and established; her revenues, her trade, her manufactures thriving beyond the hope or example of any other country of her extent; within these few years advancing with a rapidity astonishing even to herself; not complaining of deficiency in any of these respects, but enjoying and acknowledging her prosperity: she is called on to surrender them all to the control of whom? Is it to a great and powerful continent, to whom nature intended her as an appendage—to a mighty people totally exceeding her in all calculation of territory or population? No; but to another happy little island, placed beside her in the bosom of the Atlantic, of little more than double her population and territory, and possessing resources not nearly so superior to her wants; and this, too, an island that has grown great, and prosperous, and happy by the very same advantages which Ireland enjoys—a free and independent Constitution, and the protection of a domestic superintendent Parliament.”

That is the opinion of Lord Chancellor Plunket. There is the living Chancellor following the dead—the testimony of one corroborated and confirmed by the testimony of the other. I will quote another authority; a great one in this House. He was a Chancellor, too; but he was a Chancellor of the Exchequer. I mean Mr. Pitt; and in his speech for carrying the Union, we find this important testimony, published by his authority. Mr. Pitt begins by quoting Mr. Foster's speech, in 1785, on the then state of the international trade between England and Ireland, which he adopted—

“The exportation,” he said, “of Irish products to England amounts to two millions and a-half annually; and the exportation of British products to Ireland amounts to one million.”

That is a proof that Ireland was a flourishing country before the Union. But I have another evidence; it is Lord Grey. He was then Mr. Grey, and he then asserted the principles for which I now contend. When Mr. Grey, in his opposition to the Union, was taunted upon the prosperity of Scotland since the Union, he said—

“In truth, for a period of more than forty years after the Union, Scotland exhibited no proofs of increased industry and of rising wealth—till after 1748 there was no sensible advance of her commerce. Several of her manufactures were not established till sixty years after the Union, and her principal branch

of manufacture was not set up, I believe, till 1781. The abolition of the heritable jurisdiction was the first great measure that gave an impulse to the spirit of improvement in Scotland. Since that time the prosperity of Scotland has been considerable, but certainly not so great as that of Ireland has been within the same period."

There is the testimony of two Lord Chancellors—Lord Chancellor Clare and Lord Chancellor Plunket; of John Foster, of William Pitt; and there, too, is the testimony of Lord Grey—all of them demonstrating the prosperity which Ireland enjoyed when her Parliament became independent. But I possess another document derived from the Report on the condition of commerce in Ireland, which was drawn up on the motion of the hon. member for Cambridge, by which I can show that the consumption of Ireland increased considerably above that of England during the period of Irish legislative independence. I will take for example—tea, sugar, tobacco, coffee, and wine. Within the period, from 1782 to 1797; the consumption of tea in Ireland increased eighty-four per cent., while in England it only increased forty-five per cent.; the consumption of tobacco increased 100 per cent., and in England but forty-five. The consumption of wine had increased in Ireland seventy-four per cent.; England, twenty-two per cent.; while the increased use of coffee in Ireland was proved by figures, stating the increase at 600 per cent.; England being left with an addition of only seventy-five per cent. These are evidences of the increase of prosperity during this period, and I cannot be suspected of preparing or manufacturing these proofs. They, however, establish this fact completely—that considerable increase, during a number of years previous to the Union, took place in the consumption of articles of luxury and comfort by the people of Ireland. I will now advert to another topic, although I confess that it would be at least equally pleasing to me to dwell upon the commercial effects of legislative independence in Ireland. It is enough, however, that I have completely proved, that, as Ireland effected the most glorious revolution, in point of principle and moral conduct, in 1782,

so that revolution led the most useful consequences in extent of consumption, extent of commerce, and the enjoyments even of the luxuries of life. That with which I first began was a painful subject; but that with which I close my proofs of the independence of Ireland, is a matter of great and peculiar gratification. The second topic, with regard to the effect produced by its legislative independence, is a subject equally pleasing; and let me not, however, be led away from it, until I assert, that there is not a man in Ireland, old enough to remember that period, who does not know that not a particle of that independence has ever been surrendered. I was young, to be sure, in 1782; it was the first year of which I can distinctly remember anything connected with public affairs; but I am old enough to recollect the increase of the prosperity of my country. I have seen it expand; I have witnessed its decay; and I sincerely trust that I shall live to see prosperity and happiness revive under an independent and national Legislature. Since the Union Ireland has grievously declined, both in prosperity and political freedom. With regard to the Act of Union, which has been the great source of Ireland's wrongs, I fearlessly maintain that that Act was not legal. The Irish Parliament had no right to transfer its powers to the Legislature of Great Britain. It is not by merely throwing an Act of Parliament before me that you can prove anything. There might be an Act of Parliament passed to vest the Crown of this realm in Louis Philippe tomorrow; but it would be merely an Act in shape and form—in reality an ordinance which every one of us is bound to resist to the death upon principle. Is there any authority competent to strike down the liberties of the people of Ireland? The British Parliament have no such authority. The people have the inherent power to govern in themselves; and, if the people choose to alter a Government, the natural feeling is, that they have the power and the right to do so. But I deny that the British Parliament has any such authority, or that the Irish Parliament had any such authority. I assert here, as I have asserted before in other places, that the Irish Parliament was

utterly incompetent to annihilate the Legislature of Ireland, as they assumed to do by the Act of Union; and, on behalf of the Irish people, I protest against its competency. The Parliament had the power to make laws—that principle is quite clear; so have you the power to make laws; but neither of these Parliaments had the power to make legislators. You may alter and modify a branch of the Legislature, but you have not the power to annihilate the Legislature. You have not the power of transferring to France at this moment—to the Chamber of Deputies—the right of taxing the people of this country. Oh! how I should be surprised at any man getting up in this House and saying, “Send over 100 of our members to the Chamber of Deputies, in order that they may be allowed to tax the people of this country.” It would be a suggestion that could only be considered as that of a madman. Yet the principle is the same as you have applied to Ireland. The King of England was King of France, as well as Ireland, up to the reign of George III.; there was little difference between the circumstances. Henry V. was crowned King of France in France; but I ask, would that have made any difference? Not the least, in point of principle. I, on the part of the people of Ireland, assert, that the Irish Parliament was perfectly incompetent to do this—that the Parliament of Ireland exists, in right, even at the present moment—and that the Treaty—so I will call it—of 1782, is still unvalidated by an Act which has not the sanction of any regular or competent authority. But I do not depend on my own dictum—on any assertion or reasoning of my own. I know that I cannot convince unwilling persons of the truth and justice of my general principles as to the connection between Great Britain and Ireland, though you will admit them the moment that the case is put as between England and the Government of France. But I depend on other authorities than my own; and in this instance I have an authority which has ever been held in high respect and veneration by the Whigs—that great public writer, who was the principal means before any other man of establishing, or rather confirming, the Revolution of

1688—I allude to John Locke. He has shown how far the Legislature could go; he has shown that the Legislature has the power of cashiering a king, and appointing a successor; and he has shown, at the same time, the utter impossibility, upon principle, of a Legislature having any power beyond this. I will read his own words, and not comment on them.

“The Legislature cannot transfer (says Mr. Locke) the power of making laws into other hands, for it being but a delegated power from the people, they who have it cannot pass it over to others. The people alone can appoint the form of the Commonwealth, which is by constituting the Legislature, and appointing in whose hands that shall be; and when the people shall have said, we will submit and be governed by laws made by such men, and in such terms, nobody else can say other men shall make laws for them. The power of the Legislature being derived from the people by a positive voluntary grant and institution, can be no other than what the positive grant conveyed, which being only to make laws and not to make legislators, the Legislature can have no power to transfer their authority of making laws, or to place it in other hands.”

Mr. Locke then unanswerably proves that no Parliament has the right of annihilating itself, that the power of legislation can only be derived from the people, that no Legislature has any right to transfer the power so conferred on them into any other hands. He does not dispute the right or the authority of Parliament to remodel the legislature of the country—that is part of your law; but he does dispute the power of making a different legislature for those persons over whom legislature has no kind of control whatever. But, to come to a more modern authority, to which a certain portion of this House will be ready to give due weight and consideration. I find it expressly declared and laid down, that—

“You may make the Union binding as a law; but you cannot make it obligatory on conscience. It will be obeyed as long as England is strong, but resistance to it will be in the abstract a duty; and the exhibition of that resistance will be a mere question of prudence.”

Who did hon. members (Mr. O’Connell continued) think said that? Was it some wild agitator, was it some popular orator who had said it? No. It was one of the most distin-

guished lawyers of the present day; one who for twenty years had managed all the Government law business in Ireland. The name of the high authority to which he referred was Saurin, the Attorney-General for Ireland. He would be glad to learn whether or not Lord Grey had not since been of the same opinion? Did not his Lordship say in the speech already quoted, that the people of Ireland should wait their opportunity to recover the rights of which they had been deprived by the Act of Union? Lord Grey had never, in the whole course of his life, said anything more true. The people of Ireland were waiting, and would wait for an opportunity to recover their rights. He had one authority more to bring forward. He had already referred to what Saurin had said on the subject of the illegality of the Union. Did he make the speech in which he expressed it before he was Attorney-General? No, he did not. The speech was made five years after. Well, then, did he retract? He never did. Mr. Saurin was not a man to retract. He now came to the other authority, of whom he had just stated that he was about to speak. That authority had, in the most earnest and eloquent terms, warned the Irish Legislature against passing an Act of Union. That authority used language superior to any he could employ, and he would quote it to the House :—

“I warn you (said this authority), that I deny the competency of the Irish Parliament to do this act. I warn you not to lay your hands on the Constitution of your country. The act which you are about to perform will, of itself, be a nullity; it will be an Act which no man in Ireland can be called upon to obey. I repeat my assertion, that no man is bound to obey this illegal Act, and I call upon you to take down my words. You were not elected for this purpose. You are called upon to frame laws, and not to frame a legislation. You are not empowered to transfer the legislation of one country to that of another; and I solemnly warn you, that by attempting to do so, you, in fact, are only performing an act which is a dissolution of your own Government, and resolving all society into its original elements. And, mark me! I do not here state what may be called the doctrines of wise and sagacious men alone; but I state the doctrines which are to be found inscribed in the very first records of your own Revolution of 1688; doctrines by which, and by which alone, the House of Hanover holds any title to the throne of

the British empire. Would anyone venture to assert that the King of England can transfer his crown and the allegiance of his people to another sovereign? No one would. And you, the Irish Parliament, are as competent to transfer the allegiance of the Irish people to the French nation as you are to transfer your powers to the British Parliament. If you attempt to do so, that attempt is an act of abdication. Yourself you may extinguish and blot out, but the Irish Parliament you cannot. That is a body which is enthroned on Irish ground alone; its shrine is in Ireland, and in Ireland alone; and as well might the wretched suicide, in the effort of destroying his body, think he had effectually annihilated and extinguished his soul, as you, the Irish House of Parliament, believe that, in assenting to this Act of Union, you had put an end to the Parliament of Ireland. Therefore, and for all these reasons, I warn you not to lay your hands on the sacred and inviolable Constitution."

And whose words were these? They were the words of another Chancellor of Ireland. And where was the answer to it? Oh, God! it was given by the bayonet and the scourge. And who was this Lord Chancellor, who could so strongly, so eloquently, urge the truth? Who, but the Lord Chancellor Plunket. Who, having been made Attorney-General by the Tories, was made yet more by the Whigs, and having been induced to abdicate that office, was made, first, Master of the Rolls, then Chief Justice of the Common Pleas—but, mind, never having retracted one word of his declaration against the Union—and, lastly, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. And what authority had they to oppose to these two great men, Plunket and Saurin? Saurin, wholly unimpeached in all his original integrity, and Plunket, as he was in the days of his uncontaminated political fame and consistency. Let them take Saurin in any way, either as a politician or as a lawyer, and he was completely unshakable and unshaken; and a fortunate thing was it that Ireland could command from such an uncontaminated source the declaration that the Parliament of Ireland was incompetent to perform the Act of Union. It had been said by the same authority that the Irish Parliament was not dead, but merely slept; and the late Mr. Grattan had very expressively said, that he had rocked the cradle of the Irish Parliament, and followed it to its grave, but he had no doubt it would have a glo-

rious resurrection, when all parties combined to obtain their common good. He begged hon. members to recollect how great was the importance which was attached to those solemn declarations of Lords Grey and Plunket. Lord Grey had told the Irish people to wait for a proper opportunity to recover their rights. However little his hope was, when he entered that House, of seeing his countrymen recover their rights to a Legislature of their own, he trusted, at least, Parliament must see that the way to satisfy them was not by a haughty refusal to grant them the desired inquiry into the consequences which had resulted from the Union. That Union was said by some to be a national compact; but he assumed that the Union was not an international compact; or admitting that it had even the colour or shape of a compact, he maintained that it was procured under circumstances which made it void. But he distinctly denied that the Act of Union possessed any of the characters of a compact. He knew that it had been said that the Act of Union was a bargain, in respect of which Ireland got some consideration; that some persons thought the consideration great, while others thought it small.

But it was not a question of much or little, the fact being that the Act of Union was a contract by which Ireland got something, and by which she was therefore bound. He was ready to admit the obligatory nature of a contract with respect to those who were parties to it; they could not void with justice, yet there existed exceptions in every law. A *femme covert*, or a person deranged in intellect, could not make a valid contract, and those which were entered into by trustees for their own benefit were not binding on the parties for whom they were trustees. He repeated, however, that the Union had not any appearance of a contract, and though it was not skilful in a man addressing a public assembly to promise more than he could afterwards perform, yet he had no hesitation in declaring, that if an inquiry were granted him he had materials to show that there never had been committed before such enormities as those by which the Union was brought about.

He had already mentioned some of the crimes perpetrated in the early periods of Irish history; but he undertook to prove, that atrocities equal in magnitude to those had been committed shortly previous to the Union, and that the chief means by which that act was consummated were intimidation, bribery, corruption, treachery, and bloodshed. He would show that rebellion was fomented, that divisions were kept up, that religion was distorted from its high and holy purposes, and perverted into an instrument of discord and assassination; he would trace these calamities to the promoters of the Union, to effect which they set the Catholic against the Protestant, and the Protestant against the Catholic, and made the country one universal bedlam, on purpose that they might assume the office of keeper, and turn it to their own profit and emolument. Could they, then, call the Union, effected by such means, a compact? He should be obliged to detain the House some time while he laid these facts before them; but the subject was important, and it was fitting that the nature of the case of the advocates of the Repeal of the Union should be fully explained to the British Parliament and the British public. Every species of taunt, contumely, and ridicule had been thrown on them; as base a press as ever existed had been turned against them; and they who were only advocating the rights of their country had been the objects of the bitterest calumny. He only said this, that he might now appeal to universal Britain, through her representatives, to hear the real state of the case with respect to the object of the extinction of the Parliament of Ireland. His own conviction was, that the object of that measure was to enable the British Government to obtain a complete control over the revenues of Ireland. Whether this was a wise speculation was another consideration, but that it was the speculation he entertained not the least doubt. He was aware of the formidable advantage he was giving the right hon. Secretary of the Colonies by this avowal. He knew what the right hon. gentleman's estimate was of English generosity and Irish beggary; yet he had not the least doubt that he

should be able to prove that the Union was brought about for the object he had mentioned. England had engaged in a most expensive war, and her debt amounted to £420,000,000. The debt of Ireland did not exceed £25,000,000, even including that which she ought not to be called on to pay—the wages of her own sin. Yet Ireland was called on to hand over her resources to a nation by whom she had for centuries been treated with oppression. It was asserted by Mr. Pitt, that “Ireland had always been treated with injustice and illiberality,” and “Junius” said, that “Ireland had been uniformly plundered,” and in these expressions might be found the history of Ireland for centuries. The British had uniformly checked the development of her resources, paralysed her exertions, and ridiculed her pretensions to commerce. They had never made any concession to her which they had the power to withhold, or granted any favour without reluctance. All the advantages which Ireland had obtained from England had been wrung from that country like drops of her heart’s blood. Whose sentiments were these? The sentiments of Chief Justice Bushe. The House knew how he should be taunted if he ventured to speak in the same strain; yet how feeble was his language compared with the emphatic expression of Chief Justice Bushe? For twenty years that learned gentleman filled the office of Solicitor-General; he was afterwards made Lord Chief Justice; and now let the House hear his description of the motives which actuated the promoters of the Union. These were his words:—

“I strip this formidable measure of all its pretences and all its aggravations; I look upon it nakedly and abstractedly, and I see nothing in it but one question—Will you give up the country? I forget for the moment the unprincipled means by which it has been promoted; I pass by for an instant the unseasonable moment at which it was introduced, and the contempt of Parliament upon which it is bottomed, and I look upon it simply as England reclaiming, in a moment of your weakness, that dominion which you extorted from her in a moment of your virtue—a dominion which she uniformly abused, which invariably oppressed and impoverished you, and from the cessation of which you date all your prosperity. It is a measure which goes to degrade the country, by saying it is unworthy to govern itself, and to stultify the

Parliament, by saying it is incapable of governing the country. It is the revival of the odious and absurd title of conquest; it is the renewal of the abominable distinction between mother country and colony which lost America; it is the denial of the rights of nature to a great nation, from an intolerance of its prosperity."

This he (Mr. O'Connell) asserted was the real fact, and he called Lord Chief Justice Bushe to bear witness that England promoted the Union from intolerance of Irish prosperity. He would now proceed to quote an opinion of some importance, for it was his good fortune to be arguing this question not only with the authority of Lord Clare and Lord Chief Justice Bushe, but also with that of the present Prime Minister, Earl Grey. He was not, therefore, supported by men of doubtful principles, but by the great lights of the country whose unquestioned talents had raised them above their fellow-men. The present Prime Minister said on one occasion :—

"Twenty-seven counties have petitioned against the measure. The petition from the county of Down is signed by upwards of 17,000 respectable, independent men, and all the others are in a similar proportion. Dublin petitioned under the great seal of the city, and each of the corporations in it followed the example. Drogheda petitioned against the Union, and almost every other town in the kingdom in like manner testified its disapprobation. A few parties, possessing great influence in the country, obtained a few counter petitions; yet, though the petition from Down was signed by 17,000, the counter petition was signed only by 415. Though there were 707,000 who had signed petitions against the measure, the total number of those who declared themselves in favour of it did not exceed 3,000; and many of these even only prayed that the measure might be discussed. If the facts I state are true, and I challenge any man to falsify them, could a nation in more direct terms express its disapprobation of a political measure than Ireland has of a Legislative Union with Great Britain? In fact, the nation is nearly unanimous; and this great majority is composed not of fanatics, bigots, or Jacobins, but of the most respectable in every class of the community."

He had the authority of Earl Grey, then, for saying that the union of Ireland was not a compact, and did not even bear the slightest semblance to a compact. More than one hundred

and fifty years before, it appeared that my Lord Strafford issued a commission to the sheriff of Connaught to try the titles of all the gentlemen of the province to their estates, and gave the Chief Baron 4s. for each jury that he could provide to find a verdict for the Crown. But, lest the bribe of 4s. might not be enough, he also despatched a troop of horse, who were to be "lookers-on" in name, but who were in reality directed to bring bodily to Dublin every recusant jury. The example of Strafford was not lost on the Governors at the period of the Union. A formidable array of military force would, they shrewdly thought, be no dull incentive to be applied to the people; and, accordingly, in 1797, at which time a rebellion threatened to explode in Ireland, the military force amounted in number to 78,994 men; while in 1798, when the rebellion was put down, the military force had increased to 91,000 men; in 1799 it was not less than 114,000 men; and in 1800, two years after the rebellion, it had augmented to 129,215 men. Thus, the army had gone on increasing precisely in the same proportion as the necessity for its augmentation had diminished. Those troops, however, were not bad "lookers-on," and were not brought in vain to Ireland. The army was employed in the service it was intended for; and that service it performed to the ruin of Ireland and the discredit of England. What was that service? It was to suppress meetings in some places when their proceedings were likely to be opposed to the dictum of the Castle, and to control and overawe them in others; in fact, to extinguish the free expression of the popular will, or, by intimidation, to give it a direction favourable to the views of Government. In Clonmel and Birr meetings, legally convened and temperately conducted, were forcibly suppressed by the military. The first time he (Mr. O'Connell) spoke in public was at a meeting convened to resist the Union. That meeting was held under the eye of the military. Mr. Pitt told the Catholics, as an inducement to them to support the question of the Union, that, if the Union passed, they would be emancipated. Others, again, who were opposed to the Union, told

them that their support of the measure would be sealing their own degradation, and that their own freedom would be the natural consequence of the independence of their country. Mr. Pitt wrote to the Earl of Fingal, the premier Catholic peer of Ireland, that Emancipation would be surely the reward of the adhesion of the Catholics to the Union. He had no doubt that Mr. Pitt then meant honestly; but he was overruled by a rancorous and dominant faction; and in a few years after he resigned, because he could not fulfil his pledge. When the meeting, to which he had just referred, assembled in the Royal Exchange, and were waiting for the chairman, they heard at once the clashing of arms and the rush of soldiers, while the members in their consternation were hurrying from the scene of danger; indeed, the glass door and some windows were broken; the officer appeared, and told them that he had orders to suppress the meeting. The consequence was, that they were obliged to despatch an humble supplication to the Lord Lieutenant; and it was not until his gracious permission was obtained that they were allowed to meet for the discussion of a great national question. That was a historical fact, not his simple statement; for Plowden, the Irish historian, minutely detailed the circumstances of the meeting, and said that Counsellor O'Connell said so and so. Plowden was employed by Mr. Pitt to give a history of Ireland, and such a one as would reconcile the Catholics to the Union. Having quoted from the speeches of so many individuals, he might now, perhaps, be allowed to read two or three lines from the speech to which Plowden referred. He had then said—

“It is my sentiment, and I am satisfied it is the sentiment not only of every gentleman who now hears me, but of the Catholic people of Ireland—that, if our opposition to this injurious, insulting, and hated measure of the Union were to draw upon us the revival of the penal laws, we would boldly meet a proscription and oppression, which would be the testimonies of our virtue, and sooner throw ourselves once more on the mercy of our Protestant brethren than give our consent to the political murder of our country. Yes, I know—I do know, that although exclusive advantages may be ambiguously held forth to the Irish Catholic to seduce him from the sacred duty which he

owes his country, I know that the Catholics of Ireland still remember that they have a country, and that they will never accept of any advantages as a sect which would debase and destroy them as a people."

These were his sentiments then, and these were his sentiments now. He stated the fact to show that, from early life, he was opposed, as he would ever be opposed, to a measure so pregnant with shame and disaster to his country. Resolutions were passed at that meeting, among which were the following, which he would beg leave to read to the House :—

"That we are of opinion, that the proposed incorporate Union of the Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland is, in fact, an extinction of the liberty of the country, which would be reduced to the actual condition of a province, surrendered to the mercy of the minister and Legislature of another country, to be bound by their absolute will, and taxed at their pleasure by laws, in the making of which this country would have no efficient participation whatever."

"Resolved—That we are of opinion, that the improvement of Ireland for the last twenty years, so rapid beyond example, is ascribed wholly to the independence of our Legislature, so glorious in the year 1782, by virtue of our Parliament co-operating with the generous recommendation of our gracious and most benevolent Sovereign, and backed by the spirit of our people, and so solemnly ratified by both kingdoms, as the only true and permanent foundation of Irish prosperity and British connection."

"Resolved—That, having heretofore determined not to come forward any more in the distinct character of Catholics, but to consider our claims and our cause not as those of a sect, but as involved in the general fate of our country, we now think it right, notwithstanding such determination, to publish the present resolutions in order to undeceive our fellow-subjects, who had been led to believe, by false representations, that we are capable of giving any concurrence whatever to so foul and fatal a project, to assure them that we are incapable of sacrificing our common country to either pique or pretension ; and that we are of opinion that this deadly attack upon the nation is the great call of nature, of country, and posterity upon Irishmen of all descriptions and persuasions to every constitutional and legal resistance, and that we sacredly pledge ourselves to persevere in obedience to that call as long as we have life."

The interference of the military at that meeting was of a piece with their authorised interference on all occasions. The feelings of the Irish nation had been held at nought—they

were treated with the most galling contempt. The violence of the military was day after day augmented; the public meetings held by the Irish were interfered with in the most arbitrary and insolent manner; the popular feeling was exasperated; resistance was secretly encouraged by the satellites of the Government; and thus was the rebellion fomented, and brought to a head, until it ended in a fearful tragedy. Give him (Mr. O'Connell) a committee—he would not then enter into the multitudinous proofs—and he would establish to a demonstration that there would have been no rebellion if it were not to carry the Union. That rebellion was purely Jacobinical in its origin; but, at its close, it was disgraced by religious rancour, and made the instrument of splitting the people into hostile factions. It, at first, as was notorious, originated with the Presbyterians of the North; it then spread over the country, embracing men of all parties and creeds; and it was for the sake of carrying the Union that it was made to explode. What was the proof? The Government had clear evidence of what was going on, and could at any moment check it. But no; in place of arresting the chiefs, and seizing their papers, they allowed things to ripen, and the people to be goaded by petty tyranny into open revolt. And what, then, was the terrible consequence? He had heard of such things (as who had not) as free quarter, of torture, or of picketing. All these were the work of the Irish Government of those days, in order that they might enslave the country. In the year 1797 the military command was entrusted to the gallant General Abercrombie, who was no party man, and from whom, therefore, truth might be expected. He found the army demoralized and disorganized, and, on the 17th of February of that year, he published his famous "General Orders," in which he stated the memorable fact, that "the army was formidable to all but to the enemies of the country." That was a fact which was not denied, and was undeniable. Against a foreign foe they were contemptible, though to the Irish people they were a direful scourge. The fact, he knew, had been asserted in the Irish House of Commons. He asserted in that

House, that the object of the Government was to make the Irish rebellion explode for the purpose of carrying the Union. His authority was not rumoured report, but a Report of a Secret Committee of the House of Commons in 1798. In section 14 it was stated, that a man, named Nicholas Magnane, who was a colonel of the insurgent army and a member of the provincial committee, attended the meeting, and regularly entered into the debates, and after the business was over went to a neighbouring magistrate, the Rev. Mr. M'Clelland, who was now alive, and gave the names of the parties, with an account of all the proceedings.* This was in 1797. That information was duly transmitted to Government, who did not act on it, but allowed matters to go on until 1798, when they were ripe for their purpose. The ministers had then all the necessary information in their possession for twelve months, and yet they made no effort to check the march of rebellion, but, on the contrary, many efforts to expedite and facilitate it. They had a large army, but they did not, however, apprehend the danger to be so great as it was. They miscalculated grossly the amount of physical force, popular energy, and moral intelligence arrayed against them, and were near falling into the pit they had prepared for the people. The outbreak in Wexford was not the result of the concerted scheme of the leaders of the rebellion, but was caused by wanton and premeditated cruelties, practised in order to precipitate things to a crisis before the schemes of the leaders were matured. There would have been no Union but for the rebellion, and no rebellion but for the Union. The rebellion was destined to usher in the monster of the Union—that engine of English domination. But a rebellion was necessary to excite bigotry and foster religious animosity. For that the Union was a blessing; and there was the Nero-like feeling to attain it.

“Rarus et anticus habitator in urbibusserat,
Sed si non alia venturo fata Neronia invenire viam.”

If there were no other way to get at the Union but by

* See Appendix.

rebellion, the Nero of the Union was, like the Roman, determined to find that way to it. The youth of Ireland were learning these facts, and the men of Ireland were meditating upon them. Refuse them not an inquiry, to set their minds at ease. Oh! what horrible features were to be traced in the carrying out of that measure! The massacres of Wexford and burning of Scullabogue, the pillage and depopulation of whole districts, the ruin of families, the desertion of homes, the tears of the widow and the cries of the famishing children, and the exasperation of millions, were to be traced to that tornado of a measure. It was a measure that was floated into the temple of the British Constitution on the blood of Irishmen. How was the Union procured but by the familiar use of torments—by the terror inspired by a military force, amounting to 129,000 men, each of whom was judge, sheriff and executioner—and by drum-head courts-martial? Let the House hear what Lord Plunket said upon that subject:—

“I will be bold to say, that licentious and impious France, in all the unrestrained excesses which anarchy and atheism have given birth to, has not committed a more insidious act against her enemy than is now attempted by the professed champion of the cause of civilized Europe against a friend and an ally in the hour of her calamity and distress, at a moment when our country is filled with British troops, when the loyal men of Ireland are fatigued and exhausted by their efforts to subdue rebellion—efforts in which they had succeeded before those troops arrived—whilst our Habeas Corpus Act is suspended—whilst trials by courts-martial are carrying on in many parts of the kingdom—whilst the people are taught to think they have no right to meet, or to deliberate—and whilst the great body of them are so palsied by their fears, and worn down by their exertions, that even the vital question is scarcely able to rouse them from their lethargy, at a moment when we are distracted by domestic dissensions—dissensions artfully kept alive as the pretext of our present subjugation, and the instrument of our future thralldom.”

It might be asked, why did not the people oppose the Union—why did they concur in the measure? He (Mr. O'Connell) would put it to the English gentlemen to make it their own case, and then make allowance for the people of

Ireland, especially the Catholics. If they opposed it, they would be accused as rebels; if, as Catholics, they resisted it, then would they be stigmatized as setting themselves against the Protestants. He implored the House not to dismiss this part of the case from their minds until they understood it. Here the Government had all the information in their power necessary to crush the rebellion in its infancy; yet they did not crush it. Why not arrest the leaders in time, and strike a timely blow for the restoration of allegiance? Merely that they wished to foster it to a certain extent, that they might make disaffection an excuse for robbing the country of its freedom. Who that cast a glance at the proud period of its independence could fail to see the meridian glories that shed their lustre over the heroes of 1782; and who would say, that the country which so nobly won a bloodless victory, and started up from her prostration to the full vigour of a prosperous and gallant nation, deserved to be stabbed by the clandestine emissaries of her jealous rival? He (Mr. O'Connell) would, if a committee were given him, show beyond doubt, that the Union was carried by foul means. No columns of figures prepared at the Treasury could controvert the fact. The Irish loved their country as much as the English did, and were actuated by as high aspirations after liberty, and it was not without the foulest means that the English Government succeeded. It was not alone by intimidation or by force that the Union was carried; but even the subsidiary means of the grossest bribery were adopted. Considering the machinery set to work, and the power employed to work it, he would maintain, if all the facts of the case were known, that that portion of the Parliament which might be said to represent the people was more virtuous than other Parliaments; and if corruption prevailed, it was with that portion that did not sympathise with the people or represent their will. He would tell them from a high authority what means were used.

“If the Parliament of Ireland were left to itself, untempted, unawed, un-intimidated, it would, without hesitation, have rejected the measure. There

were 300 members in all, and 120 of these strenuously opposed the measure—amongst whom were two-thirds of the county members, the representatives of the city of Dublin, and almost all the towns which it is proposed shall send members to the Imperial Parliament. 162 voted in favour of the Union—of those 116 were placemen; some of them were English generals on the staff without a foot of ground in Ireland, and completely dependent upon Government. Let us reflect upon the arts which have been used since the last session of the Irish Parliament to pack a majority in the House of Commons; all persons holding office under the Government, even the most intimate friend of the minister, if they hesitated to vote as directed, were stripped of all their employment—even this step was found ineffectual, and other arts were had recourse to, which, although I cannot tell in this place, all will easily conjecture. A Bill, framed for preserving the purity of Parliament, was likewise abused, and no less than sixty-three seats were vacated by their holders having received nominal offices.”

These were the words of Lord Grey. The following were those of Chief Justice Bushe:—

“The basest corruption and artifice were exerted to promote it. All the worst passions of the human heart were entered into the service, and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect tortured to devise new contrivances of fraud.”

He would next quote a passage from Henry Grattan, who said:—

“Half a million or more was expended some years ago to break down an opposition. The same, or a greater sum, may now be necessary. He (Lord Castlereagh) has said so in the most extensive sense of bribery and corruption. The threat was proceeded on; the peerage was sold. The caiffiffs of corruption were everywhere—in the lobby—in the streets—on the steps—and at the door of every Parliamentary man—offering title to some—offices to others—corruption to all!”

Mr. Grattan to his face told Lord Castlereagh that he had said he would give £3,000,000 to carry the Union, and he stood uncontradicted. It would be found, on a reference to the parliamentary documents of that day, that Ireland had to pay for the corruption of its senators, and to purchase its own slavery. The last authority to which he would refer was that of Lord Plunket:—

"During the whole interval between the session, the same barefaced system of parliamentary corruption has been pursued; dismissals, promotions, threats, promises; in despite of all this, the minister feared he could not succeed in Parliament, and he affected to appeal to what he had before despised—the sentiments of the people. When he was confident of a majority, the people were to be heard only through the constitutional medium of their representatives; when he was driven out of Parliament, the sense of the people became everything. Bribes were promised to the Catholic clergy; bribes were promised to the Presbyterian clergy. I trust they have been generally spurned with the contempt they merited. The noble lord understands but badly the genius of the religion in which he was educated. You held out hopes to the Catholic body which were never intended to be gratified; regardless of the disappointment and indignation, and eventual rebellion which you might kindle; regardless of everything, provided the present, paltry little object was obtained. In the same breath, you held out professions to the Protestants, equally as delusive; and having thus prepared the way, the representative of Majesty set out on his mission to court his sovereign, the majesty of the people. It is painful to dwell on that disgraceful expedition—no place too obscure to be visited—no rank too low to be courted—no threat too vile to be refrained from. The counties not sought to be legally convened by their sheriffs—no attempt to collect the unbiassed suffrage of the intelligent and independent part of the community—the public addresses sought for from petty villages—and private signatures smuggled from public counties; and how procured? By the influence of absentee landlords, not over the affections but over the terrors of their tenantry, by griping agents and revenue officers. And after all this mummery had been exhausted; after the lustre of royalty had been tarnished by this vulgar intercourse with the lowest of the rabble; after every spot had been selected where a paltry address could be procured, and every place avoided where a manly sentiment would be encountered, after abusing the names of the dead, and forging the signature of the living; after polling the inhabitants of a gaol, and calling out against the Parliament the suffrages of those who dared not come to sign them till they had got their suffrages in their pockets, after employing the revenue officer to threaten the publican that he should be marked as a victim, and the agent to terrify the shivering tenant with the prospect of his turf-bog being withheld if he did not sign your addresses; after employing your military commanders, the uncontrolled arbiters of life and death, to hunt the rabble against the constituted authorities; after squeezing the lowest dregs of a population of near five millions, you obtained about five thousand signatures three-fourths of whom affixed their names in surprise, terror, or total ignorance of the subject! You have exhausted the whole patronage of the Crown in the execution of that system; and, to crown all, you openly avow, and it is

notoriously part of your plan, that the Constitution of Ireland is to be purchased for a stipulated sum. I state a fact for which, if untrue, I deserve serious reprehension. I state it as a fact, that you cannot dare to deny, that £15,000 a-piece is to be given to certain individuals as the price for their surrendering—What? Their property? No; but the rights of representation of the people of Ireland; and you will then proceed in this, or in an Imperial Parliament, to lay taxes on the wretched natives of this land, to pay the purchase of their own slavery. It was in the last stage of vice and decrepitude that the Roman purple was set up for sale, and the sceptre of the world transferred for a stipulated price; but even then, the horde of slaves who were to be ruled would not have endured that their country itself should have been enslaved to another nation. Do not persuade yourselves that a young, gallant, hardy, enthusiastic people, like the Irish, are to be enslaved by means so vile, or will submit to injuries so palpable and galling."

But it was not by cash alone they succeeded in robbing Ireland of her Legislature, though that was expended on that object to the amount of £3,000,000. They pandered to the ambition of men as well as to their venality. They created four marquises, six earls, five viscounts, and twenty-two barons; eighteen men got titles for their votes in the Commons; men who, if sent back to their constituencies, would never be returned; eight lawyers were made judges, five of whom were as fit to be made judges as they were to be made professors of Hebrew; twelve bishops were also made in consequence of the support given by their friends to Government. But a more important fact remained to be told. The right over whole constituencies was openly bought. Boroughs were purchased for £15,000 a-piece; some sold for £12,000. The Earl of Shannon got £37,000 for his boroughs, and the Marquis of Ely £46,000. Thus was the representation of the people treated as a matter of property. There were eighty-four boroughs, and of these forty-five were openly purchased. Was that a legal, not to say constitutional mode of carrying a measure? Now, under the Bill, no compensation was given to the proprietors of boroughs for the surrender of their influence; if the purchase of the Irish boroughs was legal, then the Whig Government was guilty of robbery, in depriving the owners of the boroughs of Schedule A of compensation. But if the boroughs of Schedule A should not be made

matter of barter, then the Irish Government was guilty of robbery against the State, and the Act and its consequences were illegal and invalid. There was robbery somewhere. The majority, then, for the Union in the Irish Parliament had been purchased; and purchased, too, in such a way that it must have been gross bribery, even in the least culpable view, or the late Reform Bill was an iniquitous robbery. Then in that he fixed the present possessors of power. Earl Grey had advocated compensation to the Irish borough-holders at the period of the Union, but now all compensation was denied. Oh, if the Tories had been in power, he should have been deprived of that argument, for they would have continued the work of compensation; but as the facts stood, his position was unassailable. Such was the strength of his cause, it being that of justice and truth, that he defied and laughed to scorn all attempts at refutation.

They had decided the question as to the validity of the compact; the £1,200,000 that had been given was a gross and shameless corruption and had in itself vitiated the whole proceeding. They had bought that which they had no right to purchase, for the purpose of acquiring that by corruption, which the corrupted had no right to sell. He, therefore, defied any one to contend that the Act of Union was a valid contract. And yet that was the only formal means publicly taken for the dissolution of Irish independence as established and solemnly guaranteed in 1782. The compact in 1782 was made with the Irish nation, and he, in his conscience believed, complacently witnessed by the Almighty. And yet it was to be dissolved, destroyed, by this base and iniquitous proceeding. He denied that there was any contract. The trustees had been purchased; and if he was told, that being so, they were still trustees, his reply was, that the first Irish Parliament assembled had proved itself incorruptible; that it had resisted all bribery; and that as long as the nation had the power of naming its trustees, they were faithful. The case was different with the next Parliament. It was not freely chosen by the people; it was not the representation of the people, and its acts were not the acts of the people. These, then, were the means by which the

Act of Union had been obtained. Would any attempt be made to deny his facts? Such could not be made the case. It was impossible. They were notorious beyond dispute; and in Ireland they were felt so strongly that any attempt made to throw discredit on them would excite the indignant laughter of the people. If the House doubted it, give him the committee, and he would prove every item of it. But dreadful and disastrous as were the effects of the atrocious means resorted to in order to carry the Union, he deplored, perhaps, more than any man that which had prevented those who had won the victories of 1782 from acting still in the same spirit and resisting the robbery of their country even to the death. Those gallant and patriotic men had declared that, as they had fought rebels in rags so they were ready to fight rebels in lace; but, unhappily, so deep-laid was the scheme for the prostration of Ireland that they were forbidden from entering upon the contest. There was no chance of success; and so wily and deep were the snares that no man of character and sense could resist openly the course which was equally opposed to morality, legality, and justice. I have now (continued the hon. and learned gentleman) gone through some of the topics upon which I have intended to speak; I have shown you the right of Ireland to an independent Legislature, and that that independence was established in 1782. I have shown you the effects of that independence; I have shown the incompetency of the Irish Parliament to pass the Union; I have shown the horrible means by which it was actually effected, and I come now to the terms upon which it was carried. I think I shall be able to show that these terms were as improper as the means to carry the Union were monstrous. I come at once to the frightful terms of the Union; and my proposition is, that there never was anything more unjust than those terms; and among their other mischiefs they have given to us the most useless calculations within the last week. This part of my case is quite consistent with the Union being valid in itself; and even though it be so consistent, it is no admission made by me that I consider the compact valid. The

first thing I would remark as to the financial terms is, that there were no Commissioners appointed, nor any arrangement made by them, as to the proper terms—it was done as a bribed and corrupted Parliament do it, hand over head, and no inquiry by Commissioners at all. If I now get the Committee of Inquiry I seek for I shall be able to convince them that the grossest injustice has been practised towards Ireland. The terms made at the Union were, that Ireland was to pay two-sevenths and England fifteen-seventeenths. Why was the compound fraction introduced? I am convinced simply for this reason, in order to create confusion. A nation never enters into the calculation of fractions; that troublesome process is left to some industrious man to undergo. The fraction, I believe, was purposely introduced in order that Ireland might be robbed with the greater facility. The progress of the Irish debt was thus:— In 1797, it was £5,300,000; in 1798, it was £9,200,000; in 1799, £14,900,000; in 1800, £21,700,000; in 1801, £26,800,000. You perceive that it swelled up to £26,000,000 in 1801. Now see what was the debt of England in 1799: it was £400,000,000; and the Irish debt was then £14,900,000; call it £15,000,000. The question, then, to be discovered was, how much of the joint expenditure each country ought to be liable to? What was the basis of calculation? England had been going in debt for a century—her debt had increased in that time at least £372,000,000; and Ireland, during the same period, but £9,000,000. If I were going into partnership with a man who owed £420,000, and I owed £9,000, I should be glad to know if he ought to ask me to contribute equally to the future expenditure? If you turn the debt into capital, the man who had the most capital should have most of the profits. Here are two countries, the one very little in debt and the other a great deal; and the fair way would have been to take the proportions of their respective debts, and thus calculate what each ought to pay. Indeed, as Ireland was to lose the protection of her Parliament, it would have been but fair to have taken a portion of her debt. Ireland, however, was charged with two-seventeenths,

when she ought, in fact, to have been charged with only one-seventeenth—the charge against her, prospectively, ought to have been not more than one-sixteenth; but I should be satisfied with one-seventeenth. The Irish anti-Union Lords insisted that the proportion should be but one-eighteenth, and they calculated it thus:—

	Eng.	Ird.
The balance of trade then appearing as	. 29	to 1
Current Cash,	12	to 1
Permanent Revenue,	13	to 1

Upon the debt of both it ought to be about one-sixteenth, and on revenue one-thirteenth. But there were no Commissioners then to investigate, and the one-seventeenth which Ireland ought to pay, you turned into two-seventeenths, and this without the least reason, but that your name was "Lion," and you had the power to do it. But do I want to show that this proposition was too great for Ireland to bear? There is demonstrative proof that it was too great for Ireland. You say that Ireland has prospered since the Union. You make my case the stronger by the assertion; for, with all your boasted prosperity of Ireland, you had to consolidate the Exchequers, she not being able to pay her proportion—the two-seventeenths. Ought Ireland to have been charged more than she was able to pay? You bought our Parliament; you corrupted our Parliament; you got from Ireland the proportion you wished of her contributions; you put your hands into the pockets of her people, and, like felons and pickpockets, you did not withdraw your hand until you left your victim stripped of all her wealth, a bankrupt and a beggar. It is manifest a fraud was contemplated against Ireland, and it has been successfully practised. Will the right hon. member for Cambridge say that Ireland has been benefited by the Union? If he does, he but makes my argument the stronger; for, with all the benefits of the Union, he proves that its terms were enormously and extravagantly unjust—Ireland could not comply with them. Now, one of the provisions

of the Act of Union show the fraud that was meditated. If the provisions had been, that, when the English debt was brought down to the level of the Irish, the taxes would have been equal upon both, it would have been fair; but that Ireland should be equally liable to English taxation when her debt was raised to the Union proportions was most unjust. By going in debt Ireland was to arrive at the happy consummation that her taxes were to be increased. This was literally and in terms the provision of the Union. I now call for an inquiry. They granted no inquiry in 1800. At least remedy this evil of the Union. What was the consequence of this provision? Ireland ran faster into debt than even England had. The English debt only travelled; the Irish galloped; and at last it overtook the English. This was the stipulation of the Union. I ask you, would any but an insane man have consented to it? The Irish people did not consent to it—it was proposed and adopted by plunderers and robbers. Would an Irish Parliament, if it had continued, have permitted Ireland to be thus despoiled? Would it have suffered her to be thus pressed down with a load of taxes? There were £110,000,000 borrowed in the name of Ireland; and the result has been, that Ireland is a sharer in the common debt. She owed £26,000,000 at the time of the Union; at this day she owes £800,000,000! No matter what may be our trade and commerce, no matter what the enterprise and the industry of the people may be, we must bear an equal load of taxes with you until we have paid off the £800,000,000. If you did justice to Ireland you would come back to the one-sixteenth, or the one-eighteenth, or whatever the proportion of the Irish debt ought to be. I was exceedingly amused with what was certainly not a facetious composition—the returns moved for on Thursday in this House, and printed upon Friday, and which went to show I do not know how many millions which England had paid for Ireland. Is it by any remission of duties; is it by sparing Ireland that it has been done? Will any one pretend to say that it has? No; you have taxed Ireland as much as you possibly could. You taxed Ireland to the amount of

£5,000,000, and by your excessively high taxation there was a reduction, at least, in the revenue of £300,000. You have demonstrated your injustice in your over-taxation of Ireland. Here I am most ready to meet the right hon. gentleman foot to foot upon this point; not, certainly, as he once proposed to meet another hon. gentleman, "breast to breast, and shoulder to shoulder." You, I say, have only paid more, because you have plundered Ireland too fast; and for your losses in that way I have not the least Christian charity. Now, in these calculations I have been struck with this—that if there had been no Union, England would have had to pay £16,000,000 of separate taxation. If it happened to Ireland that she was put under water—not, as Sir Joseph Yorke said, for twenty-four hours, but for thirty-four years—you would all that time have been paying £16,000,000 of separate taxation; that would make, in the thirty-four years, £544,000,000 of separate taxation. In the late returns, the amount of separate taxation claimed for England is £325,316,861. So that, in fact, the Union has saved to England £219,000,000 of separate taxation. Now, I must observe, that in June last I moved for returns and I got them not till last week. The right hon. gentleman, upon the other hand, moves for returns upon Thursday, and he has them in the House on Friday! Why, sir, I do say that there ought to be some little decency in these matters. This dexterity in financial matters is not at all creditable to those who practise them. Why should there be this anomaly? I gave notice of this motion in the last session. I renewed it at the commencement of this. Why were not the right hon. gentleman's accounts produced? Why were these complicated accounts held back till now? The object is obvious—they are now brought forward to make the people of England think that they are bountiful benefactors to the people of Ireland.

If there was any shame in the quarter from which they have originated, this attempt at deceit and delusion would not be made. The returns I moved for are kept back from June, and they are at last sent to me, by way of a compliment, on Wed-

nesday, the day before they were delivered to the House. Here, then, there was to be an occasion of triumph; but this would be the whole of the triumph. When the right hon. gentleman makes use of his tables, which were so dexterously kept back till the last moment, they will be received by the House with loud cries of "hear, hear"—they will ring around the House, and they will be followed by the cheers of his supporters. I am, I suppose, to witness this scene. But, then, I tell the triumphant party—you took care to keep back your documents until Friday;—they were concocted and prepared for the occasion. You moved for them on Thursday—they are returned the next day, while I did not receive until Wednesday the documents for which I applied in June last! And this is your candour! This is your fair play! And this, too, is another specimen of your national faith!

I have had but a very short time for examining the tables of the right hon. gentleman, and yet I have found those tables to be grossly fraudulent. In pages 23, 24, and 25, it is made to appear as if there had been a bonus given to Ireland of £39,000,000. The way in which these tables are made up is this: the taxes paid by Ireland are placed in the first column, her revenue in the second, and the amount in the third column is given of what her taxes would have been had she paid equal taxes with England. Now, no man knows better than the right hon. member himself that adding to taxation does not increase consumption. Suppose you add £5,000,000 to the taxation of Ireland, you would have no revenue from it. The account here is fraudulent—it is grossly fraudulent, because it supposes that the same consumption would continue in Ireland with increased taxation, although the contrary constantly occurs in practice; and in Ireland the very contrary has been demonstrated since the Union, where the right hon. member for Cambridge must know, that, by the increased taxes in Ireland—by imposing them to the amount of £5,000,000 there was an actual lessening of the revenue. Supposing, now, the result were otherwise, still it would be decidedly favourable to my argu-

ment; for had Ireland continued to be taxed by her own Parliament, these £39,000,000 with which we are now charged would be a sum saved to us by the Irish Parliament; for remember that it is English taxation that you have given to us. If I wanted an argument to show the benefit to Ireland of having a resident Legislature, have I not it here, to the extent of £39,000,000? Does not this simple fact alone speak trumpet-tongued to my countrymen? The features of the Union bargain with Ireland must strike any man as dishonest towards Ireland. Any rational bargain of finance made for Ireland in 1800, and by which there was to be a separate liability to joint charges with England, would claim for Ireland the revenue arising from absentee rents spent in England. Should it not have been considered that Ireland produced these rents—that these rents were taken from her—that she gained no advantage by them, but England did; for they are expended here. Should not Ireland have been credited with this? In my opinion she ought, and the reverse is the fact. Every absentee rent is separated from the Treasury of Ireland; it is added to the revenue of England, and Ireland is charged with the more taxes the more absentee rents that she produces! Assuredly, these are things which prove that I am entitled to the inquiry I now look for. Ought not, I ask, Ireland to get credit for the rents she produced, or ought England to have the credit of them? There is not a single part of the Union compact that does not show how fraudulent it was. It was as atrocious and criminal in its details as in its concoction; it was marked by malice, and, in its enforcement, stained with blood and tears. I do not know whether I should remark upon the tables that have been kept back till the last moment; but this fact I must call to the attention of the House, with respect to Treasury tables, that I find in Mr. Marshall's book, published by your authority, that there is in table No. 1 an excess over the Exchequer statement of Irish credit to the amount of £6,000,000, and in the second table there are £44,000,000 of discrepancies pointed out. When the right hon. member for Cambridge knows that

such things may happen with Treasury accounts, he was, perhaps, right in not moving for his until Thursday. Such matters have been concocted, and it is only useful to show you the necessity for fair play being given to us. As a specimen of the accounts before the House, I find that in these is a charge against Ireland of £1,500,000 for what is called Union compensation—this, remember, is made a separate charge against Ireland. You got a bargain of my country; you have it; and yet you make my country pay for the bargain! This is the most cruel wrong—it is the most outrageous insult that ever yet, perhaps, was offered to any country; it is making her pay the wages of her own sin and death. In page 13 it is put down to the separate account of Ireland. Surely, the charge should be made on the other side. In the years 1802, 1803, 1804, and 1805, the joint expenditure of both countries was £133,000,000. Two-seventeenths of this amount are £15,700,000; but it appears in the 29th page of the finance report of 1815, that Ireland was made to contribute in these years £17,300,000, being an overcharge of £1,600,000. In the accounts which were given in to me on Wednesday last I find another mistake. In the table of articles charged with duties in England, and not in Ireland, is hops; the amount of this item is no less than £7,146,479 8s. 3d. Is this, I ask, right? Was there ever anything more untrue than this item? The hops pay duty in England. Do they pay no duty in Ireland? Does Ireland use an ounce of hops that has not paid duty? And that duty she has to pay here. You claim credit for yourselves for the duty paid by Ireland; and then you debit Ireland with that, as if she paid no duty at all! These returns, however, claim for England the merit of being exceedingly bountiful, as the accounts stand between her and Ireland. Now, I happen to have by me the letter of a former Chancellor of the Exchequer upon this subject. The letter is dated the 10th of April, 1822; it was addressed to the deputies of Mary's Parish, in Dublin, and says:—

“I have been favoured with your letter of the 6th, and have, at the same time, received the newspaper containing your full and perspicuous statement of the comparative relief from taxation afforded to England and Ireland since the conclusion of the peace. Connected with the passage from the Report of the Finance Committee, as to the comparative advances in taxation during the war, the inference is, in my opinion, irresistible, that Ireland has an equitable claim on Parliament for remission of taxation to a much greater extent than she has experienced.”

The writer of this letter is Sir John Newport, and so far are the accounts that the right hon. gentleman has produced from being corroborated by this letter, that they are directly contradicted by it. Sir John Newport distinctly intimates that Ireland was over-taxed during the war, and that she was entitled to a remission of taxation much greater than she has experienced. Let me now remark, that in the accounts that were sent me, and for which I had applied, they ought to have been summed up. The omission is curious, and its effect has been to impose a great deal of additional trouble upon me. The result is, that, since the war, upwards of £47,000,000 of taxes have been repealed in Great Britain, and scarcely a million and a-half in Ireland. Let me observe, too, that some articles being taxed in England and not taxed in Ireland, has been ruinous to the Irish trader in those articles. Some of the separate taxes in England have been made to operate in favour of the English manufacturer, and against the Irish manufacturer. Look, for instance, on the tax on soap and printed cottons. The soap-tax in England was, through the instrumentality of the drawback, as a bounty to the English manufacturer, fast veering to the annihilation of the Irish manufacturer. Looking, then, to this portion of the account, you find that separate taxation upon this article has, in its results, been a bonus to the English soap manufacturer to enter the Irish market, and monopolise nearly all its profits. Why, now, do I dwell upon this? Why do I detain the House by observing upon these particular items? Because I wish to show you how much of fraud there was in the basis of the financial arrangements of the Union. A complexity was intro-

duced into them which has been taken advantage of by the most shameful robbery of Ireland. I have now gone through my fifth proposition which I meant to sustain, namely, that the financial terms of the Union were unjust. I have next to go through the legislative terms of the Union, which were equally unjust, and I promise the House that I will not be as diffuse upon this head as I have felt it my duty to be upon others. The number of representatives should necessarily have been, according to the calculation of Lord Castlereagh, much greater than they are. He gave to Ireland, after all imaginable reductions, one hundred and eight members. He took, as the grounds for his calculation—population, exports, imports, and revenue. He gave for—

Population,	202	Members.
Exports,	100	„
Imports,	93	„
Revenue,	39	„

And the result was, one hundred and eight members. Now, the first injustice done to Ireland was striking off eight members to which we were entitled, on a calculation exceedingly unfavourable to us; and we find that, in a Reformed Parliament, this injustice, no more than any other, has not been remedied. Lord Castlereagh left in the hands of the collectors of the revenue a balance of half-a-million, which Foster showed would have added more than one-sixth to the revenue proportion; so that the thirty-nine put down for revenue should have been forty-five, and it would then have stood thus, even according to Lord Castlereagh's own showing, and the revenue being fairly considered—

Population,	202	members.
Exports,	100	„
Imports,	93	„
Revenue,	45	„

The result would have been two additional members, giving to Ireland on these terms one hundred and ten members. It was

admitted she was entitled to one hundred and eight; and yet the barefaced fraud was perpetrated of lessening the number to one hundred. Newenham has calculated that Ireland should have had one hundred and sixty-five members; but, without detaining the House longer, or exposing more fully the injustice done to Ireland in this respect, I ask, what, in point of legislation, have you done for the people of Ireland? I can tell you what you have done against the people of Ireland. You have given to absentee landlords a power which they had not before the Union—a power which has tended much to increase agrarian disturbances; you have given to them a power of seizing the growing crops of the tenants; and, by another law, you enable them to eject their unfortunate tenantry at the cost of a few shillings; you have given to them every facility—first to beggar, and then to expel the wretched tenant. These are some of the advantages which Ireland has obtained, by having to legislate for her a Parliament not connected with her people. But how has Ireland been treated in point of constitutional liberty since the Union? She has had Insurrection Acts and Martial Law, from 1800 to 1805, five years; the Insurrection Act, from 1807 to 1810, three years; the Insurrection Act again, from 1814 to 1818, four years; the Insurrection Act again, from 1822 to 1825, three years; the first Algerine Act, from 1825 to 1828, three years; the second Algerine Act, from 1829 to 1830, one year; and the third Algerine Coercion Bill, one year. During twenty of the thirty-four years which elapsed since the Union, the constitution has been suspended in Ireland! You have given to us Insurrection Acts and Martial Law—you have suspended the Habeas Corpus Act—you have fettered us with Algerine Acts, and gagged us with Coercion Bills; and these are the results of your Union! For twenty years, you have shut out from us the light of liberty; and this you call a beneficial Union to Ireland! I tell you it is a Union with which Ireland never can be satisfied; it is the Union between the master and the slave;

between the oppressor and the oppressed; it cannot, and it ought not to continue.

You have totally abolished the semblance of freedom; you have established a permanent police there, whom the hon. member for Dundee has justly termed *gens d'armes*; you have placed deadly weapons in their hands, and you have taken from the people that which a Bill of Rights gave them—the right to bear arms for their defence. You took this even from the Protestants, whom the Bill of Rights originally contemplated. These are your doings, and you have left us the landmarks of your legislation — permanent police and Insurrection Acts. The Union, commenced in injustice, has been consistent in its career; it was based upon fraud, and it is still propped up by wrong to Ireland. I now come to the next topic—the injurious effects of the Union to Ireland. It increased absenteeism, the great cause of poverty amongst the poorer classes of the people, the cause of great destitution and misery to them; and when the Union was proposed, it was said that the people would be relieved from it. At the time of the Union the general prosperity of the country was increasing, its riches were accumulating, and though absenteeism did exist, still it was not so extensive as now; and if the Irish Parliament had continued, it would long before now have been at an end. Let me remark here that upon this subject the Unionists principally rest their case. You must admit that Ireland was entitled to her independence in 1782. You cannot deny that she lost that independence by the most dishonest means; by bribery, by corruption, by a suspension of the constitution, by martial law. But then you say Ireland has prospered since the Union. This is indeed the *post hoc propter hoc* argument. That which follows in point of date does not necessarily show cause and effect. England has enormously increased in the four-and-thirty years that have elapsed since the Union. Ireland, if there had been no Union, ought to have enormously increased also. I shall be able to show an absolute declension. This I say of the greater part of Ireland. If Belfast be an exception, God knows

why it should be so; but, looking to the north, the south, and the west of Ireland, the decay is manifest. I would say here that if there be any increase of prosperity in Ireland attempted to be proved, it ought to be shown to be legitimately traceable to the Union, and that any declension must be shown to be owing to the Union. I will prove that declension to you, and thus dispose of the vapouring upon the advantages of the Union to Ireland. First, the evil effects must be admitted of absenteeism. No man will deny that those evils existed before the Union. No man can deny that they have been enormously increased since. The man who pretends even to controvert that I will not condescend to argue with. He who denies it loses all credit in Ireland. The next point I put forward is the disadvantageous scale of taxation in Ireland since the Union. In England it has been increased twenty per cent. In Ireland there has been an increase of eighty per cent.; and that upon the prime necessaries of life. The Finance Report to which I before alluded—the report of the public expenditure for the year 1815—contains this passage, which corroborates a great many of my statements:—

“For several years Ireland has advanced in permanent taxation more rapidly than Great Britain itself, notwithstanding the immense exertions of the latter country, and including extraordinary and war taxes:”

The permanent revenue of Great Britain having increased since the year 1781 in the proportion of sixteen and a half to ten, and the revenue of Ireland in the proportion of twenty-three to ten. The whole increase of the Irish revenue in twenty years has been in the monstrous proportion of forty-six and a half to ten. Mark what the value of the Union is to Ireland! See how the taxation has increased! Is there any doubt of the fact? Let me, then, call your attention to the observations of Lord Lansdowne, who, in making a motion on the state of Ireland in 1822, said:—

“That the revenues of Ireland in 1807 amounted to £4,378,241. Between that year and 1815 additional taxes had been laid on to the estimated amount

of £3,376,000. From these were to be deducted £400,000, remitted at the end of last war. Now, the whole revenue of Ireland in 1821 was £3,844,889, so that the effect of adding £3,000,000 of taxes had been to produce less by several hundred thousands than that of 1807.”*

Here is a proof of increased taxation giving a diminished revenue. I must now call your attention to another document; and, recollect, I bring it forward to meet the case which would show that Ireland has prospered by the Union. It is a part of the speech of the noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, delivered in May, 1824, for the appointment of a Select Committee on the state of Ireland, on which occasion the noble lord is reported—as it appears to me accurately—to have used these words:—

“He had, on a former occasion, stated it to be his opinion that the repeal of the taxes in Ireland would tend mainly towards reviving the manufactures of that country, and bringing it into a prosperous condition. It was objected to him on that occasion that he sought by giving large and exclusive advantages to Ireland to raise her up into a manufacturing country, which should make her the rival of Scotland and England. While he disclaimed any such intention, he feared Ireland was far indeed from any such state of prosperity. She was as little to be feared as she was to be envied.”†

Sir John Newport, in bringing forward a similar motion to that of the noble lord in 1822, said:—

“Up to the period of the Union, as I have before observed, Ireland was lightly taxed. Since that period taxation, and especially local taxation, has been infinitely increased; and the result has been, not increased but manifest and signal diminution of revenue.”

I have in every succeeding year opposed the increase of internal local taxation, and again and again stated to the House that the finance ministers would reap from the system “a harvest of discontent but not of revenue.” The House has now before it positive proofs that my predictions were unhappily too well-founded: you have reaped a plentiful harvest, not of ways and

* “Hansard” (New Series), vii., p. 1049.

† *Ibid.*, vol. xi., p. 659.

means, but of debt and of discontent; and what is still more to be lamented, you have broken the spirit of the gentry of Ireland—deprived them of the influence which they formerly possessed (and rightfully possessed by the power of doing good). Too many, from the pride natural to persons of their rank in society, could not brook to alter their mode of living amongst those with whom they were accustomed to dwell in affluence; they transported their families to some English watering-place; and, consigned to obscurity in lodgings, ceased to occupy their family demesnes, increasing all the national evils under which they themselves suffered. Nothing, I repeat, could be devised more injurious to Ireland than the excess and rapidity with which taxation had advanced since the Union, and which has diminished not increased the revenue. Since 1808, the estimates of the finance ministers held out a nominal increase to the extent of four millions; and yet, so complete has been the delusion, the amount of actual revenue is now less than in 1808. As a system of taxation it has entirely failed; and it has been shown more forcibly here than in any other country, that the iron grasp of poverty has paralysed the efforts of the tax-gatherer, and placed a limit to the omnipotence of Parliament. The taxes increased—the revenue diminished—the only augmentation observable, and that in a fearful degree, was the increase of debt and discontent.* The right hon. gentleman, too, Mr. Poulett Thomson—I beg his pardon, I should have said the Vice-President of the Board of Trade—said, on the 26th of March, 1830: “A case is established in the instance of Ireland, which is written in characters too legible not to serve as a guide to future financiers—one which ought to bring shame upon the authors. The revenue of Ireland, in the year 1807, amounted to £4,378,000. Between that year and the conclusion of the war, taxes were successfully imposed which, according to calculations of Chancellors of the Exchequer, were to produce £3,400,000, or to augment the revenue to the

* “Hansard” (New Series), vi. 1471.

extent of £7,700,000. What was the result? Why that in the year 1821, when that amount, less about £400,000, for taxes afterwards repealed, ought to have been paid into the Exchequer, the whole revenue of Ireland amounted only to £3,844,000, being £533,000 less than in 1807; previous to one farthing of these taxes having been imposed." Here is an example to prove that an increase of taxation does not tend to produce a corresponding increase of revenue, but, on the contrary, an actual diminution. I admit (continued the hon. and learned member, who had been interrupted by some confusion in the House as he was quoting these passages) the tediousness of this—I am endeavouring to make out a case, and, even though it may be inconvenient, I wish gentlemen to listen. I am now showing that at the period when Lord Althorp's motion for inquiry into the state of Ireland was brought forward, it was admitted that Ireland was not prosperous. We have here a counsel for prosperity, and I wish to give him the opinion of one of his own witnesses, who, in answer to Lord Castlereagh's declaration of Irish prosperity, thus replied to him:—"The noble lord said, that it behoved Parliament to watch over the rising greatness of Ireland, and to endeavour to ascertain the cause of the evils which had so long oppressed her. As to the words 'rising greatness,' he (Sir John Newport) did not know how they applied, unless in the sarcastic sense of that remark which was made to Philip III., who had overrun a great part of the Low Countries, that they resembled a ditch, out of which the more that was taken, the greater it grew." Now, the last time I heard this gentleman's name mentioned, it was with great respect by many. Is, I ask, his authority now to be upset by the multiplication table, and his opinions refuted by a page from Cocker's Arithmetic? The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Poulett Thomson) has told you, that there was a constant struggle to increase taxation. This, remember, is one of the beneficial results of the Union. In the document which the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) has given me, I find that the relief of taxation to England has been £41,085,202,

and to Ireland but £1,684,211; that is about one twenty-fifth of the amount of taxes repealed or remitted in Great Britain. There is another point in which the Union is felt in Ireland, that is—in expenditure. Savings have been boasted of, but what savings are they? Savings of money spent in Ireland. Look, for instance, to one item, and see how it must be felt in Dublin. To the establishment of the Lord Lieutenant was formerly assigned £68,000; it is now reduced to £16,000. This is a reduction of £52,000, that is £1,000 a week spent in Dublin less than there used to be. I like economy, but dislike that Ireland should feel exclusively the effects of it. We have heard it boasted that the Irish estimates have been reduced £104,000. This, remember, increases our remittances to the British Treasury, and it is, in fact, so much of relief to Great Britain. I now come to those articles which must show the increase of consumption before the Union, and what it has been since. The amount of consumption of the following articles is taken from the Report of the Committee on Irish Poor, of which the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) was chairman, in 1830, page 112:—From 1785 to the Union, the increase of tea in Ireland was 84 per cent.: in England 45 per cent. From 1785 to the Union, the increase of tobacco in Ireland was 100 per cent.: in England, 64 per cent. From 1787 to the Union, the increase of wine in Ireland was 74 per cent.: in England, 22 per cent. From 1785 to the Union, the increase of sugar in Ireland was 57 per cent.: in England, 53 per cent. From 1784 to the Union, the increase of coffee in Ireland was 600 per cent.: in England 75 per cent. Now, these are the effects of the consumption of Ireland before the period of the Union. Compare them with the increase of consumption in England and Ireland subsequent to the time that Ireland lost its independence. In tea, the increase in England since 1800 has been 25 per cent.: in Ireland but 24. In coffee, the increase in England has been 1,800 per cent.: in Ireland, 400. In sugar, there has been an increase in England of 26 per cent.: in Ireland, 16. In tobacco (the poor man's luxury) there has been,

an increase in England of 27 per cent. : in Ireland, however, there has been a decrease of 37 per cent. In wine, the increase in England is 24 per cent. : in Ireland, the decrease is 45 per cent. Looking, then, at the two periods, we find the consumption of the poor man's luxury diminishing in Ireland in the period that has occurred since the Union. These results, remember, are not taken from any tables made by me, but are furnished to me by the report drawn up by the right hon. gentleman opposite. In the tables published by Mr. Halliday, there were, I find, imported into Ireland, of green tea in 1802, 132,674 lbs. ; in 1823, 38,163 lbs. ; decrease, 114,506 lbs. ; of port wine, in 1802, 4,478 tuns ; in 1823, 1,014 tuns ; decrease, 3,473 tuns ; of French wines, 1802, 654 tuns ; in 1823, 101 tuns ; decrease, 333 tuns. In all these articles there has been a decrease of above three-fourths, and it is to be observed, that, while the consumption of green tea thus fell off, there was only an increase of one-eighth in black tea. The same tables give the comparative consumption of some articles—raw silk and bark, for instance. The value of raw silk consumed was, in Ireland, in 1800, £78,451 ; 1823, £45,331 ; decrease, £33,120. In England, it was, in 1800, £703,009 ; in 1823, 1,067,265 ; increase, £364,256. Thus showing that in the one country there had been a decrease, and in the other an increase. But silk was a luxury of the rich ; bark was in some measure necessary to the poor. It was necessary for the manufacture of native leather, and in that the contrast is still more remarkable. The quantity of bark consumed was, in Ireland, in 1800, 174,401 cwts. ; 1823, 115,441 ; decrease, 58,960 cwts. In England, in 1800, 153,825 cwts. ; in 1823, 933,488 cwts. ; increase, 779,663 cwts. Now, let it be observed, that the Irish at the first date—that of independence—exceeded England by 20,576 cwts. In the second period—that of the Union—England exceeded Ireland by 816,047 cwts., the amount standing thus—England, 933,488 cwts. ; Ireland, 115,441 cwts. ; difference, 818,047 cwts. I have now made known these facts to you to show you that the Union has not conferred blessings upon

Ireland, as some would pretend it has. I do not know whether the right hon. member opposite has read the letter of Doctor MacHale, describing the state of Connaught. He must, however, recollect the report of Doctor White on the state of the poor of Dublin. That gentleman states, that amongst 1,716 individuals, he found but fifty blankets. This demonstrates the poverty that existed among the wretched people of Ireland. I will ask the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) whether he read the evidence which was given last year, before the Committee of Agriculture, and which exhibits the distress of the people. The first evidence I shall quote is that given by the hon. member for Kildare, Mr. More O'Farrell, who illustrated the deteriorated condition of the people, by the diminished consumption of meat. "There has (says he) been a most remarkable falling off in the demand for meat in Dublin. Thirty years ago Dublin consumed, with a less population, as large a quantity of meat as at present; and I would say the same for all large towns." Mr. Murray, a Scotch land-agent and a surveyor, who had been visiting Ireland for the last eleven years, says:—"The North is not as well cultivated now as when I knew it; the South is nearly stationary. In Cork and Kerry there has been some improvement." Mr. Clendenning showed, from a table of the sheep and horned cattle sold and unsold at Ballinasloe, for upwards of forty years, that there was pretty much the same quantity of cattle disposed of in 1790 (when there were none exported) as in 1832. During the last forty years the quantities of black cattle exported to England have astonishingly increased; but that shows that, while the productive powers of Ireland have increased, its powers of consumption have diminished. But there is a passage in the speech of the right hon. gentleman, the President of the Board of Control, made in the year 1822, which up to that period shows what was the state of the people of Ireland:—

"I believe" (said that right hon. gentleman) "that the Irish are the most wretched peasantry in Europe, except, perhaps, the Polish. Their whole scale of existence is, in all respects, the lowest possible. Their garb and

their habitations are of the meanest and commonest kind. I need not say that their food, which is principally the potato, is obtained with remarkable facility, and in ordinary years, is sufficiently abundant, but the crops of which are peculiarly liable to failure; the consequence of their living upon this lowest kind of food is, that, in the event of a failure of the crops, they have nothing to fall back upon, but are left completely without resource. The least calamity, the slightest visitation of Providence, reduced them at once to absolute misery."

That, sir, was the conduct of Ireland twenty-two years after it had received the blessings of the Union—a Union which gave to her what a late right hon. gentleman once called "the periodical returns of famine in Ireland"—his word was "periodical." In answer to all this, I shall be told the trade of Ireland has increased, and that her prosperity has increased accordingly. In the report of the Committee of 1830, drawn up by the right hon. Secretary of the Treasury, I read this passage:—"The foreign trade of Ireland has continued progressive, and the general tonnage being greatly increased, it is not to be doubted but that the British imports (of which no returns have been kept since 1825) have augmented at least in the same ratio." Now I deny that the foreign trade has increased. I assert the directly opposite fact; and I do this on the authority of the returns thrown up on the table on Thursday. In the 8th page we have these figures:—

	Imports.			Exports.		
1830	£1,573,545	£839,014
1832	1,491,036	635,909
1834	1,386,045	410,715

This is what is called the "improvement" of the foreign trade, and on this "improvement" it is assumed that the trade with Great Britain has been progressive. But tonnage and shipping are referred to as a test. Let him show the House what reliance is to be placed on such a criterion. I have a letter from Dublin, in which the system of making out schedules of exports in that part is thus described:—

"Any person conversant with the official forms in use at the Custom-house, on entering coasting vessels, either inwards or outwards, must be aware

that the list of goods specified in the transire of ships' clearance, by no means affords a correct account of the respective cargoes, especially of steam vessels; the despatch which they require, and the practice of their receiving goods on board nearly to the very moment of sailing, prevent anything like a correct return being given. The brokers, or Custom-house clerks of the several steam companies, never even think of ascertaining the cargo, but usually write down in the Custom-house papers any quantity or description of goods that comes into their heads, and which they think will have the appearance of being a proper cargo. The practice of clearing out the vessels of the City of Dublin Steam Company, which is the most extensive shipping company in Ireland, strongly illustrates the point. At some periods of the year this company sail from three to six vessels daily to Liverpool; and the clerk who clears them out at the Custom-house writes down a fictitious cargo in the Long Room, not even considering it necessary to go down to the vessel to inquire what her cargo is; and, to sum up the imperfection of the ship's clearance, the transire ends with the sweeping item of 'sundry British goods.' Such are the documents from which the Government officials are now glean- ing information, for the purpose, no doubt, of exhibiting at the approaching discussion of the Repeal question in Parliament a splendid view of the prosper- ity of Ireland, as indicated by the extent of her imports and exports. 'The son of the functionary through whom the inquiry on this subject is now making at this port being a broker, and transacting the Custom-house busi- ness of the Liverpool Steam Company, his father can scarcely plead ignorance of the fact, that the only return of our imports and exports which he will be enabled to give must convey a most erroneous impression, from the very falsity of the documents on which it is founded.'

There is a sample of the accuracy of official returns of Irish exports and imports for you. It betrays the grossest ignorance in the right hon. gentleman to attach any value to the tests. Tonnage means the capacity of vessels to hold commodities, whether they be coals, cattle, or stones, or the most precious merchandise. A ship is, in the general acceptation, any vessel that sails, whether it be great or small. Thus there may be a great array of ships and tonnage with a comparatively insignifi- cant trade. Let us compare Liverpool and Newcastle in this regard—

	Ships.		Tonnage.		Custom Duties.
Newcastle,	1,048	..	215,784	..	320,893
Liverpool,	806	..	158,596	..	3,594,344

Now, this shows that, according to one of these ridiculous tables by which the right hon. gentleman is to extinguish Repeal and crush Ireland, Newcastle is a far more important place than Liverpool, though the Customs duties of the minor place are more than eleven times the amount of the other. Away with such miserable and impudent delusions! Now, what, I ask, has been the effect of the Union upon the population of Ireland—that population of whom the right hon. gentleman I just now quoted, the President of the Board of Control, said this—

“When you reflect on their many admirable qualities—their genius and intelligence—their peculiarly social and affectionate character—their disposition to give confidence—their steady devotion to any cause which they have once heartily espoused—their patience under privations—their constitutional hospitality—their remarkable love of country—their attachment to all the charities of life and kindred: what must you think of that policy by which all these excellent qualities have been perverted—by which all these gifts of nature and of Providence have been rendered the fruitful source of misery and of bloodshed?”

Policy, indeed! Your policy is now scattering them over the face of the earth. The Union is banishing them from their native land. The number of emigrants who landed at one port—Quebec—from England, Scotland, and Ireland, in the years 1829, 1830, 1831, and 1832, was—Scotch, 10,317; English, 43,136; Irish, 90,256. There is your prosperity for you! Dispose of that, if you please, with a column of figures. There is the result of your prosperity in three years. It has banished thousands of agricultural labourers from a country the most fertile and productive upon the face of the earth. These have left you, because they were starving at home by being misgoverned from abroad. What, then, has the Union done for Ireland? Has it given to Ireland tranquillity? No; you must admit that it has not. I see a smile upon the face of the right hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Stanley). I dare say he will attribute the want of tranquillity to me. I treat the assertion with ineffable contempt. For twenty years since the Union

there has been that want of tranquillity. It existed before the question of Repeal was agitated. You have not given to us tranquillity; and you have suspended the Constitution. You say that the Union has given to Ireland prosperity. If I were arguing the question in Ireland I should merely say "circumspice." The very condition of the country and the wretchedness of the people would be a sufficient refutation to your assertion. Men are working in Ireland for 3*d.* a day; this is prosperity!—this is the "prosperity" which the Union has given to them! This is the consequence of Ireland being deprived of a resident Parliament! I have already shown to you what were the consequences of our having an independent legislation. But it is not in Ireland alone that the baneful consequences of the Union are felt; it extends to the labourers and artisans of this country, who are interfered with by the Irish who are obliged to come here. It increases your poor rates, by sending a greater number upon the parish. It interferes with wages, for the Irish poor enter into competition with your artisans. Such are some of the effects of the Union. I am glad to inform the House that I have not much more to say upon the subject.

I have only one remaining topic upon which I shall address you. What, I ask, will be the consequence of retarding the Repeal of the Union? I ask that question of Englishmen. It is a matter of prophecy—it cannot be a certainty. The men of Ireland know the nature of national independence, and I shall esteem but little the man who thought another country should be more independent than his own. The people of Ireland recollected the manner and the means by which the Union was effected; they feel its sad consequences; and they are desirous to put an end to them. Repeal cannot endanger the connection—continuing the Union may; and although, while I live, I shall oppose separation, yet still it is my opinion that continuing the Legislative Union must endanger the connection. I can tell you what would be the advantages to my country if the Irish Parliament were restored. I can see no advantage to follow from separation. I know there must be a

great deal in continuing the connection. I am most favourable to the connection, although I have been accused of seeking for separation. The Union can alone endanger that connection; and this is not alone my opinion but that of others of far more weight than I possess. In the debate on the Union, Mr. Gray, the present Prime Minister, said:—

“I trust that his Majesty’s ministers will not, by an undue means, seek to triumph over all opposition. If the Union shall be effected by such means I am confident that that more than anything else will endanger the connection of the two countries.”

I have a still stronger passage to read. It is this:—

“Sir, I warn the ministers of this country against persevering in their present system. Let them not proceed to offer violence to the settled principles, or to shake the settled loyalty of the country. Let them not persist in the wicked and desperate doctrine which places British connection in contradiction to Irish freedom. I reverse them both; it has been the habit of my life to do so. For the present constitution I am ready to make any sacrifice. I have proved it. For British connection I am ready to lay down my life. My actions have proved it. Why have I done so? Because I consider that connection essential to the freedom of Ireland. Do not, therefore, tear asunder, to oppose to each other, those principles which are identified in the minds of loyal Irishmen. For me, I do not hesitate to declare that if the madness of the revolutionist shall tell me, ‘you must sacrifice British connection,’ I will adhere to that connection in preference to the independence of my country; but I have as little hesitation in saying that if the wanton ambition of a minister should assault the freedom of Ireland, and compel me to the alternative, I would fling the connection to the winds, and I would clasp the independence of my country to my heart.”

You have made the individual who delivered those sentiments Attorney-General. You have promoted him to be a Lord Chancellor; and these, mark you, are his opinions. Now I would not, like him, “fling British connection to the winds.” I desire to retain it. I am sure that separation will not happen in my time; but I am equally sure that the connection cannot continue if you maintain the Union on its present basis. What, then, do I propose? That there should be that friendly con-

nection between the two countries which existed before the Union. I propose it not as a resolution; but what I look for is, that friendly connection by which both countries would be able to protect each other. As Ireland exported corn to England, so could England export her manufactures to Ireland—both countries would afford mutual advantage to the other. I propose that you should restore to Ireland her Parliament. We have our viceroy and our Irish peers; we only want a House of Commons, which you could place upon the same basis as your Reformed Parliament. This is the claim of Ireland upon you; this is what I ask from you. I have shown you that Ireland is entitled to an independent Legislature. I have shown you the effects of that independence. I have shown you the incompetency of the Irish Parliament to vote itself away. I have shown you that the Union was accomplished by crimes the most unparalleled. I have shown you that the terms of the Union were unjust to Ireland. I have shown you that the Union has been ruinous to us, and that some of its consequences have reverted to yourselves. I have shown you that the legislative terms of the Union were unjust. I have shown you that the Union has deprived my country of the protection of the law and the benefits of the Constitution, and that it has despoiled the people of the means of existence. I have shown you that the English labourers and artisans have suffered equally from the poverty of Ireland. I have shown you the probable consequences of continuing the Union. I have shown, or rather I have suggested, with what facility the connection could be placed on the basis of right and justice. You are unable to govern Ireland, even to your own satisfaction; for two-thirds of the time you have presided over her destinies you have ruled her, not by the powers of the law, but by undisguised despotism. You have not made Ireland prosperous, and her misery has been of no advantage to you. In the name, then, of Ireland, I call upon you to do my country justice. I call upon you to restore her national independence.

The hon. and learned member concluded by moving—

“That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report on the means by which the dissolution of the Parliament of Ireland was effected; on the effects of that measure upon Ireland; and on the probable consequences of continuing the legislative union between both countries.”

The debate was adjourned.

SAME SUBJECT.—ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Mr. O’Connell rose to reply. He said: There are two propositions in which the whole House seems to agree; the first is, that it is my duty now to close this debate; and, in deference to this House, I shall, in discharging that duty, condense my observations as much as I possibly can; the second is, that this debate must be eminently useful. It cannot but be eminently useful; and I regret to say, from the nature of the topics which some have introduced, that it is not more conciliatory and more useful than I am now afraid it can be. Let me—for there has been a silence upon the subject—let me, without the slightest levity, conjure his Majesty’s Government not to rely on their immense majority of English members for a continuance of the Union; but, presuming they do agree in the opinions of the right hon. member for Tamworth, to reflect for one moment upon the poverty which has generated a cry for Repeal, and the widespread desolation which has caused it to be made. Let them remember that the demand for Repeal is, as it is said by the member for the University, made, for the first time, by a part of the Irish people; let them consider what that demand will be when the whole Irish people are compelled by distress and misery, increased and aggravated by injustice, to urge it on. The hon. member for the University says, it is called for but by one part of the people. I make the admission, though it may weaken my own case; for I seek not to succeed by disguise of any kind, and it would be impossible to disguise the fact after what we have heard in this House. But let this be considered, that if there be some who do not concur with me now, is it not more than probable that they may concur with

me hereafter? The game of playing us off, one against another, can no longer be continued; another course must be adopted. The Government have not the hearts of the Irish people. I mean, they have not the hearts of the numerical population of Ireland. Even in the north of Ireland, you perceive that the disposition to repeal the Union is increasing, and, as one of the proofs, I would appeal to the speech delivered in the House by the hon. member for Londonderry. The very candid and fair speech of that honourable gentleman demonstrates this state of feeling, and it is spreading elsewhere. It shows how little the people believe the Government to be inclined to do any good for them; and that it has not reached the entire population is only caused by the bye-gone contentions which have existed between us. The Government have, then, this course to pursue. I did not want them to court one portion of the people as a party, nor did I ask them to turn to another and advance them as a party. But while I did not want or wish them to do this, still I do hope that, as there was an opening for the Government in the debate, they would have taken advantage of it to explain what are their views of amelioration and relief to the people. I do hope that some project would be put forward by them as an amelioration of the admitted misery of Ireland; that they would have held out some legitimate hope, and not of a very future date either; some pressing expectation of buying up from agitation (for you may villify it as much as you please, the name does not signify) those who now take the lead, and by that means to take from discontent that on which it feeds and fattens—the neglect of Ireland, and the total want of measures of a remedial and beneficial nature. I have promised to condense my observations, and I shall indulge no further upon this point than to make a single remark upon that which the whole of this discussion certainly proves—the silence; the total absence of any promise of amelioration; the failure of the attempt to prove that good has been done for the people of Ireland in the administration of our affairs; the utter hopelessness that the Government will be induced to do anything effectual

for my country. A good deal of this discussion has been taken up in attacks upon myself. Now, I appeal to this House, whether, from the manner in which I brought forward this subject, I deserved or provoked those attacks? I ask in the recollection of the House, whether in five hours, to which my lengthened speech upon that occasion extended, there was one observation personally offensive to any man or any party? and, notwithstanding this, I was assailed; and what is still worse, as being caused by these assaults being made on me, I am compelled, reluctant as I am, to say a few words of myself, and they shall be as few as possible. The first person who assailed me was the hon. member for Belfast. I presume he is in his place ("hear"). I am glad of it; and I now ask, was there ever anything more indiscreet in a Government than to take such a person as a seconder of their amendment? If I could have desired to have lessened the effect of what had fallen from me; if I had desired that my arguments should have as little weight as possible in Ireland; if I had desired that my opinions should be disregarded there, the course which I should have taken would be to have as my seconder a fiery and furious partisan, who would have pronounced an invective against the people, their religion, and their clergy, and taunted as "adventurers" men upon whom he, at least, ought to be sparing in casting such an imputation. The Government knew that there was a Corporation inquiry, to forward which the greatest anxiety had been expressed by them. Now, what has been done by the hon. member for Belfast? Why, with an equal love of truth and chivalry, he attacked, not long since, that very inquiry as an inquisition, and assailed one of the commissioners in a manner that did not terminate very creditably to himself.

This is one portion of his political conduct; and now look at a preceding part of his career. When the Reform Bill was to be carried, the modern Conservative was an old Republican. "A pampered prelacy" and "the folly of an hereditary aristocracy" were then his favourite topics; and the doing away with these, he said, was one of the blessings that should follow

from the Reform Bill. And this—this is the person whom Government has selected as the seconder of their motion, and whom, too, they have enthusiastically cheered when he assailed me. I shall not, however, retaliate; but I can imagine a being who would assail me also—a being at one time exulting in all the fury of republicanism, then a speculating adventurer, and dwindling at last into a mean and mercenary dandy—I can conceive such a being servile and sycophantic in one place, petulant and presumptuous in another, calumnious and contemptible in all. And yet the Government has selected this able gentleman (the member for Belfast) to second its motion for an address! The proof it gives of its anxiety to do all the good it can for the people of Ireland, is having for its seconder the opponent to Corporation inquiry. Then I am assailed from more than one quarter, and I must endeavour to get rid of these attacks as fast as I can. It has been stated by an hon. member, that I said there should be a bounty of five-and-twenty per cent. upon Irish manufactures. I did not know such an opinion was attributed to me until I saw it in the speech of the right hon. gentleman. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman really said so, but if he has, I suppose he must have met it somewhere, but it certainly must have been where I was not. I do not think, that I ever put forward such an opinion; if I did, it must have been many years ago. For several years back, I have preached what I believe to be sound doctrines on this point—namely, that there might be an unnatural state of society in which a protecting duty might, from unnatural causes, be necessary to a small extent; but that is a problem very difficult of solution, to find a protection sufficiently small not to entice capital to that particular branch of manufactures to the injury of others. Another doctrine has been attributed, and justly attributed, to me, necessarily in my absence, which was inevitable. The right hon. gentleman represented me to have said—and I have said—that, in the present state of Ireland, it was absolutely necessary that proprietors in Ireland should be proprietors there alone. I have

said this, and I will never seek a vote upon any other ground than what is my conviction upon this subject. The evils of absenteeism can never be got rid of so long as the proprietors of estates elsewhere are proprietors of estates in Ireland. It may be an exceedingly unpalatable doctrine—it may be exceedingly disagreeable; but, being my opinion—my firm and settled opinion—I shall not conceal it from you. I am not for an absentee tax; I know that the Irish Parliament tried it for two centuries and a half, and yet it did not prove effective. There is one topic more, with which, while I am upon this subject, I will trouble the House. A right hon. gentleman has been very facetious upon a speech which I am supposed to have delivered at Kildare. I am sorry to detain the House with a denial of what is there attributed to me. Any one who read it should have had a suspicion of its accuracy. There was no reporter present on that occasion. It is scarcely necessary for me to repeat what I really did say. It was, that a deputation of five or six persons could go up to the representatives in Dublin, to use an Irish phrase, with short sticks in their hands, and return the same night. But the most serious charge of all has been imputed to me by a friend. It has been said, that my acts tended, and from thence an inference was drawn that my disposition went towards a separation of the two countries. I do not object to any gentleman canvassing my acts with a view to show their tendency to a separation. So far from objecting to that, I invite it. The instant that any man can show that such is the tendency of my acts, that instant I will alter such conduct. But if the charge be made directly against me as a fact, it is one of a traitorous tendency, and I have but one way of meeting it—proclaiming its utter falsehood. My conduct has been directly the reverse of this. I am sorry to have detained the House with these preliminary observations; but I now come to the question as it has been debated. I make no apology for the introduction of a long discussion by me upon the right of the Irish nation to an independent legislature in 1782. It was said elsewhere, that there had been what was

called "a conquest of Ireland." That was talked of before this debate occurred in another place, and by a member of another Administration. I did not know but it might also be introduced here, and, therefore, I anticipated it, and I am confident I did so successfully. The claim now, therefore, to continue the Union is put, and is perfectly put, too, on the Act of Union itself. The argument stands or falls by that, and it is disembarassed of everything else; on that ground I insisted upon the incompetency of the Irish Parliament to pass that Act, and I am the more convinced of the justice of my position upon that point, and the soundness of my arguments, when I recollect how it was attempted to be met by two members of this House, for there were only two who discussed it, the member for Kirkcubright and the hon. and learned member for Monaghan. The hon. and learned member for Kirkcubright has admitted the authority of Locke, but alluded to the Revolution, and shown that the Convention Parliament had the power to do what? To appoint a king? No. To alter the Legislature? No; but the power to declare the throne vacant, and that the natural heir should succeed. The daughter of the reigning monarch succeeded to the throne. The abdication of the king was declared complete, and that very case was put in the authority which I quoted. The hon. member for Kirkcubright impeached my authorities by calling Plunket and Saurin partisans, but in no other way were they impeached. The hon. and learned member for Monaghan took a different course; for he, without reference to authorities, argued the case as if it were a special demurrer, and insisted that I should be stopped by it.

I shall not now argue the demurrer of the hon. and learned member; I only advert to it to show the futility and absurdity of the objection with which it has been sought to meet me upon this subject. I tell the House, though they think lightly of the people of Ireland, they are a shrewd, an observing, and an intelligent people, and that they will read my arguments as well as those of the gentlemen who are opposed to me; if they have

better arguments than I have to support their positions, then it may be expected that they will have more weight with the people; an importance will be attached to them, which cannot be given by any majority of this House, nor be regulated by the applause which is given to any gentleman who speaks on the other side. On this subject, I cannot help thinking, that it would have been better for my opponents to have passed it over without attempting to reply to it; for they have only, by their observations, demonstrated the accuracy of my statement, when I insisted that there was nothing to authorise the Irish Parliament to dispose of the Irish nation to the English nation, as there is nothing to authorise this Parliament to dispose of the English nation to any other state on the face of the globe. It is unnecessary for me now to remark upon the means by which the Union was produced; the foul corruption, the extensive bribery, the horrible manner in which it was effected or admitted; these are things which no one denies. There is only one thing in my statement that is disputed, and that is the fomentation of the Irish rebellion by the Government. To that I have a triumphant reply. It has been suggested, why should Mr. Pitt and Lord Castlereagh, the then ministers, have fomented such a rebellion, when they were placed in a situation of sufficient difficulty at the period of 1797, by the mutiny of the Nore? Can anything be more foolish and absurd than such an observation? Did Mr. Pitt or Lord Castlereagh foresee the mutiny of the Nore? Was it not an unexpected event, a most fortuitous circumstance, which was nearly as suddenly suppressed as it had started into existence? And, again, would there ever have been a Union if there had not been a rebellion? It was proved by documents before the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Commons, that one individual (Magnane) was in the habit of giving weekly and monthly returns to Government of all the proceedings of those who were embarked in the rebellion of 1798; and yet Government never made an attempt at interference by arresting anyone of the parties. But, then, the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) has taunted us with those transactions, in his

allusion to them, as a proof that there were materials for treason in Ireland. Why, if there had not been, no rebellion could have taken place. Even, with all the incitements used, that rebellion was not formidable; it prevailed only in Ulster and some parts of Leinster. It exhibited itself only in two petty conflicts—one in Saintfield, in the county Down, and another in Antrim, where Lord O'Neil was killed, and which was rather a scuffle than a battle. Where the rebellion was organised, one or two skirmishes put it down; and in Wexford, where there was no organisation, and the people were forced into insurrection, it did not appear at all formidable. The truth of history, then, is vindicated; the Union was brought about by means the most detestable, and it never could be carried until sectarian animosities and party antipathies arrayed Irishmen against each other. It was the policy of the Government which placed the country in that situation, that even the most loyal and most devoted to its interests were, in their own defence, arrayed against those who were designated rebels. I now come to a point which has been more immediately discussed here. It has been said, no matter how the Union was brought about, the question, and the sole question here is, how has it worked? And with that another consideration is mixed up; what would be the consequence of its Repeal? From 1782 to 1800, there was great prosperity in Ireland, and it would, I think have been better for the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) to have left this period untouched; because there is historical evidence of it too strong to be controverted, and it is so well known in Ireland, that there, at least, it will not be denied. However, the right hon. gentleman delivered a speech, in which that state of happiness and prosperity was controverted; he denied facts the most notorious and the best known, and, for all the effect his speech will have in Ireland, he might as well have denied that there was a Sunday within the last week. When the report of this debate goes to Ireland, I ask you what will be the effect of his contradiction, and the applause with which that contradiction was received? Why, if it had not been proved before,

the incapacity of this House to regulate our affairs, and its ignorance, of the history of Ireland, this one fact alone is sufficient to demonstrate it to the people of Ireland. It is most important that it should be considered whether Ireland has been benefited by the Union; and I can tell the House that, if it had not been for the actual misery, the overwhelming distress, and great destitution consequent upon the Union, and pervading the whole of that country, the people would not press to have that Union repealed, nor should I seek it. And if such misery and distress do prevail, of what value are the returns, the imports, and the exports, and the sophistication of returns produced by the right hon. gentleman? The hon. member for Belfast did not deal in official returns at all, but he quoted the fanciful returns of a pamphlet-writer, whom I could name if I wished; but he is not worthy of it. Of what value are these columns of figures and these documents, if distress and destitution are prevailing throughout the land? You will soon hear what value Ireland will set upon these figures. The right hon. gentleman possesses the advantage of having returns of what he pleases, and he can make them so as to suit his purpose in this House; but your cheers cannot disprove the distress, nor your applause drown the cry of misery. I do not appeal to such returns of this House, but I appeal from them to the experience and misfortunes of Ireland.

The hon. member for Paisley has fleshed his maiden sword in this debate; he has shown equal talent and courtesy in this debate. He began by deprecating personalities, and he had not gone very far when he became personal himself. I heartily thank him for one point which he put forward. When he talked of figures, he said, "what signifies calculations when we have appalling facts?" That is my opinion precisely; and for his utterance of it, I cannot do less than pronounce him "a second Daniel." Exactly so, I say; what signify columns of figures when they are controverted by appalling facts? Did you not hear the hon. member for Derry?—did you not hear the hon. member for Cork?—did you not hear every

member agree in this, except the hon. member for Belfast, who is an exception, who deserves to stand alone, and who does stand alone? Did you not hear them all talk of the increasing distress in every part of Ireland? And this distress, too, existing in a country the most fertile and abundant! Yes, there is that distress in a country the most productive. There we see in the midst of abundance, year after year, thousands of Irishmen fading into their graves, perishing of hunger, and periodical visitations of famine recorded in their history! Oh! how little do you know—how little do you consider what an impulse has been given to the call for Repeal—not from any feeling of inferiority in one class to another, but to the unsettled state of mind produced by the constant recurrence of distress in my country. We follow you in your revolutions, and we are generally the most severe sufferers. Government made an experiment with the currency, and Ireland still groans from the shock given to the social system; it made many a child desolate, and many a widow destitute. But, then, while the distress is increasing and the destitution extending, we are told here that we are increasing in wealth and prosperity ever since the Union! To my utter surprise this has been attempted. I lamented I was not present when “the wonder-worker” insisted upon “the prosperity of Dublin!” The right hon. member spoke of the prosperity of Dublin! Why, the members for Stroud and Knaresborough contradicted him. Did he remember even the pamphlet of Surgeon White, in which the distress of Dublin is so accurately depicted? But all these facts fade into nothingness when the brilliant imagination of the “West Briton” is warmed by the dazzling array of figures. Was not this catalogue of benefits and advantages to Dublin a glaring insult to the distressed people there? Such is the state of Ireland. Ought it to be in that state? The Union was to have given to Ireland the benefit of British laws; and now that thirty-three years have elapsed since that measure had been effected, I congratulate the hon. member for Carlisle on the fact that, for twenty years out of those thirty-three, the people of Ireland

had been deprived of the benefits of the law and constitution. That hon. member was, I remember, opposed to me on a former occasion. It was when I sought for freedom for the West Indian negroes. He deals in such a traffic; and I cannot but admit to him that it is right, it is proper, it is consistent, that the proprietor of such kind of property should be the advocate of slavery to Ireland. But, has the Union ever yet given us the protection of the British Constitution? No; for your last and worst act, the Coercion Bill, has, within the last few days—the ink is not yet dry in the proclamation—put four baronies in the King's County out of the pale of the Constitution; and, after that, will you talk to me of the blessings of your Union, and, after that, will the right hon. gentleman entertain you with his official returns? An hon. and gallant officer (Sir H. Vivian) has, indeed, entertained you in a different way, for he said that agitation alone produced poverty in Ireland; and yet, having done that, he illustrates his observations by declaring there was poverty in Ireland in 1779, when the oldest agitator amongst us was in his cradle. But, then, the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Spring Rice) has gone through a table of imports and exports, to show the prosperity of Dublin. Does he not know how these tables of imports and exports are made up? They might answer for any other port as well as that of Dublin. He knows that these imports and exports are not now made up upon oath; they are not examined, nor compared with the cargo; they are frequently filled up when the vessel is sailing, and when the only concern is, not that they should be correct, but that the revenue officer should be despatched as quickly as possible; and they have no more to do with what may or may not be on board than if the vessel was in China. But, then, we have the evidence of the right hon. gentleman himself that, up to 1825, this Parliament did nothing for Ireland. From this speech, now, you would suppose that there had been a constant increase of prosperity in Ireland since the Union; that then the sunshine first beamed upon us; that it has been increasing in intensity and effulgence ever since; and that, at this moment, its

glowing beams are warming the whole of my country! How such poetry would be scoffed at by the unfortunate misery of the Irish! How would that misery be aggravated, when there was read the glowing display of six hours, expended in proving that the Irish were the most prosperous people in the world! In that speech of the right hon. gentleman, sophisticated arguments were all that were required to prove what did not exist—arguments that, if put forward in Ireland, the only reply necessary to give them would be “circumspice.” The gallant officer (Sir Hussey Vivian) who opposed me, even corroborated my statement, and contradicted that of the right hon. gentleman; for he admitted that there was great poverty and destitution amongst the Irish people. Up, then, to 1825, it is admitted by the right hon. gentleman you did no good for us. You gave us emancipation, I admit; but how? After twenty-nine years of the most violent struggle for it. I read to this House a speech in which it was declared, that the Catholics were determined never to meet as a separate body. Why were they compelled to do otherwise? The Union forced them to it.

The noble lord who has spoken upon this question seems to have read only snatches of Irish history. If he would look to the progress of emancipation in Ireland, he would find that an Irish House of Commons would have soon conceded it—he would find what rapid progress the Irish House of Commons made in emancipation. It commenced in 1778—there was another relaxation of the penal code in 1782—another in 1792—another in 1793, which gave to the Catholics of Ireland the elective franchise; so that if a Parliament had continued in Ireland, the men who had the elective franchise would only have returned to it those who would vote for their religious freedom. When the poor were emancipated, the rich must soon have been freed from their shackles. It was an Imperial Parliament that prevented us from being emancipated for many years; it was the want of a domestic Parliament that compelled us to agitate for it for twenty-nine years. You may, if you choose, pour out the vials of your indignation upon me.

Why, for twenty-nine years I have been traduced. I have been abused six times a week in one paper—three times a week in another—once a week in another; in every publication vituperation has been poured upon me, and I scorned it. I was an agitator then, and I am an agitator now. What is agitation? "It is seeking for the redress of substantial grievances." Distress is the agitator's stock-in-trade; put an end to the distress—destroy the grievances, and you annihilate the agitator. Your rule has been attempted to be prolonged, and it is now sought to be continued by the perpetuation of party feuds; but this, be assured, is not the mode in which you can either free yourselves from agitation or stop the demand for Repeal. It is an argument against the Union, that it compelled us, for twenty-nine years, to agitate for emancipation. This was your doing; and it was you who excited the worst passions of the people in that period—it was British injustice and British intolerance that roused these passions, and at length excited them to such a height as at last to compel some glorious apostate to follow the chariot of agitation into the centre of the Constitution. That crime you committed; and that you did so is admitted by the right hon. gentleman himself, up to the year 1825. The hon. member for Paisley has said, that the Scotch Reform Bill was miserable, while the Reform Bill for Ireland was bountiful. This is all Greek to me. Scotland, containing 2,000,000 of inhabitants, obtained an increase of eight representatives, while Ireland, containing 8,000,000 of inhabitants, got an increase of only five. I take the principle of population, because that is the principle upon which the Reform Bill was founded, and according to that principle the Reform Bill carries a decisive conviction to the minds of the Irish people of British injustice. It speaks to them trumpet-tongued, and warns them that, between the right hon. gentleman and the noble lord, they have not a particle of justice to expect. I will take the hon. member for Paisley foot to foot upon the subject. In England you doubled, nay, quadrupled, the elective franchise, leaving all existing franchise untouched. To Scotland an

elective constituency has been also given, for it had none before. Thus you were bountiful to both countries, while you had the daring presumption to insult Ireland by giving her no additional franchise. I speak not of the present Parliament—that Parliament you had not anything to do with. Oh no; you are all bountiful men to Ireland—you gave us no Coercion Bill, that last and beautiful production of the Union with which the right hon. gentleman is so enamoured. I should not be surprised to find that right hon. gentleman refer to Limerick as he has referred to Dublin, to prove that Ireland is most prosperous. I admit as a proof of the prosperity of Limerick, there is a new square there—it has a statue in the centre, too, but, then, I believe, there is not a single house in Rice’s Square. Upon the pedestal of that statue the people ought to write “the wonderful West Briton!” What a fortune he would make if he could get that statue, and bring it to every fair in Ireland, as a show for a shilling. “Walk in,” he might say, “and see this wonderful West Briton all the way from Rice’s Square in Limerick, where there is not a single house.” In passing a Reform Bill, you insulted Ireland; and it has been regarded the most intolerable because, upon the first reading of the Reform Bill, the majority of the English and the majority of the Scotch members were against the Bill, but the majority of the Irish members were in its favour, and the first reading was carried by means of that Irish majority. Why were you afraid of granting the benefits of Reform to a similar extent to Ireland? It was because you have a by-gone persuasion that you could not give an extensive franchise to the people of Ireland; not because they would abuse that franchise, but lest they should prevent the British Government from abusing them. You have given to Scotland a Borough Reform Bill. The hon. member for Monaghan has, perhaps, one in his pocket for Ireland, but no doubt it shall not be brought forward until it shall be too late in the session to pass it. At all events it was not mentioned in his *esto perpetua* speech. The hon. member for Monaghan said that, if you wished Ireland to be quiet, you

had only to give her a fair and impartial administration of justice. I would confirm what the hon. member has said—and yet you have suffered this debate to go on to its close without saying one word as to what was to be done for Ireland. Even the hon. member for Middlesex has failed to elicit from the ministry a promise that they would do anything more for Ireland. The right hon. Secretary for Ireland ought, instead of prosecuting the Press to an extent almost rivalling the prosecutions of Louis Philippe, to seek to give to Ireland a fair, impartial, and equal administration of justice. I appeal to you all who have heard me, and I will put this case to your common sense. A gentleman high in the confidence of the Crown, and of stainless integrity in private life, here tells you that you cannot complete the Union with Ireland, because you withhold from that country the advantage of a fair administration of justice. The shrinking peasant who knows nothing of the law but from the first process of tithes, which cost more money than he ever saw; and the farmer, to whom a tithe would be little less than ruin, will hear of your speeches, and will feel that no remedy is to be applied to his grievances. They will hear of great speeches here and there; they will hear of that of the hon. member for Belfast, all the thoughts which he remembered of, or, at all events, that were coincident with the speeches of Chief Justice Bushe. They will hear how that side of the House praised this, and how that side of the House praised that, and how the hon. member for Carlisle brought up the awkward squad. The gallant officer (Sir Hussey Vivian), who thought he understood political economy as well as fighting—though he did not like it half so well—has read a letter written by me, in which opinions were stated which the gallant officer did not coincide in. I thought that the gallant officer, who distinguished himself, I believe, at New Orleans, would have known enough of America to be able to trace the opinions to the source from which he took them. I have to tell the gallant officer, I, in that respect, only borrowed my opinions from America. I shall not longer detain the House. It is time the

discussion should close here, and I think that nothing but good can follow from it. I do not know what may be your feelings towards me; but for myself I will say, that I heartily thank you, in the name of my country, for the mode in which this debate has been conducted. If some of my friends had concentrated their feelings more, they would have been more patiently listened to. The manner in which the discussion has been carried on, and the temper displayed in it, cannot but tend to good; if your arguments be better than mine, the people of Ireland, who are a shrewd and a clever people, will attend to them; your majority will be as nothing to them; the greatness of its amount will rather weigh another way with them. Before I conclude, let me observe, that the hon. member for Waterford, from whose politics and principles I differ, put some points which are exceedingly deserving of your consideration. He would have you make a party for yourselves in Ireland. Do so. Make a party of the people by being just to them, and try not to delude them. What should be your way to oppose the Repeal of the Union? Not by reviling those to whom the people are attached, and not by imputing improper motives to them. For twenty-nine years I struggled for emancipation. I am now the paid servant of the people. I am prouder of the salary I thus receive than any pension and title that a monarch could bestow upon me. You may for this arraign my motives. I care not. I shall do no act I consider derogatory to myself, and I shall not be afraid to do any one that, in my conscience, I feel bound to do. The autocrat Nicholas might honour a man with his bounty—and is it to be regarded as degrading when the people of Ireland exhibit their gratitude? Look to the country which you say you must continue to manage. I tell the Government now, in the hearing of their supporters, not to follow up their triumphant majority, by a miserable Tithe Bill—a Tithe Bill which, if you send to Ireland, you ought to send black banners along with it. You have now a sufficient fund to pay to the Protestant clergy the full amount of their claims, and maintain the vested interests of the present

incumbents. Provide for the spiritual wants of the Protestants of Ireland; but give us no sinecure Church Establishment. You have been told by one of your law officers, that the law is badly administered in Ireland. Give, then, to the people what they want—impartial justice; and do not think of stopping their demand by a paltry little Special Jury Bill, which gives a proper jury to the rich and refuses it to the man who has not money. Let there be a fair jury system established throughout the country—let there be impartial justice—follow, as you ought to do, your triumphant majority of this night by honest and fair conduct towards Ireland. Let this be done by you—if it be not, the misfortune will be ours, but yours will be the crime.

Subject, PUNISHMENT OF DEATH; Date, JULY 3, 1834.

In the Poor Law Amendment debate, June 16, O'Connell called attention to the absurdity of saying that Ireland was over-populated when one half the land was not under cultivation.

Mr. O'Connell said, the Criminal Law of England was a bloody and barbarous code, and very badly administered. It was lamentable to see a country excelling every other in science and art so backward in the progress of civilization in her criminal laws. What did the noble lord mean by bodily harm? A mere bruise or discolouring of the skin was included in the words of the Amendment, and this was to be as great a crime as murder in the eye of the law. What else could be meant by "bodily harm?" They knew that "grievous bodily harm" was already a capital offence; every case of cutting was provided for by the bloody Act of Lord Ellenborough. This reminded him of three deaths which had recently taken place from boxing-matches. He contended that all the persons engaged in these barbarous practices were guilty of murder. He would have all those who backed the pugilists, as well as the lookers-on, and those who encouraged such acts of inhu-

manity, punished as murderers. It was easy to show they were guilty of murder. The law was clear, that if any persons went out to fight with weapons likely to cause death, and death should ensue, they were guilty of murder. It could easily be shown that the weapons used at a prize fight did produce death, for death had taken place in several instances. There could, therefore, be no doubt they were murderers, and should be punished as such. He thought if a batch of the noble lords, magistrates, and gentry who were present, and gave encouragement to such inhuman scenes, were sent to Botany Bay, it would have a tendency to put an end to them. He should oppose the Amendment of the noble lord.

Subject, CORPORATION REFORMS—COMMITTEE;

Date, JULY 3, 1835.

Mr. O'Connell said, that the hon. and learned gentleman when he talked of disappointing the will of the original donors, forgot how many souls were at this moment suffering in purgatory for want of the Masses they gave their property to obtain. As the hon. and learned gentleman had been pathetic upon the disappointment of the original donors, he would, in his turn, be pathetic, and appeal to him on behalf of the suffering souls who had not had the Masses celebrated for them, which much of this property was given for. At all events, he could assure the hon. and learned gentleman that his fears were vain; for by the Irish penal laws, passed by gross breach of the faith of treaties, the Roman Catholics of Ireland were deprived of all power, directly or indirectly, to present, either individually or as corporators, to any living, and these statutes had never been repealed.

Mr. Law—That is in Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell—Nor in England; and the Duke of Norfolk could not now present to any advowson any more than before the passing of the Emancipation Act. The 15th section of that Act kept the penal statutes in full force; and there was

nothing in this Bill to repeal them. He was, however, quite ready to agree to any clause preventing the interference of the Roman Catholic councillors, under a penalty, with any appointment relative to the Established Church. He did not exercise power of this kind as he might in his own religion, he considered the subject too delicate for him to meddle with the ecclesiastical appointments of a religion with which he was unconnected.

In answer to Mr. Law, Mr. O'Connell said he would protest against the introduction into this Bill of any test to make a distinction between Dissenters and the members of the Established Church. He would repeat, however, that he would have no objection to impose a penalty on Roman Catholics acting improperly in regard to Church livings.

Subject, IRISH POOR LAWS; Date, JULY 8, 1835.

Mr. O'Connell said that it was clear that the hon. member did not understand the statute of Elizabeth. The abuses of which he spoke flowed necessarily out of that statute; for the principle of the statute of Elizabeth was, that the labourer who had employment should contribute a portion of his labour to the person who had no employment. The necessary consequences of such a principle was that abuses grew out of it. He had come down to the House with the intention of voting that the Bill be referred to a committee, and he had been determined in that intention not by the speeches which he had heard in favour of the Bill but by those which he had heard against it. The hon. member for Knaresborough had amused himself not a little. He had called upon him to give some arguments in favour of the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland. Now, the only reason which he (Mr. O'Connell) would give for their introduction was this, that although the system of Poor Laws was a bad one, still they were driven by necessity, not by choice, to do something for the indigent poor of Ireland. They

were driven to it even at the expense of the property of the country. The hon. member for Knaresborough, by his speech, drove them to this.

[Mr. Richards said he did not know what the hon. and learned gentleman meant.]

No one had less right to interrupt him than the hon. member for Knaresborough, for the hon. member had addressed almost all his remarks to him. The hon. member had addressed him half with flattery and half vituperation, and he freely admitted that he preferred the vituperation to the flattery. The hon. member had spoken of him as a renegade. Renegade, indeed! He threw back the insinuation upon the hon. member for Knaresborough. The hon. member talked, too, of Scotland, which, he said, had obtained tranquillity by means of the introduction of Poor Laws, and in supporting this view, he even made Latin quotations. The hon. member was as classical as he was consistent. He said that Scotland had arrived at her tranquillity *per saltum*. Now, the fact was, that Scotland had arrived at tranquillity in spite of the Poor Laws, for it was proved that in some parishes in Glasgow, where the Poor Laws were in full force, that tranquillity was annihilated, while in those parishes where they were not introduced the people were flourishing. Ireland was in a miserable condition, and it would seem that nothing was to be done to relieve her but the application of the paltry quack remedies of the hon. gentleman opposite. The hon. member for Knaresborough having disposed of his Welsh tenantry, proceeded with his French mendicants to Dublin, and complained that he did not find the hon. member for Dublin among the supporters of the Mendicity Society in that city; but that society cost him more than any system of Poor Laws could. He was a subscriber to that society, though he did not approve of the applications of the funds, because the paupers were employed at a rate of wages which deprived the wealthy and efficient labourers of employment. That Ireland has in a wretched state no man could doubt who had read the

petition from Borrishoole, and he would defy any set of political economists to say the time had not arrived when something must be done to alleviate the sufferings of the Irish people. The fact was, Ireland was now suffering from misgovernment, and from the misgovernment of that party to which the hon. member for Knaresborough had recently attached himself. He wished that party joy in having such a political economist as the hon. member for Knaresborough at their back.

The people of Ireland had been misruled for the last seven hundred years; they had been misruled by the Tory party; and had the late Government remained in office for nine months longer, there could be no doubt that their mode of governing Ireland would have produced a sanguinary insurrection in that country. The hon. member for Knaresborough would give the people of Ireland a system of Poor Laws, while denying them justice; they asked for bread, and he would give them a stone. The people of Ireland were by no means anxious to join with the hon. member for Knaresborough in this experiment of Poor Laws. What they desired was the experiment of fair and regular government in Ireland. At present the condition of Ireland was terrific. There were to be seen persons desolating the land by decimating the country of the tenantry. Landlords were recommended by the Orange party to get rid of their Catholic tenants; and the result was, that the miseries described in the Borrishoole petition would speedily extend all over Ireland, if something were not done to arrest them. In considering this question, he must confess that he had been obliged to give up logic and resort to feeling. He therefore should concur in voting to-night for going into Committee on this Bill; but he would not do so, if something worse even than Poor Laws did not exist. He wished them to read the Bill a second time, in order that this subject might undergo inquiry by a Select Committee during the remainder of this session; and he hoped that they would arrive at some proper course to be pursued. Looking at the history of Poor Laws throughout Europe, it was well known that misery had

increased wherever they were adopted. This must be apparent to anyone who has read the book of that intelligent but wrong-headed man, Mr. Nassau Senior. Before they proceeded to lay down any system of Poor Laws for Ireland, they should look at the example of foreign countries. If there existed any system by which the tranquillity of Ireland could be restored, how was it that it had not been discovered? He did not think that the hon. member for Knaresborough understood anything of the circumstances which led to Whiteboyism; if he had, he would not have made the observations he did on that part of the subject. Whiteboy acts were, for the most part, perpetrated by sturdy, lazy fellows who were unwilling to work, and if Poor Laws were introduced into Ireland, and they were refused relief when they applied for it, their next step would be to burn the workhouse ("no, no"). No! He asked whether such acts had not been committed in this country, and whether, in many places, the poor population were not almost in a state of rebellion against the new Poor Law Act? He asked whether they wanted to add to the other incentives to Whiteboy acts that which would be given to them by a system of Poor Laws? Though he was averse to Poor Laws, he still felt that something must be done; but he would not proceed blindly, or do more than he felt was inevitable. The state of society in Ireland was such, that he did not think there could be found there the materials for forming local authorities to administer a Poor Law. In three of the provinces—in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught—the chief part of the population were Roman Catholics; and the consequence would be that the funds would go into hands in which the landlords would not confide, and they would be applied to purposes of which the landlord would not approve. This, he contended, would have the effect of throwing an additional firebrand between landlord and tenant, and rendering them more hostile than they were now towards each other. Talking of the north of Ireland—there were in the province of Ulster 781,000 more Catholic than there were Protestant inhabitants; and, even there, all the objections he had

stated would apply, so that the result of the introduction of such a system would be to involve that country in one scene of trouble and discord. It was said, however, that though Poor Laws in Ireland might be injurious to that part of the empire, they would be beneficial to England. He had always thought there was something at the bottom of the recommendation, more especially when he saw some particular newspapers. The *Morning Herald* was one advocating the introduction of such laws into Ireland. This he considered a great mistake. In his opinion, the adoption of the system, instead of serving, would injure England quite as much as Ireland. He would take his own parish for the purpose of illustration. If a man had a wife and several children, the course that would be taken was this: The man would have ten shillings given to him to carry him to England, and they would tell him that he should work for whatever he could get here, and, in that way, endeavour to lighten the burden at home, while he pressed on the labourers of this country. Thus, instead of diminishing, they would increase the influx of the Irish labourers into this country. The petition from Borrischoole proved the country to be in a dreadful state. It was a shocking thing that people should be famishing, when the fields around them were teeming with produce; but all this he attributed to bad government. He concluded by saying that if something was not done to ameliorate the political condition of Ireland, certainly something ought to be done to relieve the people of that country from the starvation with which they were threatened.

Subject, EDUCATION—IRELAND; Date, JULY 13, 1835.

The extent to which Catholics are indebted to O'Connell for his fearless denunciations of religious animosity, and his clear expositions of Christian doctrine can scarcely be over-estimated. O'Connell was, in every sense, a practical Catholic, and he had the rare combination of ability and moral courage to profess his faith plainly before men who made no secret of their

bitter contempt for it and for him. Bitterness, ignorance, and prejudice had to be encountered in almost every debate in which he took part. There is so much complimentary religion in the present day that such fearless statements of truth might serve as a moral tonic to those who are so exceedingly afraid of speaking out plainly lest they should offend.

The question before the House was the grant of £35,000 for the advancement of education in Ireland, for the year ending 31st March, 1836. Mr. Plumptre objected to the grant. He said Protestant children had attended these schools, and had been rewarded for going to Mass by the gift of a suit of clothes. Mr. Plumptre would have approved highly of such a gift to a Catholic child to make it attend Protestant service, so curious is the perversion of party spirit.

Colonel Sibthorp, the precursor of the Whalleian age, said he had "the greatest suspicion of everything." A state of mind not conducive to personal tranquillity. O'Connell hoped there would be more peace and Christian charity in the next generation. He could not have anticipated that an ex-Premier would stir up, or try to stir up the bitterest party spirit by refurbishing all the old world calumnies on Catholic loyalty, and bring up rusty and long disused weapons out of old Protestant armouries.

Mr. Randall Plunkett excused himself for trespassing upon the time of the House in the fashion of men who feel that what they have to say is of extraordinary importance. He had "a fact" to communicate, and before he got to the end of his speech, he had a second fact. Fact the first was that "two Franciscan friars" had got possession of the schools in Drogheda, and Mr. Plunkett assured the House, "that there were no persons more zealously disposed to establish Popery on the ruins of the Protestant Church in Ireland than these two Catholic ecclesiastics." But he did not say how so mighty an effect could be accomplished by so feeble a cause. Furthermore, these Franciscan friars had made preparations for erecting a monastery in the town; and Mr. Plunkett pathetically, but somewhat inconsistently, implored "the members of his Majesty's Government, if they were really as sincere members of the Church of England as they pretended (*sic*) to be," to save Ireland from the Franciscan friars, and their future grandchildren, if they should have as numerous a progeny as the hon. member for Dublin, "from being sent to this school, and give them a chance of a Christian education like their fathers." Mr. Plunkett got happy when he plunged into the stream of futurity. It is not evident whose grandchildren he was anxious to protect; whether the grandchildren were to be the progeny of the children then educating, or of their fathers, is not evident.

But Mr. Plunkett had yet another fact. There were monks at Ennis also beginning school; and he declared it to be "the opinion of the gentry and ma-

gistry of Ireland that the Government system of education would not promote anything that was desirable amongst the people."

Mr. Bellew positively contradicted Mr. Plunkett's statements, and said the gentry, and even the "high Tories," approved of the schools.

A very lively talk ensued. Mr. Young complained that the schools were too near the Catholic chapels; it was "an unfortunate locality," and it is a curious evidence of the power and injustice of Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, even at so recent a period, that it did not occur to him that the majority—the overwhelming majority of scholars being Catholic, the locality best suited to them should be chosen. Furthermore, he "had heard" that the Catholic clergy were as "hostile to the Gospel of St. John" as he "had been informed," they were "to the whole Bible." This gentleman does not appear to have been animated with any specially hostile spirit; he was at least gentlemanly in his language; his ignorance, it must be hoped, was not culpable.

Mr. Henry Grattan replied fully and somewhat warmly to this and other remarks. He asked, "what had been the effect of the Protestant ascendancy system in Ireland? They had made bad Christians; they had set Protestant against Catholic, and Catholic against Protestant till they had made the island like a demoniac assembly."

Mr. Plumptre read a "report" which he had got from some "ushers," about a school which was visited daily by friars, and who declared that the friars said Mass twice every day, morning and evening.

Then O'Connell replied again. It was no wonder that he commented severely on the "gross ignorance" of those who made attacks upon the Catholic Church.

Mr. O'Connell repudiated in as strong terms as any man could use, with courtesy, the imputations which the hon. gentleman had cast upon those whom he had been pleased to designate, tauntingly, as Franciscan friars. He wanted to know whether a man had not as good a right to be a Franciscan friar as a sworn Orangeman; for the latter was a member of an illegal society, while the former was attached to a Church to which the hon. member did not belong; but which had, nevertheless, its ordained ministers, and was tolerated by law. He had had the honour of knowing a Franciscan friar, to whom it would be a difficult task for the hon. gentleman to compare himself. He was alluding to Father O'Leary. Father O'Leary was a Franciscan friar, and he (Mr. O'Connell) thought the hon. member would find it a task of exceeding difficulty to find any

man who was acquainted with both, ready to affirm that the hon. member was as well educated as that ecclesiastic. In one portion of education, he was sure that the hon. member was more deficient than Father O'Leary, and that was in Christian liberality. It did not become the hon. member to speak in the way he had done of Franciscan friars. They had as good a right to be in the town of Drogheda as the hon. member himself had; and, perhaps, were as well received by the inhabitants as the hon. member would be, if he should go to visit them. If they conformed to the regulations of the board in their management of that school, they had a right to keep that school. But, if the hon. member could show that they violated those regulations, then he would make out a case, either against the Franciscan friars or against the Commissioners, or, it might be, against both; but, until he did make out such a case, those despised Franciscan friars would acknowledge no superiority in the hon. member above themselves; on the contrary, he believed that they would assert their superiority over the hon. member in any literary or religious controversy to which he might be pleased to challenge them.

It became the hon. member well enough to talk as he did about Franciscan friars; he would recommend the hon. member to reserve such language for Exeter Hall; there the hon. and learned member would have the police and a picked auditory. The hon. member had also spoken tauntingly about the monks at Ennis. Why, those monks belonged to a class called "education monks." They gave themselves up to be taught at an early period of their lives in order that they might, in the course of it, be able themselves to educate the children of the poor. They received no fee—they demanded no pecuniary reward. Their lives were devoted to purposes of education and to the promotion of those purposes alone. There were now 300 or 400 of them in Ireland, and they were doing incalculable good in that country by promoting the diffusion of education. Many of them came within the regulations of the Education Board, and received assistance. Others of them refused to come within

those regulations, and received no assistance. With the latter the House had nothing whatever to do, but with the others it had; and the House had a right to blame the Government if it permitted a Board under its control to supply money to those who would not conform to its regulations. Why, then, were excellent individuals, when they conformed to the regulations of the State, to be spoken tauntingly of as monks? It was this foolish affectation of superiority by the Protestant aristocracy of Ireland over those who differed from them in creed that worked such fatal consequences in that country. It was as if they were superior to them in station, conduct, and moral character—aye, even in the rank of human beings, when men of a certain position in society spoke tauntingly of excellent and pious individuals as “monks.” He hoped that the lesson which the hon. member had that night received would teach him, when he next addressed the chair, to keep the violence of his sectarian feelings to himself, and not to obtrude them on the British House of Commons on a delicate subject of this nature.

Mr. O’Connell said that the hon. member had accused him of accusing the hon. member for Drogheda of displaying violent sectarian feelings in defence of his religion. Now, he had done no such thing; but he had accused the hon. member of displaying violent sectarian feelings when he assailed the religion of another Church. He, for his part, assailed no man’s religion. But the hon. member had talked tauntingly of Franciscan friars and monks, and had used the word, “Popery.” Now, if there was an offensive nickname for Protestants—as there was—what would be said of him if he were to use it in that place? If he were to speak of Protestants as heretics, he should deserve to be put down in that House. He expected, if the same courtesy or privilege was not to be extended to Roman Catholic members which they were disposed to show towards Protestant members, he expected, he said, that the House would extend to him the right of repudiating any attacks that might be made upon his creed. The monks, to whom the hon. member for Oxford had referred, were called education monks, but were

not monks according to the definition of the law, for they had not taken any oaths, or entered into any orders, which brought them under the statute prohibiting the increase of monks in Ireland. They had, however, registered themselves as the Emancipation Act required, but under a protest that they felt that they did not come under the interpretation of that Act. He wished that his example in refraining from making attacks on the religion of others might be followed by those who, with Christian charity ever on their tongues, exhibited little of it in their speeches and actions.

SAME SUBJECT ; SAME DATE.

Mr. O'Connell said he would give the hon. member as much conscience as he pleased ; he wished Protestants had a little more of it. The hon. and learned member said the Dublin University was open to Catholics. Yes, as far as education went, they were very liberal ; but they never gave a scholarship or a fellowship to a Catholic : they were very careful of their good things. But to this he would answer, the college of Maynooth was precisely on a footing with the Dublin University. Protestants might be educated there if they pleased, and, with all due regard to their consciences, they might attend all the courses, excepting, of course, those of religion. He would now relate an instance of the way in which Catholics in a Catholic country treated such a subject as this. In Belgium a vote of money was moved in the Chamber of Representatives towards the expenses of a Protestant chapel in Brussels. Some division of opinion took place on that occasion ; there were four Catholic clergymen in the Chambers, and three of those voted in favour of the grant, and only one against it.

Subject, ADJOURNED DEBATE—THE CHURCH (IRELAND);

Date, JULY 23, 1835.

Mr. O'Connell rose amidst loud cries of "Question," and "Go on." He said, if hon. gentlemen would listen to him for a few minutes, he promised to sit down the moment they expressed their disinclination to hear him further. He should not go into any details on the question, for these were already fully before the House; but he said at once that one of the worst things which they could do for Ireland was to reject this measure. What was the real question before them? The House, which had been called together under the auspices of the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth, who had declared himself hostile to the great principle of the measure, the House had resolved that the Irish nation should participate in the advantages of that which was national property. That declaration had raised the hopes of the people of Ireland. He implored the House, then, to pause and consider the fatal consequences which must inevitably result from the rejection of the measure, not only to the empire generally, but to the hon. gentleman opposite, on whose actions and on whose course of proceeding alone, the consequences of that rejection must rest. The hopes of the Irish people had been raised; anticipations of the redress of long-existing and heavy wrongs had been excited in their bosoms; they were taught, for the first time, to feel that their brethren in England had awakened to a sense of the demand they possessed on their sympathies and kindly feelings. He entreated the House not to cast lightly away the good effects which this impression had already produced. Tranquillity and peace had even now been in a great measure restored. The judges in the southern and western parts of the country had complimented the grand juries on the tranquillity of their respective districts; the only disturbances that had been committed had taken place in the North of Ireland, and they had originated with the extreme loyalists, who had so misconducted

themselves that it became necessary for the soldiers to fire upon them. He implored the House, in the strongest and most emphatic terms he could possibly make use of, not to accede to the proposition of the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth, the more especially after what had taken place in the course of the debate; in which, although great interest was expressed as to the number of Protestants in different places—now stated to be 120 here and 50 there, and again 20 elsewhere—no allusion had been made to the number of Catholics in the different benefices. And yet, what was the real state of the case. In the diocese of Armagh the total number of Protestants was 783,000, of which 517,782 were Episcopalians, while the number of Catholics was 1,437,401—1,437,401 Roman Catholics in the diocese of Armagh alone. In Dublin the number of Protestants was 137,230, and that of the Catholics 1,630,681. In the diocese of Cashel the number of Protestants was 112,434, the number of Roman Catholics, 2,220,000 and upwards. In Connaught the number of Protestants was 444,900, the number of Catholics 1,188,500. Could the Established Church in Ireland, under any circumstances whatever, be called a National Church? “Can you presume,” continued the hon. and learned gentleman, “can you presume, I ask you, to call the Established Church of Ireland a National Church? Turn Ireland into a province if you please; call it a Provincial Church, and then I will discuss with you the point, whether its extent is sufficiently commensurate with its utility to justify the appellation; but the mere act of calling an establishment like this a National Church is as gross a violation of every principle of nationality as can be conceived.” The Catholics of Ireland, continued the hon. and learned member, were six millions and a half; the total number of Protestants was one million and a half. Count them, take them man for man, and what was the result? A balance of five millions in favour of the Catholics. What did they find else? That there were two Catholics for every Protestant, and a surplus of three millions and a half of Catholics into the bargain. Why was this Church Establish-

ment, this National Church, to be endured? An hon. and gallant member had alluded to the town of Dundalk, and had stated that the members of the Church were increasing in that neighbourhood. The town and parish contained 1,433 members of the Establishment, and when reminded that that included the fourteen Protestant inhabitants of Castletown, the hon. member asked what that had to do with the case? But do not let it be forgotten that the rector of these united parishes was also rector of Louth. Where, then, was the anxious attention to the wants of the few Protestants in the parish of Castletown? Of course the rector of these united parishes does full justice to the 261 members of the Church in his parish of Louth. Where, then, was the anxiety to provide each clergyman with his £175? The rector of Louth was resident, and had only his 261 Protestant parishioners to take care of. Why not, then, give up his £2,000 a year surplus for other purposes? He would take the dioceses of Raphoe and Ardagh as to the number of the members of the Established Church and the Catholics, and even the most bigoted must admit that he had not taken an unfair case, but that it was unexceptionable. In the first of these dioceses, then, take the 33,600 members of the Establishment to the 145,000 Catholic inhabitants of it, and in the latter the 17,000 Protestants against the 195,000 Catholics. The revenues of the Church should be for the religious instruction of the entire 400,000 inhabitants of these dioceses. Every parish paid tithes—there was a glebe house, or land, in almost every one of the parishes of those dioceses. But take, on the other hand, the diocese of Tuam with its 467,000 Catholics against its 9,000 members of the Establishment. The Establishment was intended for both the 9,000 Protestants and the 467,000 Catholics.

He was told, however, in the vulgar language of authority, that Protestant worship must be maintained in every parish. Here, then, were the 467,000, and the 9,000 members of the Church. They were told that the means of religious instruction must be maintained for the latter; but who was to provide

for the religious instruction of the 467,000 Catholics? Was it not themselves? They were taxed for the maintenance of the Protestant Church, and they supported their own churches, and they had their own archbishops, and bishops, and deans, and priests, and curates, without coming to the treasury of Protestants, or taking money from their pockets. They did not require Protestants to contribute to their Church; but there were many liberal Protestants, and they received the blessings of thousands for it, who did largely contribute to the building of places of Divine worship. Was not the Protestant Church as good as that of the Catholics, and it required this adventitious aid? Had it not a powerful influence on the human mind? It was said that the Catholic religion was founded in ignorance and could be dispelled by education; how, then, could those who advanced such an opinion refuse to Catholics the chance of education out of the funds which they mainly contributed to? But there was an objection to educate the Catholics. It was said that they were a benighted set, and buried in ignorance, and that the only remedy was in education. By this means it was said that they would be made Protestants; then why not adopt this course, if such was the result that was expected? The truth was, they charged the Catholics with ignorance, and refused the means which they alleged would dispel it. The hon. member for Cumberland had done him the honour of noticing him in a pointed manner—a notice which he (Mr. O'Connell) had not provoked in any manner; the right hon. baronet had touched on topics which had not previously been alluded to; he then went on to sneer at the Catholics, and to heap his praise on the Protestant Dissenters of England. The deductions from his speech were very different from the facts he had stated, for he had drawn out of his pocket a passage of Clarendon, respecting the turning the bishops out of the House of Lords; but, instead of endeavouring to excite unnecessary fears, he should rather have deplored the circumstances which had brought matters to that point. He should have deplored their conduct, and

remembered that the bishops occupied themselves in hunting out where the Dissenters had last been at prayers, and pursued such a course of persecution as excited the indignation of the people of England. He should not have forgotten that they had lent themselves in every instance to palliate the crimes of the court. When the right hon. gentleman sneered at the Catholics and praised the Protestant Dissenters of England, and endeavoured to excite alarm by alluding to the expulsion of the bishops from the other House, he might have remembered, that this was done by the provocations heaped upon the Protestant Dissenters, and there was not a single Catholic then in Parliament who voted for the bishops retaining their seats in the Upper House. They then pursued a consistent and zealous, but mistaken course of policy. Was this, then, a topic for the right hon. member to sneer at the Catholics for? But what had the Church gained by the rejection of the Bill of last year? By that Bill the Protestant clergyman was to receive £77 10s. per cent. from the Treasury, and to be exempted from all the trouble and anxiety of collecting his tithes. Had the Irish clergy, then, gained by the rejection of the Bill of last year as compared with either of the measures that had been introduced in the present session? The right hon. and gallant officer proposed in his Bill to give the Irish clergyman £2 10s. per cent. less than he would have received by that rejected by the House of Lords last year. A further reduction was to be made in this measure; so that if this measure had passed, £5 10s. per cent. would be lost to the clergy in every £100 more than would have been the case if the Bill of last year had not been delayed. But if this measure were rejected what would be the Bill of next year. The Bill of last year was rejected, which the noble lord had opposed in consequence of so much being taken from the Church; but he hinted that that part of the Bill of this year which was to reduce the income of the clergy to £73 5s. per cent. should have his approval. So, then, this year those were ready to accept £73 5s. per cent. who rejected the Bill

of last year, which was to give the clergy £77 10s. per cent. The right hon. baronet might despise the Catholics of Ireland, and might call upon the House to throw out this measure; but what did his Church gain by the rejection of the Bill of last year? Had the Church gained by the massacres that had taken place because that Bill did not pass? How had it gained? Was it by the slaughter of the men at Rathcormac, whose lives would have been spared if this Bill had passed? Had the Church gained by the rejection of that Bill? He would appeal to the wailings of the widows, and the screams of the children, and the moaning of the parents, for the husband's, and father's, and offspring's blood that had been shed at Rathcormac. Were more Rathcormacs desired? The Catholics of Ireland were not only treated with disregard, but with contempt. In passing through Connemara, ten Protestants would hardly be met with in the district, which was equal to one to a square mile, and yet a Protestant Establishment must be kept up in that part of the country.

You are strong (observed the hon. and learned gentleman), and you will tell the Catholics of Ireland that their feelings and judgments shall be outraged, and that they shall be exposed to every injustice? Will you tell them that, although they are upwards of 7,000,000, their feelings shall be wounded and insulted, and their interests sacrificed, for the gratification of 800,000 persons? It might be proper that the 800,000 should have provision made for their religious instruction, but would they not allow the overwhelming majority of the Irish nation to receive any share of education from the funds which were mainly furnished by themselves, lest they should be improved? And who pursued such policy—what statesman, forsooth? He could not help smiling at the pious Serjeant (Mr. Serjeant Jackson) saying that the members of the Irish Church had not increased because it had been so poor for such a series of years. He thought that he saw the tears flowing down the learned Serjeant's cheeks when he uttered such a pious lamentation. These

receivers of tithes, then, were so poor that they could not propagate their religion in Ireland, and yet it might be thought that the Catholic priest would be poorer who received no tithes. The lamentation was, that there was no corn in Egypt; but how just was the remark. Allusion had been made to the Island of Achill, the Protestant incumbent of which received £900 a-year. A person had been sent over to that island from Exeter Hall to convert the Catholics. He took out with him a capital of £2,500, and took a number of Protestants with him, who were daily increasing. As the island at the time was overflowing with population, the people were dissatisfied and drove the settlers elsewhere, and yet this had been the ground of attack on the Catholic Church. The same circumstances would certainly have taken place elsewhere. He could not refrain from laughing at the importance attached to the increase of the number of Protestants in some parishes. Any person who carefully looked at the two columns in the report—the one taken in 1830, and the other in 1834—would see that the latter was rather a correction of the former; he, however, did not place the slightest reliance on such returns. In one parish, near his own residence, it had been stated, that there had been a great increase in the Protestant inhabitants in the course of three years—namely, from thirty-two to forty-nine. Now, it so happened that sixteen Protestants had been transferred from one parish to another. The keeper of the water-guard and his family had been moved from one side of the river to the other. So much for the increase of Protestants in that quarter. If there had been an increase in one parish there had been an accompanying diminution in another. In another case an apparent increase had taken place, by a Protestant relative of his own and his family coming to reside in a parish. This, however, was miserable special pleading with an important question. He would not follow the right hon. member for Cumberland through the length of his speech. He had, amongst other things, alluded to the Church of Scotland. But how did the Scots acquire their Church? Were there no Grahams or Graemes—no knights of the bright sword

in those days. The Grahams seemed fallen from their former chivalry. They were become prudent country gentlemen, anxious to risk nothing? Those who conquered for the religion of their country, risked everything for it. The right hon. gentleman, however, would risk nothing. They had also received a lecture on charity by one of the members for Berkshire, whom he did not then see. Oh! he perceived that the right hon. member had moved over the way; he congratulated him on his change of place; he was in his proper hemisphere—he was now in his proper element. The hon. member reminded him of—

"The last rose of summer
Left blooming alone;
All its lovely companions
Were faded and gone!"

The hon. gentleman had shown a great deal of cunning; he appeared to be mighty charitable and kind on those points which did not hurt him in the slightest degree. He was willing to give Poor Laws to Ireland, forsooth, which could not affect him in the slightest degree. The hon. gentleman reminded him of the man who gave a stone when asked for bread. The hon. gentleman said, that he would not consent to dispense with any portion of the revenues of the Protestant Church in Ireland. Would England give anything for the maintenance of the Catholic clergy? Were the people of Ireland to continue to pay the Protestant clergy if this measure did not pass? They regarded it as the earnest of the future peace and tranquillity of Ireland, and were their hopes to be disappointed, and the cup of expectation to be dashed again from their lips? By the Bill of last year the £1,000,000 advanced to the Irish clergy was to be repaid to the English Treasury; but what was the right hon. and gallant officer's proposed amendment to this? The £1,000,000 was to be allowed to the clergy, and no portion of that sum was to be repaid. The plan of the present ministry was to give up the £1,000,000 to the clergy, and by doing so to endeavour to make a purchase of the peace of Ireland!

Twenty millions were freely given to remove the stain of slavery from the British colonies, and was the House unwilling to give £1,000,000 to relieve the Catholics from the oppression of that grinding faction which had crushed the country to the dust—which had deeply imbued its hands in the blood of the people of Ireland, and was now as anxious as ever to pursue a similar course ?

The passing of this measure would produce a great and electric effect throughout Ireland. It would proclaim to the people of that country the downfall of those who had tyrannized over them—the dismissal of that faction which had ever exerted itself to oppress and crush them to the earth. Even now the toast was drunk of “Protestant Ascendancy;” that was, that there should not be equality, but that one party should domineer over another. The law, however, had put Catholics on a footing of equality with Protestants, and if the attempt were made to put them down, they would reply, “We are 7,000,000, and will not be suppressed by a miserable minority.” Was the House proud of putting its hands into the pockets of the Irish people for the purpose of taking tithes for the maintenance of the Protestant clergy ? He thanked the right hon. gentleman (Sir James Graham) for the sneers he had indulged in at the Catholics. He was a man of nice conscience; corn and currency was formerly his maxim; now it must be conscience and candour. The right hon. gentleman had taunted him about the bloody head and bones. The sneer came extremely well from such a quarter. Half Reformer, half Tory; pallid with fear on one side, insolent with temerity on the other. He would keep up the apparition before the right hon. gentleman, and set up the bloody head and bones for a coat of arms for him. The great object of the people of Ireland was to procure peace and tranquillity from the British empire. All that they demanded was justice; it had been long withheld from them, and then they demanded an independent Legislature. The demand was made, and the proposition was met with an overwhelming majority of that House, and the unanimous vote

of the other House ; but, then, the two branches of the Legislature solemnly promised to adopt immediate steps to get rid of the grievances of Ireland. He asked, were they or were they not prepared to fulfil their promises? The right hon. baronet opposite and his friends had never in their whole career benefited Ireland by more than a single measure, and that was invariably disfigured by their pointing to one individual and stigmatising him. He remembered the origin of the career of the hon. member for Cambridge, and it furnished a melancholy story ; but he certainly, with most beautiful consistency, held out till the end, and in the end pronounced his own eulogium. On what ground could they object to the present Bill? It provided for the spiritual wants of the Protestants, and it gave to the Catholics nothing more than just as much education as could be provided for by the surplus. They were told that ecclesiastical property was inalienable. Was it so? Did it not originally belong to the Roman Catholics, and was it not wrested from them? Was it inalienable? If so, he claimed it. The power which gave it to them had the power to take it away. He put it to the hon. member for Cumberland if a few Roman Catholics found their way to Cockermouth, and insisted on taxing the Protestants, what would he say? Would he not resort to his bright sword to resist the innovation? He would resist to the death, and he would have a right to do so. The people of Ireland did not resist. To be sure they had got a habit of not paying. Though, perhaps, the jocose speech of the noble lord on the subject of his own religion might coax them into doing so. This was their time to introduce the principle contained in this Bill. They did wrong last year in rejecting it. Why was it rejected? Why, because a noble duke—no, he begged his pardon ; he believed that noble duke strove against the Opposition, seeing what the probable effect would be to the clergy ; but he was overwhelmed, and acquiesced in the violence of those whose violence and bigotry were allowed to prevail. He hoped they would see no more religion stained with blood ; he hoped they would see no more of the pity which,

while it raised its eyes in devotion, found a musket with a bayonet fixed. Let them not be swayed at such a time as this by considerations of pounds, shillings, and pence; but let them rather, in the noble spirit of benevolence, endeavour to infuse peace and tranquillity into Ireland.

Subject, PAYMENTS TO THE CLERGY (IRELAND);

Date, JULY 29, 1835.

Mr. O'Connell remarked that the disclosure of bad principles sometimes led to good. The right hon. member for the University of Dublin had that night given them a specimen of his liberality of feeling; he seemed actuated with such zeal as to amount almost to spiritual ferocity. The hon. member seemed to be actuated by the feeling that he alone was infallible, and that the law which he laid down must be right. He was glad that the hon. and learned member for Bandon had at last shown himself up. Perhaps the House had not been aware that the hon. and learned gentleman had been secretary to the Kildare-street Society for twenty-five years. He was the man to whom the superintendence of the education of the people had been intrusted. Could they be surprised that the people of Ireland were dissatisfied with the system of education afforded in the Kildare-street Society schools after what had fallen that night from the hon. member. He had told them—and he had been cheered by those behind him when he did so—that children had been educated within the walls of a convent. The hon. gentleman did not say whether or not there were any Protestant children in the number. What was the use, he would ask, of keeping up a church in a parish where there were no Protestants? Were they to maintain a church for abstract Protestants? If there was not a single Protestant in a parish, what was the use of keeping up a church and paying a clergyman? Was it that the atmosphere might be improved by the savour of Protestantism? He would ask the late Secretary of the Kildare-street Society at once, where was the Protestantism where there were no Protestants? But were the souls of Catholics

of less value than those of Protestants? The hon. and learned gentleman would make the 9,000 Catholic inhabitants of some parishes pay largely for the support of a Protestant clergyman, and the maintenance of a church for the religious instruction of five Protestants. Were not the Catholics equally entitled to the means of instruction as the Protestants? Was redemption to be counted in money? Was it a part of the Divine operation not to think it charity to inculcate the feeling of benevolence on the part of the five to the 9,000? "But you only think of money," said the hon. and learned gentleman. If that be your religion; avow it—and then we understand it; and I say, we want not your cant or hypocrisy; but tell us that you battle for money—for pounds, shillings, and pence. Is that your religion? If it be, say so. If, indeed, you have Protestant feelings, you will rejoice to take away the tarnish upon your religion.

Great alarm had been expressed at the idea of a number of children being educated at a school-room in a convent. What harm was there in the school-room being within the walls of a convent? It was an absurdity to suppose that a school could be held there for the purpose of proselytism. There were two classes of nuns in Ireland—one who devoted themselves to the education of the poor, and the other who were employed in visiting the sick. When the cholera raged with such violence in Ireland, these excellent women devoted themselves to attending the sick in the hospitals. In his neighbourhood eleven nuns constantly attended the hospital for twenty-four hours; and at the expiration of that time, they were succeeded by eleven others. There was not one individual, however, from Kildare-place to be met with in those places of misery. In the prime of life, and vigour of health, these amiable women tended in the most pestilential atmosphere those who had been attacked by that frightful disease. He had seen them at the time, and they were most cheerful in consequence of the satisfaction they experienced in doing good and alleviating the sufferings of their fellow-creatures. In Killarney he knew a convent in which

three young Protestants had been placed by their parents for the purpose of education. Their parents had sent them there from choice, and had no fear of proselytism. He challenged any man to point out a single instance in which the nuns engaged in education in Ireland had ever interfered with the religion of the Protestant children intrusted to their care. He would meet any antagonist foot to foot on this point, and would defy him to point out a single instance where such conduct had been proved. He denied, also, that the Protestant children attending the schools under the new system of education were ever interfered with by the Roman Catholic clergy. This had repeatedly been asserted; but he challenged any hon. member to show him a single instance of the kind. If they did not do so, what became of their declarations on the subject? The hon. and learned gentleman opposite had spoken with a degree of bigotry, which he was surprised that a man of education could exhibit. It was the remains of that bigotry which, thank God, the present Government had put down. They never could have a recurrence of that system which the hon. gentleman was so anxious to see carried into effect. The late Government even had shrunk from adopting that system which the hon. gentleman advocated. They had refused to abolish the new system of education, and fall back on the Kildare-place Society. All that he required was a modification of the law. He had been told that there should be no surplus. At the present moment there was a Protestant clergyman in every parish in Ireland. There was not a benefice or parish that was not filled up. Now, a second number of these, on vacancies occurring, were not to be filled up; and was he to be told that no income would be derived from these parishes? Was there no difference whether or not the parishes were filled up? In the province of Leinster there were 2,200,000 Catholics and 183,000 Protestants. The Church was to be better apportioned to the wants of the latter than it at present was. It was, therefore, a monstrous absurdity to tell him that there would be no surplus in that province. The truth was, that the animus which was now manifested on

the subject originated in that paltry feeling of superiority which had been engendered in one party in Ireland, through the instrumentality of England, whose policy it was to create division. He trusted that the time was not distant when the Kildare-place Society and its orators, and the Recorder and his judicial qualifications, would be estimated at their full value, and would sink into the insignificance they deserved.

Subject, MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (IRELAND) BILL; *Date,*
JUNE 14, 1836.

The Dublin Corporation was for years the subject of O'Connell's special attention. It was a monopoly not of sound and respectable Protestantism but of Orange faction. His fiercest invectives were hurled at it; his duel with D'Esterre originated in one of his attacks on it, and he carried the lingual war into the House with all the energy which was his special characteristic. If he had only been a pagan or a Hindoo he would have been exceedingly honoured by some modern writers for his hatred of shams and his vigorous denunciations of abuses. With the *Times* he had an internecine feud, which resulted in an exchange of amenities with the member for Berkshire. The whole subject caused fierce debate. The stronghold of intolerance was well defended; so well indeed that the argument ran thus:—"Three-fourths of the people of Ireland are Papists; therefore they are unfit to enjoy municipal institutions." Mr. Walter spoke during the debate, and O'Connell rose to object to his speech, on the ground that he had introduced the Poor Laws, and that there had been quite enough about the Poor Laws in the *Times*. "I wish to heaven," exclaimed O'Connell, "the hon. member would take himself from this side of the House. I scented him last session as the 'Last Rose of Summer,' and yet he still remains amongst us. I wish he would go to the side where he votes, and not remain where he ought not to be." Colonel Peel shouted, "Order;" but O'Connell was not easily silenced. "Has that person observed the slightest decency towards me, and shall I not now be permitted to retort upon ——"

Mr. Kearsley rose to order. A scene followed. Mr. Richards accused O'Connell of brow-beating and ruffianism. Mr. Walter kept his temper quietly, with the consolation that he could have a bitter revenge elsewhere. A number of interruptions followed, and Lord John Russell threw the *ægis* of his protection over O'Connell for reasons best known to himself. O'Connell continued.

Mr. O'Connell—The speech of the hon. member for Berkshire, to which I was advertng when interrupted, contains three subjects. The last was the Poor Laws—the last but one on the Church question. Upon that I have shown his utter inconsistency. Whatever that person's inconsistency may be, it is not my fault. I have nothing to do with it. It is no act of mine if a man becomes a renegade to the one side or the other; but when a man does so, it is material that he should have, at least, the sympathy of those who are also renegades, and have abandoned principles they formerly professed. It is matter so completely personal that it is not to be accounted for. The inconsistency of the hon. gentleman is, however, a matter of very little importance in itself; it certainly has very little to do with the public interest. He has attacked all the Protestants—he has done so in identifying them with the wretched corporations. Why, he has done this in utter ignorance of the fact that the number of Protestants in those corporations was so miserably small. And, besides, there is evidence before this House that those Protestants, who, from their intelligence and education, belonged to the class of politicians, were as decidedly and as strictly excluded from the corporations as the Roman Catholics themselves. So totally ignorant is the hon. member for Berkshire upon the subject, that even this fact—so notorious to most others—he is not, in the least degree, aware of. He is, too, doubly ignorant when he founds an argument upon the assumption that the corporations have been the representatives of the great body of Protestants. Now, in connection with the hon. member for Berkshire, I have made observations upon the *Times* newspaper. The hon. member for Knaresborough, for the first time in his life, is perfectly correct. Well, then, he was not perfectly right; but in principle he was right; and if there is a denial in this House that the individual is not connected with that paper, the moment I have heard that denial, I shall never again say a word on the subject. But he is right. Let there be, as there ought to be, in this House, a disclaimer of any connection with an instrument of falsehood,

foulness, and calumny, of one that affords an instance of the most abandoned, and certainly the greatest degradation of talent—of one that has lowered literature and debased the character of public writers—that has shown them up as marketable commodities—that has only done this, that the higher they rise in public estimation the more ready are they to be bought, and the greater must be the price paid for them. If there be any human being, out of this House—recollect, I speak of a man not in this House—who continues to earn the wages of public prostitution—if there be such a man as I describe—then, I say, he is too despicable for further notice. I leave him to pocket a portion of the wages of his pensioned writers.

Those who poison the waters that even an enemy in a hostile country drinks of, are accounted guilty of a crime most abhorrent to civilized life; but what are we to say of those who poison the first sources of literature, who stigmatise the character of a nation, and debauch the instruments of learning—their is the worst mode of earning the wages of villainy, for theirs is the most abominable of all prostitutions. They are those who argue for a question, and turn against it; who hope for one thing to-day and turn against it to-morrow. Does this touch the hon. member for Berkshire? I hope not. I really hope that he has no connection with an instrument of that kind. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Knaresborough that he has not. I adopt the suggestion. I believe at once that the fact is as the hon. member has stated, and then every word I have said is merely in reply to that base instrument which has attacked me so long. But if my words do apply, I mention no name, I say, *qui caput ille fecit*. Let him who chooses take them up, if any man wishes to find them, and in the vulgar phrase, "the cap fits him." I cannot help it. The people of Ireland are not so degraded, as the hon. member for Berkshire has suggested, that they are incapable of managing their own affairs. What is the ground, what is the pretext for saying so? It is because they are Catholics. That is not a topic which suits this House, though it might read well elsewhere. It is as

British subjects they claim their right. Does any man contend that this measure alone will pacify Ireland? I shall not do so. Refuse it, and you create agitation, because you afford additional materials to the grievances which the people already endure; grant it, and you advance another step, for I admit you have already commenced, in giving to the people of Ireland equal rights with every other part of the empire. Why should not a measure like this be adopted towards Ireland, and which tends so much to the pacification and tranquillity of all? It is for these reasons I have risen to repudiate the speech of the hon. member for Berkshire, and to call again for justice to Ireland.

Subject, MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS; Date, JUNE 30, 1836.

Mr. O'Connell—Sir, I have no apology to offer, and I believe the House will admit I stand in need of no apology for recommending myself to its notice on this subject. I confess that my first impressions of what has taken place this evening were of a nature that I would rather have suppressed than have given them utterance. I do not think that it ever fell to my lot to hear a more unstatesmanlike speech from the right hon. baronet than that which he has just uttered. That upon an important question like this the right hon. baronet should stand up to advocate delay, under the mere formal pretence of having the Lords' reasons and amendments printed, was in itself quite astonishing, and showed the weakness of its position and of his arguments. But the right hon. baronet immediately answered on this very point, by detailing the unhappy consequences which would result from prolonging this discussion. He answered himself admirably, and his prudence in avoiding to press for another division upon this question was equally to be admired. The right hon. baronet recollected that the former division of forty-one had lately swollen into eighty-six, and he feared that on another division the majority would again be

doubled. But whilst I admire the right hon. baronet's prudence in this matter, I do not think he has shown himself equally prudent in standing forward, as he has done, to advise the House of Lords to persevere in the course they have taken up. If the people of England were to rally round the House of Lords and the Crown in this matter, as he says they would, what chance of justice would remain to Ireland but in a repeal of the Union between the two countries? The right hon. baronet adopts the House of Lords; he becomes a participator in all their outrages against Ireland, and when at last the seven millions of people who are wronged in these Acts are driven to rank themselves in open hostility against their lordships, the right hon. baronet flatters himself that he can calmly take up his position and defy the storm. I know well all this may be sneered at, but we are in a temper to bear it. Scotland obtained her measure of Municipal Reform two or three years ago; England hers last year; and this year Ireland might have had hers at the time this Bill went up to the House of Lords. It has been admitted on all hands that the Corporations of Ireland have become grossly corrupt; that they have been perverted, even in the administration of justice, to party purposes and unblushing partiality. All this has been admitted; even the hon. and learned Recorder for Dublin could not deny it; and yet all this is to remain for another year at least. I appeal to the people of England whether it is just that things which no man has had the audacity to defend should be continued in Ireland for two years after similar abuses have been swept away from England? I know it may be said that there was not time last year to pass this Bill for Ireland. But look at the fate of the Bill sent up to the Lords this year. What have they done with it? They have cut out all the essential principles of it, and they return it to us a measure for destroying all that at present exists, without substituting anything in its place. I tell the right hon. baronet that the people of Ireland will not be content with the 9th George IV.; and that there is another thing, namely, the appointment of sheriffs, which they

will never consent to give up. I do not mean the absolute appointment, but the choice of three, out of which one is to be chosen, and with power to reject; this is a right which the people of Ireland do and will demand. Look at the position the case is brought to, and it is you, the Opposition, who have done all this. It is you who have done this injury to Ireland, declaring that she shall not have what England and Scotland are permitted to enjoy. It is you who have adopted the man who said that the people of Ireland were aliens in blood, aliens in religion, and aliens in country to the people of England. It is you who have injured the people of Ireland and then insulted them. And then you talk about avoiding agitation. You may have got rid of the normal schools of agitation, but wait till you see what finished agitation you will soon have about you. For, from the hour in which I stand here till I see corporate reform in Ireland, I promise you you shall have plenty of agitation.

With the exception of a small faction, whom I may call the ascendancy faction, there is not an Irishman who will not take offence at the condition to which you have attempted to reduce them, and I shall despise the man who did not feel the force of the result. That you injure us no man can be surprised, but that you should insult us also, and with impunity, is not to be credited. The right hon. gentleman need not take the trouble of going through the towns of Ireland; the towns of Ireland will meet in the open day—there will be no secrecy in the matter—and organise their system for the peaceful agitation of their rights and character. We will do so, and you ought to despise us if we did not. As to these reasons, as they are called, of the House of Lords; cant and hypocrisy could not be carried further. I actually blushed for Ireland when I heard a noble duke read them in the other House. Oh! what a state of misery and degradation are we reduced to, that you cannot meditate an act of injury against Ireland but you can find one who was born within her shores to assist in perpetrating it. What hope

has Ireland now? The pledge of the House of Lords! Why, the Peers have violated their pledge a thousand times. All disguise has now been thrown off by them; all the disputes about petty details have been thrown overboard; they have come to the principle, and the principle they reject also. The right hon. baronet halloes on the House of Lords to persist in rejecting this principle, and then he tells us that their lordships represent the people of England, and, moreover, he finds out that they have a responsibility also. But the right hon. gentleman is a plagiarist. A responsibility! so, too, had Mahomet, who told his people, "You are all represented in me; and as to responsibility, Mahomet be praised! I am responsible to God!" This is the tyrant's responsibility. If I were disposed to be profane, I should like to know how we are to bring that responsibility to bear, how to make it avail in human affairs? If their lordships are quietly resigned to endure the punishments of the next world, for having done all the mischief they can in this, hurrah! for their lordships' responsibility to God—hurrah! for the high priest and the Prophet of Mecca! After all, perhaps you are right. It is almost impossible to speak of the subject without approaching the profane; but it is him you should blame, and not me; blame him who treated us, in the first instance, to this mighty theological discourse on the responsibility of the House of Lords. But, can there be anything more pitiful than such an argument? The House of Lords are indeed responsible—responsible to the people—and to them they must account for their actions, and the true motives of their conduct. They shall not hide it under the cloak of a difference in religion. If that be their reason, let them speak it openly, let them declare that Irish Catholics are irreligious aliens, and mentally inferior to this country, but they shall prove both of these assertions if they make them. The right hon. baronet then went on to talk about the British Constitution. What is a constitution? It should be more than words—it should show itself in matter and

for the good of the people. I have said that the right hon. Baronet's speech was a most unstatesmanlike one; and why is it so, but because it does not contain a single statesmanlike reference to the actual position of affairs and the feelings of the people upon this great question?

The House of Lords did not dare to mutilate the English Corporation Reform Bill to so outrageous an extent, and for this very simple reason—they saw the organised and menacing determination of the people of this country, and they were afraid to meet it. But the House of Lords do not fear the people of Ireland, and, therefore, they refuse to do them justice. That is the real reason of their conduct. Every one knows that it is almost impossible to suppose that a Bill of utility to Ireland can ever be passed into law. If you talk of bringing in such a measure, the answer immediately is, "What possible chance have you of passing it through the House of Lords?" But is there really any one so insane as to suppose that this can last for ever? Having succeeded by dint of peaceful agitation in obtaining one portion of Catholic emancipation from your hands!—yes, a portion, for, after all, that Act was but a part of the justice we looked for—having forced that part from the right hon. baronet and from the noble duke, who in 1828, talked about conquering Ireland with the sword, and in 1829, found it more agreeable to put it in the scabbard—I tell you that the people of Ireland defy your menaces for the future. Neither the noble duke nor your minority shall ever be permitted to trample upon Ireland with impunity. In the name of the Irish people I give you this defiance. Do not think that I mock you when I talk so to you. I tell you that if you refuse to do justice to us, we are able to do justice to ourselves. I have given up the agitation of the question of the Repeal of the Union, and now see what an argument you have given me in support of it. See the large majority in the House of Lords, and the majority in the House of Commons, both denying justice to Ireland; and

the leader of the Opposition party absolutely identifying himself with the majority in the House of Lords—that leader himself having made a brief and vain attempt at Government last year, with the “No Popery” flag floating over his head.

I know there are men who, because they see a person obey the mandate of what he fancies to be a superior authority, charge him with the want of personal, though I defy them to deny him moral courage. Let them try this experiment a little longer, and I tell them there is not one man in Ireland, with the small exception I have somewhere else alluded to, who would not die ten thousand deaths rather than submit to the insult which is now attempted to be put upon them. I know the present Government are disposed to do all they possibly can in order to obtain justice for the people of Ireland. Let my support of them be misrepresented as it may, I shall support them, because I know there is no alternative between a system of uncompromising despotism in Ireland and the maintenance of the present power of the Ministry. I repeat, that there is not a man in Ireland who can read, and we are more fortunate in this respect than you are, but will read the account of these proceedings, and instantly demand of the Parliament to wipe away the insult which it has put upon him. The moral courage of a whole people will unite, and, peaceably, quietly, but irresistibly, demand one of these two things—the Repeal of the Union, or justice to Ireland from the British Parliament. For my own part, I shall continue the experiment I have entered upon, of obtaining justice for Ireland without a Repeal. I shall persevere in that experiment as long as it seems to be compatible with justice to my country, and no man would pardon me if I were to go further. This is my determination. In the meantime, you have heaped insult upon injury; the iron has entered into our very souls; but you will find that we are not unresisting victims, and that you cannot continue this career with impunity.

Subject, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION (IRELAND);

Date, JULY 3, 1837.

Mr Serjeant Goulburn called the attention of the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, to the existence of an association in Ireland called the National Association, which, he said, "was incompatible with the rights of the House." Lord John Russell did not find it convenient to quarrel with the "broguing Irishman" at the moment, and replied that it was not "convenient" to give an opinion. In the year 1830 a society was established, called "The Friends of Ireland," which was simply the Catholic Association under another name. It was proscribed, and was at once dissolved and succeeded by the Anti-Union Association. Hence arose a permanent feud between O'Connell and the Marquis of Anglesey, then Lord Lieutenant. It was said that O'Connell's letters were opened in the Post Office and inspected, and even letters addressed to him were tampered with in the same way. There is no doubt that the great Agitator gave considerable trouble to Government. The next Association was called the Irish Volunteers for Repeal of the Union. It was proclaimed also; but O'Connell would not submit, and was arrested with some others. He allowed judgment to go by default, but he was never called up for sentence; his services were too necessary to the Whig Government.

Mr. O'Connell not only highly approved of what had been done by the Association, but he had heartily joined in it. He did not know whether the opinion alluded to by the hon. and learned gentleman had been delivered or not by the Prime Minister, nor did he much care. He rather feared that it had been exaggerated. At all events, he was highly delighted with the proceedings of the Association; and when any specific charge was brought against it he would be prepared to satisfy the country that it was not only legal but had been most useful. The Association had this feature about it—that, whereas the Catholic Association had not one-fourteenth of its number Protestant, this Association had more than one-third of its members Protestant—those, too, were men of rank, property, and intelligence; and the number was increasing every day. This afforded a hope that Ireland would at length become one country, instead of being divided into a faction on the one hand and the people on the other. The proceedings in that

Association were open as day; they courted publicity in every discussion; and he would say, that he believed the utmost possible facility was given to every person to know what was done amongst them. That Association had sprung from a just sense of wrong, aggravated by insult. There had been found men audacious enough to assert that Irishmen were aliens in religion, in language, and in blood. There had been found a party atrocious enough to join with the individual who had dared to make use of that insult; and though the blood of Irishmen boiled, yet they had learned in the school of adversity to control and regulate their feelings. That Association was determined to obtain justice. They were determined to obtain an equalisation in the privileges enjoyed by Scotchmen and by Englishmen; and if they could not obtain justice otherwise, they were determined to have it by a domestic Legislature. The Union should not be a mere paper and parchment Union—it should not be a Union of insult and degradation. The people of Ireland hoped for justice in a complete Union; and if they could not obtain a complete Union, he would never despair of the exertions of seven millions of men in obtaining justice for themselves.

Mr. Shaw said, that, although it was an inconvenient practice to indulge in incidental discussion, yet he could not allow any person to suppose, by his silence, that he acquiesced in the sentiments of the hon. and learned gentleman. It appeared to him that the existence of the Association was inconsistent with the peace of Ireland. The Association assumed to itself the functions of Parliament, and was inconsistent with the rights of that House. The hon. and learned gentleman charged others with using insulting language: he had himself repeatedly called the English Saxons, Sassenachs, and strangers. And, with regard to the hon. and learned member's observations on the Union, had he not said, over and over again—he could show, that the hon. and learned gentleman had written the same thing—that under any circumstances he would not be content without the Repeal of the Union? He could produce the words of the hon. and learned gentleman, in which he said, that he neither could nor would be content with any other measure than the Repeal of the Union. In his conscience he believed that the object of the Association was to impede the Union between the two countries, and to overthrow the established religion.

SAME SUBJECT; SAME DATE.

Mr. O'Connell said, he did not stand in the same situation as the hon. and learned Recorder. He was merely a political agitator, but the hon. and learned Recorder was a political judge; he combined the functions of judge and partisan. When the hon. and learned member again quoted him, he begged that the quotation might be accurate. At different periods he might have said, that he no longer looked to this country for justice. Since then he had entertained some remnant of hope; and even if this country did not grant them justice, he would not despair.

Subject, MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS; Date, JULY 7, 1837.

This debate led to a good deal of personality, and the Speaker had to interfere. Mr. Serjeant Jackson attacked O'Connell; and O'Connell in the early part of the speech, from which the following extract is given, spoke of "that species of heart" close to the breast of the hon. Serjeant.

Mr. O'Connell—I do not ask mercy and compassion for the people of Ireland. If I did, I know I should ask in vain. As one of the representatives of the Irish people, I shall demand justice for them. The hon. and learned Serjeant may sneer; it is a commodity he does not deal in. How can any assembly of rational persons taunt the Catholics of Ireland with inferiority to the Protestants? How can the hon. and learned Serjeant venture to abuse the loyal and patriotic Association which has been established in Ireland to maintain the cause of that country, and to oppose bigotry and intolerance? It is true that that Association advocates the claims of the Catholics, for it advocates the welfare of Ireland. The hon. and learned Serjeant does not say anything in hostility to the Catholics; but he is a political hypocrite; he does that which he abstained from saying. Let him speak up; let him at once declare that

the Catholics are not worthy of being placed on a footing with Protestants. Let him say "the law has pronounced them equal to the Protestants, but I pronounce them inferior." They have as good a right as any man now before me to full equality. Does the hon. and learned member imagine that, by abuse, they are likely to be changed from what is called bigotry and intolerance? I demand for the people of Ireland municipal reform. Why did not the learned Serjeant grapple with that argument? I will tell him. Because he is a political hypocrite. Why did he not speak out? The learned Serjeant was quite consistent in not then grappling with the question—was always consistent—from the first moment he became Secretary of the Kildare Society, and maintained the necessity of distributing the Bible without note or comment. Would that the learned Serjeant had followed the same system in speaking of my letters.

The learned Serjeant, in his consistency, had never declared himself one day in favour of Catholic Emancipation; and, again, when occasion offered, had professed himself to be against it; and a third time had veered about again, and opposed the measure. It could not be termed inconsistency in the learned Serjeant thus to try the merits and defects of every side of the question. But turning from the hon. and learned Serjeant to more weighty matters, I repeat that, as a representative of Ireland, I stand here for justice; and I must not forget that the learned Serjeant is opposed to justice being so administered as to involve the notion of a partial exercise of clemency. What will the learned gentleman say, if I inform him that I have heard Mr. O'Loughlen declare that many instances had occurred in former times of a similar exercise of mercy? I suppose that the right hon. Recorder—for the title applicable to the Recorder must give place to that which honoured the Privy Councillor—could give his testimony on the point in question. The right hon. gentleman has threatened to read my speeches. I give him leave to do so—full leave—until he is sick, and the House sick of hearing him. I will pledge myself to speak not a syllable

in answer to the right hon. gentleman. But I must ask why am I inferior, on account of religion, to any Englishman of the Protestant persuasion?

The hon. and learned gentleman opposite has accused the Roman Catholics of endeavouring to subvert the Protestant religion, and raising their own into its place. Just as if the Catholics could, by any possibility, take a single step, derogatory or hostile to the Protestant religion, without those gentlemen at his side being the first to take the alarm and offer a determined opposition. And yet, who will dare to say that the hon. members around me are not as sincere Protestants, and as much attached to their religion as any hon. gentleman opposite? They are just as sincere, but not altogether so sanctimonious. Would the people of England tamely suffer any attempt to be made to subvert the Protestant religion? Would Scotland permit it? Would any persecution of Protestants, if such were intended, be for a moment tolerated? It is sheer nonsense to say so. When I see that Catholic constituencies return a majority of Protestants to Parliament, I laugh at such wild assertions, and those who make them. But I must again return to my often repeated demand—how are Irishmen in Ireland inferior to Englishmen in England, or Scotchmen in Scotland? I require an answer. I have already trespassed at some length on the House. I do not intend following at length the rigmale speech of the learned Serjeant; but I once more call on the people of England, on the House, on every member of Parliament, to remember that one of two things is expected—either a Repeal of the Union, or a full measure of justice to Ireland. Oh! what an argument of the learned Serjeant, to say that the two countries are not in the same equal condition, and that the Union ought not to be supposed to imply any such assimilation. Why, what is the Union if it be not an identification of interests and an amalgamation of the two countries? Was not Ireland to become by it, to use the language of Mr. Pitt, to be as much part of England as Yorkshire? There are many gentlemen from Yorkshire present. I love a Yorkshireman.

What would one of those gentlemen say, if an attempt was made to subjugate and keep down Yorkshire? The cases are perfectly similar. I do not mean to threaten; but as from the Union equality of rights and an amalgamation of the two countries were intended, are now expected, I warn the House, that if these expectations are deceived, the people of Ireland will be thrown back upon their rights, and will be forced to seek justice for themselves. And, as surely as that clock will point to noon to-morrow, so surely will the Irish people persevere until they arrive at the full attainment of civil equality.

Subject, POOR LAW—IRELAND; Date, APRIL 28, 1837.

One of O'Connell's most carefully prepared speeches, containing a mass of invaluable information on the state of Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell—I confess that it has been my most anxious wish to address the House upon this subject at the earliest possible period of the discussion. The regulations of the French Chamber would be more suited to my object than the rules and orders that prevail in this House. There, the speakers are divided into those who speak for a measure, against a measure, and upon a measure. My intention was to speak upon this measure. I am not for it. I do not think that it is likely to succeed. My own deliberate judgment is, that, not only that it will not succeed in mitigating the evils to be found in the present state of the poor of Ireland, but that its tendency will be to aggravate them much; therefore I cannot advocate the measure. I do not mean to vote against it. I think it has now become inevitable that we must have some measure of Poor Law for Ireland. I yield to the necessity, while I regret it. There has been for some time an opinion prevailing in England, that a Poor Law in Ireland will prevent the evils arising from the emigration of the Irish labourer, and mitigate the English poor. Many men, too, in Ireland, have taken up strong opinions lately in favour of a Poor Law, whose opinions formerly were in opposition to

it. Several of the Catholic clergy, too, are anxious for the measure. There are also many influential persons who heretofore imagined that political ameliorations would produce improvements in the state of the peasantry generally, and are now disposed to make this experiment. I confess that I am not decidedly opposed to it. It is, I know, an untried experiment. I am deeply convinced that Ireland never can obtain prosperity until she has a legislature of her own. That is my thorough—that is my decided conviction. The people are disposed to try whether that is a mistaken conviction; so am I. I find it impossible to have the people of England consider that the experiment has been fairly worked out, as long as that portion of the experiment which relates to Poor Laws is untried. For these reasons I yielded to this Bill. I do not mean to vote against it at any stage. I will not vote against it; if necessary, I shall vote for it. I repeat it, I yield to the necessity without being at all convinced. In looking to a measure of relief for the poor of Ireland, the first course for the House to pursue is, to understand the nature and extent of the distress that prevails there. The noble lord who introduced this subject to the House omitted that topic altogether. He made a speech which was an extremely perspicuous one in all its details, and having the very best quality of a speech, it being impossible for anyone who attended to it not to understand the subject from one end to the other. But then, he rather took for granted the distress than described it. It was not difficult for him to assume that great distress prevails in Ireland. He entered into none of the details. He stated that there was overwhelming distress; but he did not at all trace out any of the causes that have produced the distress in that country. And yet, it is impossible to find out the proper means for putting an end to the prevailing distress, unless the causes of that distress are first ascertained.

I know how wearisome it must be to the House to enter into a subject of this description; but we are now making a new experiment in the administration of Irish affairs, and before we do so, we are bound deliberately to look to the causes—to

trace them to higher sources than any that are immediately before our eyes. I do distinctly say, that this ought to be done, because I am convinced that it is my duty to trace the evil to its source. The poverty and distress that have prevailed in Ireland for ages in my opinion are owing to political causes. If any one remembers the nature of the Government in Ireland, this must be admitted. I need not go far back. It is unnecessary for me to go further than the last century and a half; and, looking at that, no one can be surprised to find Ireland in the state that she is in. I allude merely to two heads of those which are called penal laws. By two distinct branches of those laws, ignorance was enforced by Act of Parliament, and poverty was enacted. Such were the effects of the penal laws. I will mention the statutes. By the 7th William III., chap. iv., sec. 9, and 8th Anne, chap. iii., it was enacted, that no Catholic should teach or have a school in Ireland. Such instruction of youth was prohibited. No Roman Catholic could be an usher in a Protestant school; it was an offence punishable by confinement or banishment. To teach a Catholic child was a felony punishable by death. The Catholics were prohibited from being educated. For any child receiving instruction there was a penalty of £10 a-day, and when the penalty was two or three times incurred, then the parties were subjected to a *praemunire*—the forfeiture of goods and chattels. To send a child out of Ireland to be educated was a similar offence; to send it subsistence from Ireland was subjected to the same forfeiture; and what was still more violent and unjust, even the child incurred a forfeiture. By these laws there was encouragement given to ignorance, and a prohibition imposed upon knowledge. I am not now to be told that these laws were part of ancient history—they were in full force when I was born. Another part of this code of laws prohibited the acquisition of property. No Roman Catholic could acquire property. He might, indeed, acquire it; but, if he did so, any Protestant had a right to come into a court of equity and say, “Such a man has, I know, purchased an estate—such a man is a Roman Catholic; give me

his estate;" and it should be given to him. To take a lease beyond thirty-one years was prohibited; and even if within thirty-one years, and the tenant by his industry made the land one-third in value above the rent he paid for it, it could be transferred to a Protestant. These were laws that were in force for a full century. For a full century we had laws requiring the people to be ignorant, and punishing them for being industrious—laws that declared the acquisition of property criminal, and subjected it to forfeiture. For one century ignorance and poverty were enacted by law as only fit for the Irish people. The consequences of a system of that kind are still felt. Nobody can say that this is exaggeration. It has been said you have to address yourself to the poverty and ignorance of Ireland; and we know that no ingredient can be so fatal in the history of a country—no greater impediment can be discovered to its improvement. When you see that, you are at once shown the source from which such misery has flown. There are sufficient political causes for the present state of Ireland. I now wish to bring the attention of the House to the effect of some statistical facts with respect to Ireland. They may not, at first, appear to bear directly upon the question; but they afford the materials for thinking, and are likely to lead you to a just conclusion. These documents show you accurately the political economy of that country. First, then, as to the contrast between England and Ireland. There were in England 24,250,000 cultivated acres. In Ireland the quantity of acres under cultivation is 14,600,000. The proportion is not more than two to one of cultivated acres. The agricultural labourers in Ireland are 1,131,715; the number of agricultural labourers in England is 1,055,982. This gives an excess to Ireland of 75,733 agricultural labourers. The value of the agricultural produce of England is £150,000,000; the value of the agricultural produce of Ireland is £36,000,000. The quantity of hands is two to one as compared to England; the quantity of produce by England is four to one as compared with Ireland. England produces four times as much as Ireland, although she ought only, considering

the fertility of the soil of Ireland, to produce twice as much. Agricultural produce is the source of wages to the labourer. In England the wages paid to the labourer is from 8s. to 10s.; in Ireland the wages paid is from 2s. to 2s. 6d. This shows that agricultural produce is the source of wages. Let it be recollected that this is the state of Ireland—this is the state of her agricultural produce when she ought naturally to produce comparatively more than England, because the soil of Ireland is more fertile comparatively than that of England. If there was an equality of cultivation, Ireland would produce much more, according to its extent, than it now produces less. The diminution of its produce, that by which it is so much less than it ought to be, is to be attributed to the want of capital to be expended in cultivation—it is to be attributed to the poverty of the proprietors of the soil; it shows that there is a diminution where there ought to be an increase in the quantity. You are not to be surprised that there is not that capital. You perceive that there is not a sufficiency of capital to have that produce what it ought to be. It was not to be wondered at that such a country as this should be in such a state of destitution. In Ireland it appears that there are 585,000 heads of families in a state of destitution—persons who for more than seven months in the year are without employment. This is the number of the heads of families, and comprising, on an average to each family, not less than 2,300,000 individuals. It has been said that destitution has been created by the undue bidding for land. The competition for land has been declared to be one of the great causes of the present destitution, and it has been said that if you could diminish that competition, you would diminish the destitution. Accordingly, the Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners has been publishing pamphlets and declaring that he has found out the secret of Irish destitution. All, he says, that is to be done, is to take away the demand for land, and that the moment you do so you will give relief—that by putting an end to the exorbitant rents now demanded you will afford relief to the destitute. See how little foundation there is

for such an assertion. Because there are 585,000 heads of families in a state of destitution he would thus relieve them. Now there are not less than 567,441 of these persons who have not an inch of land; they, then, were not poor by reason of the competition for land; and he would only give relief to 17,000 heads of families that have land.

Without, then, referring to a Poor Law there were 567,000 who had no land; these persons were to be swept away before they could come to the panacea to prevent the competition for land, and which could only affect 17,000 persons. I state these facts because they can be no longer disputed. I wish to show the state of society in Ireland. There is this overwhelming excess of agricultural labourers in this miserable state; there is this inferiority of agricultural produce; there is this attributable to the poverty of the landlord and the tenant equally. Let it be recollected (although I have not the document here to prove it) that it has been calculated that the landlord receives 50s. in England for every 20s. that the Irish landlord gets. I have now presented facts to you to show the situation of the peasantry, and to prove to you that they are in the most extraordinary state of destitution. I have the evidence of this fact from every county in Ireland. I begin with the—

“**COUNTY ANTRIM.**—Dr. Forsyth observing a poor man's cabin locked up on Sunday, he was induced to make inquiry, and found that he had not risen from his bed during the day, having nothing to eat.”

The Rev. Mr. Brennan states “it would make your blood run cold to hear the tales of woe and misery that are told me in my confessional—the hardships of the poor are beyond endurance.”—“*First Report,*” p. 401.

“**COUNTY WESTMEATH.**—Instances have been known of persons having committed trifling offences for the purpose of being sent to prison, in order that they might obtain food and shelter.”—“*First Report,*” p. 408.

“**COUNTY CLARE.**—At all times of the year a large body of able-bodied men are out of work, but in summer there is the greatest scarcity of employment. The poor are then reduced to the greatest extremity, and are obliged to put up with just as much food as will keep body and soul together.

Many is the man who thinks himself well off at that time with one meal a day. The following case gives an idea of the distress to which these poor women were reduced when the cholera hospital was established. Notwithstanding the dread which was entertained of the disease, three poor widows feigned sickness to get admittance.”—“First Report.”

“COUNTY LONDONDERRY.—The widows are frequently reduced, with their children, to six pounds of potatoes a day. Spinning is the only employment to which they can have recourse.”—“First Report.”

The habits are as follows :—

“Two or three families occupy one room. We have found four families in a room; in one corner a woman, who had just been delivered, lying on a little straw; no other straw in the room.”—“First Report.”

“COUNTY ANTRIM.—Many cases of death arise from starvation.”

“COUNTY CORK.—Doctor Fitzgibbon is disposed to attribute much of the disease, which is at all times prevalent, to the use of bad food, and to the miserable state of the poor as to the bedding and bed-clothes. He has often found sick persons lying with only a little damp straw between them and the ground.”—“First Report,” p. 323.

“The huts that labouring people live in are often such that they have scarcely a place to lie on, on account of the rain.”

“In point of clothing the state of a great portion of the labouring class is very wretched. The clothes, or rather rags, of many labouring men are utterly insufficient to protect them from the cold; many have no blankets, but make use of the clothes they wear during the day for the night covering.”

The hon. member next referred to a return from the county Carlow, showing the destitution of the class of small farmers, and observed that it was intended by an Act of Parliament to tax that class of persons, and make them pay poor-rates.

He next referred to the—

“COUNTY MAYO.—Numberless instances were known of families, being unable to procure straw, cutting rushes for beds; still more, that for want of bed-clothes they lie in the clothes they wear by day. Independent of rain from the roof, they cannot but be damp from their situation, as the most valueless (that is swampy) piece of land is always selected to build on for them, for fear of wasting any that might be profitable.”—“First Report,” p. 292

“The Rev. Mr. Hughes mentions a case in which he was called on about three months ago, to administer the rites of religion. The family had been attacked by the fever; he found the father, and four, out of the five, children sick, and all together on one bed of moist rotten straw; their only covering a single fold of what is called a poverty blanket, half wool and half tow.”—“First Report,” p. 292.

“In the parish of Burrishoole, in a population of 10,553, 3,931 were men and women destitute of necessary raiment; 9,553 of the total population were lying at the best on straw; and of those 7,070 were on the cabin floors.”—“First Report,” p. 375.

In the parish of Kilmore Erris (Mr. Lyons says), according to a census which I made, there were 751 men who had no shoes; and out of a population of 9,000, 3,136 persons, male and female, who within five years had not purchased any article of clothing. According to the same census, of 1,648 families in the parish, 388 have two blankets each; 1,011 have one blanket each; and 299 have no blankets at all. You may well be surprised at this; it surprised myself, although many years resident as parish priest.”—“First Report,” p. 386.

Now look to the effect of a Poor-law in one parish of the county Mayo, the parish of Burrishoole:—

“Statement showing the acreable extent, the population, distinguishing the number without employment, and those unable to work, and the rental and tithes in the parish of Burrishoole, county of Mayo, deduced from the evidence in the first Report of Commission of Poor Law Inquiry (Ireland), Session, 1835 (369), pages 375-6.

ACREABLE EXTENT.

Number of acres of arable and pasture land,	16,000
Number of acres of reclaimable mountain and pasture land,	15,000
Number of acres of irreclaimable land,	15,000
	<hr/>
Total number of acres,	46,000

POPULATION.

Number of persons capable of labour without employment seven months in the year,	7,078
Number of persons destitute and unable to work,	434
Population in 1834,	10,534

RENTAL AND TITHES.

Rental.—Amount paid to absentees or mortgages,	£4,796
——— Amount paid to the resident landed proprietors,	2,176
Amount of Tithes as compounded,	350
	<hr/>
Total amount of Rental and Tithes,	£7,322

“ Estimates and inferences drawn from the foregoing statement, assuming that relief was to be entirely drawn from the land, and that at the lowest possible calculation, without reference to the expense of workhouse, or management, &c.

ESTIMATES.

“ Of the amount it would annually take to provide support for the destitute unable to work, at $2\frac{1}{4}d.$ per head per diem, £1,953; or more than one-fourth of the rental and tithes.

Of the amount it would annually take to provide for the persons left without employment seven months in the year, at $3d.$ per head per diem, £18,579.

Of the amount it would annually take to provide for both classes—those destitute and unable to work, and those seven months in the year out of employment, £20,532, or nearly treble the rental and tithes.

INFERENCES.

“ Proportion per acre on the cultivated land it would annually take to provide for the destitute unable to work, $2s. 5d.$

Proportion per acre on the cultivated land and that reclaimable it would annually take to relieve both classes, $13s.$

Proportion per acre on the cultivated land it would annually take to relieve both classes, those unable to work and those seven months out of employment, $25s. 7d.$ ”

I mean to read but one other statement. I assure the House I am confining myself to a few of the many extracts I have made upon this subject:—

“ COUNTY LONGFORD.—Those who have a plot of early potatoes dig them before they are half grown; they often have dug them out when they ought to be beginning to ripen; eating these unripe potatoes causes sickness; many men are put into their graves by this bad food; they are pounded with salt and vegetables to give them a substantial body, otherwise they could not be eaten, they are so wet and tasteless; they are soft as mushrooms.”—See “ First Report.”

“**COUNTY KILDARE.**—It is a matter of frequent occurrence to find able-bodied persons committing offences for the purpose of being sent to gaol and getting food and shelter there.”—“*First Report*,” p. 400.

“There are, at least, 200 families without straw to lie on, and without any potato-ground, and as they get little employment, it is a miracle how they live.”

“**COUNTY TIPPERARY.**—The poor have to live on phrassagh (yellow-weed), or on unripe cabbages or potatoes. Even in ordinary seasons no small number of labouring men are compelled to allow their wives and children to have recourse to begging.”—“*Report*,” p. 453.

I suppose there is not a civilised country in the world, except Ireland, where such details of misery are to be found. It is heartrending. It is so extensive as to be almost incredible. But let it be recollected—let the House remember—that this evidence has been collected by gentlemen of intelligence and humanity; that the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, that the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, that Mr. Blake, aided by a number of Assistant-Commissioners, vouch for the accuracy of those statements, which underwent investigation on the spot. There was a Report published in 1830. See what a description it gave. Mr. Nicholls, who paid a flying visit to Ireland, reported that there were great and encouraging prospects of the happiness and comfort of the Irish. The Report of 1830 stated it was gratifying to them to notice the progress of improvement. Mr. Mahony declared that “the state of the peasantry was improving very rapidly,” and that “the peasantry were now better clothed than formerly.” Then there was Mr. Wayne, of the Woods and Forests, who said that every corner in Ireland was rapidly increasing in prosperity. There was, too, Mr. Wigans, an English land agent, stating that there was very great improvement in Ireland within the last twenty-two years. He stated that he conceived there was even an improvement in the morality of the people! This was the evidence in 1830; but I have been reading for you the evidence in 1835. There you find that these prospects of improvement all end in this miserable display of wretchedness! I assure the House I have shrunk from half the selections I have made. The Report says

that the population is increasing rapidly. I know that it is generally believed that the increase of the Irish population is greater than that of the English. The fact is not so. The population increases more rapidly in England than in Ireland. The ratio of increase from the year 1821 to 1831 in England has been sixteen per cent.; in Ireland, in the same period, it has been thirteen per cent. This ratio shows that it is totally false that the great increase in the population can be made fairly accountable for the distress that exists. You see the pictures of misery that Ireland presents—you behold it in its present condition; that condition is attributable to the most frightful code which a Satanic imagination could have invented. That is the condition of a country blessed by nature with fertility, but sterile from want of cultivation, and whose inhabitants stalk through the land miserable wretches, enduring the extreme of destitution and of misery, living upon bad potatoes, feeding upon wild weeds seasoned with salt, with no blankets to cover them, no beds to lie upon, nothing to shelter them from the rain, exposed to the worst ills of life, and without any of its consolations. Who did this? You—Englishmen—I say you did it. I say that the domination of England did this. You—you cannot accuse us. This horrible poverty is all your doing. It is the result of your policy and your system of government in that country. The blessings of Providence to Ireland are superior, perhaps, to those bestowed upon any other country. Recollect her navigable rivers—recollect the extent of her agriculture—recollect her situation for commerce—then add to that her fertility, and then regard her wretchedness; it is not an imaginary picture—it is taken on the spot—the portrait is painted from living subjects. This, then, is the natural consequence of your rule. Agricultural produce has been comparatively decreasing—the number of labourers comparatively increasing.

There is a great debt due to Ireland. I have no hesitation in saying that the real remedy which the Irish people have to look for is self-government. In the discussion of that question

I had to encounter column after column of figures, which were displayed against me. They were commented upon to show the increase of wealth in Ireland. What now becomes of the columns of figures, contrasted with the Poor Law Commissioners? They remark, at once—political causes have reduced the country to its present condition. I come not here to make a polemical or political speech. I wish only to state facts; to trace the cause of misery and destitution that are unequalled on the face of the globe. To be sure, it may be said that I am making a case for a Poor Law. Certainly, I am for a provision for the poor, and affording to them relief; but whether that is to be by a Poor Law is another question. I am here making a case to interest your humanity. I am here making a case to excite your compassion, and to afford every possible stimulant to assist me in taking Ireland from the situation in which you have placed it. You know now what is the condition of Ireland at present. It is crying out for a remedy. I ask you for the remedy. What remedy do you propose? We require some remedy. It is admitted upon every hand that the case calls for a remedy. What do you propose? You gave £20,000,000 to the negroes, or to their masters; will you give £20,000,000 to the Irish? Twenty millions would do a great deal. Will you give a grant, or send money over to Ireland? or will you give an annuity of the twenty millions? Will you give £600,000 a year, and apply it to the benefit of the Irish people? No; but you come out upon me, and say, if you have your five shillings in one pocket, we will give a shilling out of one pocket and put it in the other, in order that, according to the proverb, you may not say you are poor, having, "money in both pockets." You say to us, we will give you leave to tax yourselves. This is the mode in which you will relieve our misery and distress. The Carlow farmer, who is dying from not being able to have a refreshing draught to wet his lips in fever—that man is to be taxed. Will you compel him to give relief to support wretches who are not, perhaps, half as miserable as he is himself. I believe that you ought to bethink yourselves

whether or not you will give to Ireland some annuity. Will you form a proper system of emigration? Emigration is now going on. The noble lord has very properly remarked that the expense of emigration is now defrayed by emigrants themselves, and that, if the system were altered, those persons would not go without assistance from Government. Why not take the waste lands of Canada? Why not dispose of them in such a way as to promote an effectual emigration? Why not take the colonial waste lands as the American Government does? Why not make them a fund? Nobody would miss them. Such a step might, perhaps, put an end (to a certain extent) to the Land Company; but it would enrich the Canadian people by sending out to them great numbers of healthy, able-bodied labourers. There would be something in that; but you do not talk of doing it. What is it that you propose to do? Do you mean to give us public works? I know the noble lord told us that no permanent good could result from public works undertaken merely for the purpose of giving employment for the time. I admit that; but there are works of a different description that might be undertaken. Read the Report, and then tell me whether there are not public works from the undertaking of which there might not follow an increase of revenue and of national prosperity. I do not propose to dig holes one day and fill them up the next, as was once proposed by a celebrated statesman in this House. I propose works of public utility. I propose the construction of roads, and means of communication through mountains and bogs. I propose the drainage of land where the capital required goes beyond the means of individuals to supply. My hon. friend near me suggests the opening of the Shannon. Perhaps that might come within the works I should propose. But you have nothing for me except this Bill.

I have already shown you that it is not competition for land that makes the misery of Ireland. Then what is it that causes the distress and wretchedness of the country, and of what value is this Bill to remove them? I will not now canvass

any of its details, which may be more suited for discussion in committee. I take only its great principles. In the first place, it is founded upon Mr. Nicholls' report. Ought any Act of Parliament be founded on that man's report? I find it impossible to speak of that report in the terms one ought to use in this House. It is impossible, with due regard to the decorum of Parliament to speak of it in the terms of execration in which it ought to be held. What did Mr. Nicholls do? On the 22nd August, being in London, he fits himself out for his Irish expedition, deliberately takes his way to Ireland, and by the 15th of November has prepared his report, and safely returned to London. This report is drawn up entirely from his own observation; for, with contemptuous indifference, Mr. Nicholls cast aside altogether all the information that could have been afforded by the Poor Law Commissioners who had been sitting upon the subject of Poor Laws in Ireland. Mr. Nicholls, having spent rather more than two months in his survey on the state of Ireland, certainly begins his report in rather a comical manner; for, says he, remembering of course the weary period he had engrossed in the service, "it is only by personal inspection that the state of Ireland can possibly be known." After a personal inspection of six or eight weeks, Mr. Nicholls actually advances an opinion that Irishwomen were chaste! Of a truth, he must be a mighty keen observer; but I agree with him that it is by personal inspection only that Ireland can be known, though it would perhaps have been well if the personal inspection of Mr. Nicholls had been carried somewhat further before he cast aside from him, as wholly unworthy of observation or regard, the report of the Irish Poor Law Commissioners. I have inquired a little of Mr. Nicholls' mode of proceedings whilst he was in Ireland, and I understand that, although several of the Commissioners were resident in Dublin during the time he was there, he only thought it worth while to seek out one of them, Mr. Vignolles, upon whose experience and understanding he might certainly have put implicit faith. Disregarding, however, any information he might have received

from that gentleman, Mr. Nicholls decides upon establishing in Ireland one hundred poorhouses. That is the scheme to relieve Ireland from all her distress and all her misery. One hundred workhouses! I will canvass this scheme a little more particularly presently. Mr. Nicholls with his one hundred workhouses, talks of giving relief to 80,000 persons. Now, you will recollect that the Irish Poor Law Commissioners reported that there were 385,000 heads of families in Ireland without one single acre of land amongst them. Mr. Nicholls proposes to relieve this mass of poverty by boxing up 80,000 poor persons in a hundred poorhouses. Is not this preposterous? Is it not much worse than preposterous? I will not insult the good sense of the House by dwelling upon it. I will not pursue Mr. Nicholls through all the absurdities of his scheme, but I will call the attention of the House to the charities that now exist in Ireland, and, comparing the number and extent of these charities with the misery that exists with them, and in spite of them, I will then ask the House how far the confinement of 80,000 poor persons in one hundred workhouses is likely to alleviate the sufferings of my unhappy and destitute countrymen? In the city of Dublin alone the sums annually granted by this House towards the support of charitable institutions amount to £44,450. There are besides a number of other charities supported by private subscriptions, of which the annual amount is £29,360 19s. 10d., and beyond these there is another series of charities, the amount of which in pounds, shillings, and pence, has not been exactly ascertained; but, including all the sums distributed by the Sisters of Mercy and Sisters of Charity in Dublin, the annual amount cannot be less than £30,000. So that, in the city of Dublin alone, the sums given in charity by Parliament, by private subscriptions, by collections at Protestant churches and Catholic chapels, by religious and charitable societies, amounts in the aggregate to £103,800 per annum. And, with all this, is the destitution of the people relieved? Is there no misery, no wretchedness in Dublin? Is there a city in the world where there is so much

wretchedness or so much misery? Then, if £103,800 a year be insufficient to relieve the distress of one city, how can it be supposed that £312,000, the estimated expense of the hundred workhouses, will be sufficient to relieve the distress of the whole country; recollecting, too, how many sources of private charity will be dried up the moment a general measure of this kind is passed? I will put this fact in another point of view. I have in my hand the statistics of the medical charities of Ireland. It seems there are in the provinces four hundred and eighty-two dispensaries, sixty-seven fever hospitals, thirty-six county and city infirmaries, eleven district lunatic asylums, including that at Cork, and in Dublin eight infirmaries and six hospitals, making a total of six hundred and ten establishments for the distribution of medical charity in Ireland, supported at an annual expense of £164,994. This is equal to one-half of the sum calculated by Mr. Nicholls as the annual amount of the money to be distributed under the provisions of the Bill now before us. The average number of persons admitted into the infirmaries and fever hospitals in Ireland amounts to 40,000, and the expense, as I have already stated, amounts to £164,994 a year. Do you suppose by doubling the number of persons to be relieved, and the sums to be employed for that purpose, that you will include all who stand in need of relief in Ireland, or that you will have sufficient pecuniary means to remove all the distress of that country? Stopping the sources of individual charity, do you suppose that, by simply doubling the amount now expended in medical charities, you will be increasing to the people of Ireland the aids they at present receive. Have I not described to you the distress that exists everywhere in Ireland? Have I not at the same time given you the amount of the charities that are maintained in that country? Have I not shown that upwards of £250,000 a year are annually expended in charitable institutions and medical establishments? What, then, becomes of Mr. Nicholls' calculation that £312,000 a year is to do everything for Ireland? It is a dream—a wild dream: £312,000 a year will do nothing. I tell you that this

law must be confiscation or nothing. Make your minds up to that—make the experiment if you please, but prepare to take the consequences. I should mention that Mr. Nicholls put in a postscript to his report. It is said that the material part of a lady's letter is generally to be found in the postscript. Mr. Nicholls, being a man of gallantry, thinks this, I suppose, a proper mode of following the example of the ladies, and accordingly he puts in his most important calculations by way of postscript.

“The population of Ireland,” says he, “being about 8,000,000, I assume that workhouse accommodation may occasionally be required for one per cent. or 80,000 persons;” and then in a foot-note, he remarks, by way of illustrating his proposition, that “in Kent, Sussex, Oxford, and Berks, the amount of indoor pauperism, as returned on the twenty-ninth of September last, was just one per cent. on the population. These four counties were among the most highly pauperised, have been longest under the operation of the new law, and are provided with the most effective workhouse accommodation.” Yes, one per cent. of the population are relieved in the workhouses; but Mr. Nicholls forgets how many are relieved out of the workhouses—he omits that altogether—he totally forgets it; and it is upon this man's report that you are going to act—upon such a report you propose to legislate for the relief of a nation. Would it not be wise to pause? Before you proceed, would it not be wise and well to ascertain the correctness of the grounds on which you are required to act? I have in my hand a calculation of the amount of in-door and out-door relief afforded in the four English counties mentioned by Mr. Nicholls. I have heard the amount of that relief rated much higher; but I will confine myself to the statements contained in the document before me. It will be recollected that Kent, Sussex, Oxford, and Berks are the counties which Mr. Nicholls describes as having been longest under the operation of the new law, and provided with the most effective workhouse accommodation.

Well, then, the calculation I hold in my hand demonstrates clearly that instead of one per cent. on the entire population, as calculated by Mr. Nicholls, the proportion relieved in-doors and out of doors is five per cent. ; and, therefore, proceeding on Mr. Nicholls' own data, it follows that, not one hundred, but five hundred workhouses would be required; that 400,000 persons, and not 80,000 persons, must be accommodated; and that the amount of the annual charge must be £1,560,000 instead of £312,000. Will the House be content to proceed upon calculations which I prove to be so grossly fallacious? But why does Mr. Nicholls make the workhouses the test of destitution? What the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) stated was, that the able-bodied poor were to be relieved in Ireland, and that the Bill should not be limited, as the Irish Poor Law Commissioners had suggested, to the relief of the sick and maimed alone; and then the noble lord, applying Mr. Nicholls' test, said, "It will be a proof of destitution—of such destitution as demands relief—if they go into the workhouses we propose to establish?" Do you, then, want proof of destitution in Ireland? Is the wretchedness of the people a matter of doubt? Do you require proofs, such proofs as these, that they are starving? Such language sounds strangely indeed on the ears of those who know anything of Ireland. But in England it was said that the Poor Law system was so defective that until the new law was adopted nobody could dream of introducing it into Ireland. What did the Poor Law system produce in England? It produced laziness, dissipation, want of care; it took away habits of thriftiness and industry; it engendered profligacy, and made men destitute from their own incaution; it produced all these consequences in England. They became at length intolerable, and you said, "We will redress them; and in order that we may find out who are really destitute; we will adopt a test which none but the destitute will abide: we will separate the idle and vicious from the honest and industrious; we will relieve those only who stand the test we apply to them."

Accordingly a sort of prison discipline was invented for the government of all the English workhouses; a discipline, no doubt, to which none but the really destitute would be willing to submit. But do the Irish people require any stimulant of that kind to keep them from idleness or to induce them to work? Does even Mr. Nicholls say that the Irish people are idle and will not work? Is there any people on the face of the earth so anxious to procure wages by labour? Is there a civilized, or a cultivated, or a cultivable spot in the wide world where Irishmen are not found performing the heaviest and most incessant labours? What works are there requiring great physical strength and unrelaxed exertion where Irishmen are not the chief labourers? Must you imprison them, then, to make them work? No, no! the people of England would never have required such a stimulant for their industry, if you had not first demoralised them by your Poor Laws; and till you have demoralised the people of Ireland by the operation of a like system, you need not threaten them with imprisonment to make them work. The system of poorhouses, as proposed in this Bill, may hold out to the Irish landlords the delusive notion that there is an extent beyond which the rate for the relief of the poor will not go. Such a notion may for a time be entertained by the landlords, but it will be fallacious. It is, indeed, a delusion you are practising upon yourselves if you think you can with such a paltry sum do anything for the substantial relief of the people of Ireland. I would implore you before you plunge into this Bill to consider this—by adopting such a measure do you deprive the people of Ireland of nothing? Do you take from the poor of Ireland nothing? Your Report shows that the Irish poor receive at present in alms an annual amount varying from £1,000,000 to £1,500,000. They do not receive it in coin, but in kind; and this is easy to the farmer who affords the relief. Has any farmer in Ireland told you that he would rather pay money than the produce of his land? No.

Your humanity to the farmers is delusive—your inhumanity to the poor is obvious. You take away from them the £1,500,000 of charity they have at present, but do you take away from them nothing else? Do you take away from them no kindly feeling? Do you know the evidences that have been given of strong filial and parental affection in the Irish? Have you read nothing of their habitual kindness and consideration for all of kin to them? I have a multitude of passages in my hand, extracted from the Report of the Commissioners, passages which do the greatest credit to the affections of the unfortunate Irish poor. They are in misery and distress, but their kindly feelings never freeze under the chill hand of poverty and destitution. There they are—the son supporting the mother, the daughter supporting her aged parents; nay, with the latter it is often the speculation to marry young that they may have a partner to assist them in the office of maintaining those who can no longer support themselves.

There is not a higher testimony to the moral qualities of the Irish poor than the evidence that has been placed before us relative to their condition. Do you wish to take all these away? You know it is a very natural thing for a son to say: “Why should I diminish my own means to support my infirm father, when there is the union workhouse to receive him? Why should I exhaust myself with labour to maintain my mother, when there is the same refuge for her? Why should I assist my blind cousin, or lend a helping hand to my lame unole—is there not the union workhouse to receive them?” This is only a natural train of argument. You will deprive the Irish poor, therefore, of the charity they at present have; you will extinguish in their bosoms those kindly feelings and generous emotions which are beyond all price, and you will reduce them to the same miserable and degraded condition out of which you are now seeking to raise a considerable proportion of your own agricultural poor. Again, then, I implore you, to hesitate before you plunge into this measure. I have mentioned

many reasons that should induce you to do so. Are there no others? In Ireland, you have around the poorest and most destitute class a broad margin, composed of men who are not actually paupers, but who are scarcely able, by dint of the strongest and most incessant exertions, to eke out a livelihood. All these are for the future, under the operation of this Bill, to become rate-payers. Every man rented at £5 a-year is to become a rate-payer. This will include every man who at present saves himself from begging. There are multitudes of this class. I would have you recollect, then, that when you are taking away from the beggar the charity he at present receives, you are, at the same time, taking from the small farmers the means that hitherto prevented them from becoming beggars also. Is there not another consideration? What is it that supports the Irish labourer at present? What fund is there in Ireland for the payment of wages? There is not capital enough to pay for labour in Ireland. Do you want to take away part of the funds that now exist? Is not every shilling levied for poor-rates a shilling taken from the means of paying the wages of labour? By imposing a rate, therefore, you will destroy the inadequate means that even now exist for the payment of wages. But it is said (and this no doubt would be a great boon, if it could be accomplished)—it is said a measure for the relief of the poor will tranquillise Ireland; there will be no more insurrectionary movements in the country when the people find that their wants are supplied. To accomplish that end, you must carry your calculations much farther than you propose to do by this Bill. You must go the full length of the £1,500,000 of charity, which you will be putting aside if you hope to give permanent tranquillity to Ireland. I confess that the measure as it now stands, does not appear to me to be calculated to give tranquillity to that country. How does it proceed? There is to be no parochial relief. All relief is to be given in the workhouses. Perhaps Mr. Nicholls, in his sagacity and wisdom, will make rules for the government of those houses. What will be the consequence? You will give to every man

whom you refuse to relieve a cause for praedial agitation. The man you refuse is the very man to resent in the worst way the refusal; he will go to others and induces them to adopt his quarrel; perhaps, to avenge what he conceives to be his wrong. Thus, instead of tranquillising Ireland, you will only be giving to her another source of discontent. Am I speaking imaginary things when I refer to the operation of a system of Poor Laws as a cause for praedial agitation? Was there not a period, and a recent one, when the rural districts of England were nightly illumined by the torch of the rustic incendiary? Am I, then, speaking only of imaginary things when I say that this law, instead of affording a protection against praedial agitation, will become only a new source of irritation and exasperation. If it do not, it will be only from the extreme extent of the relief you give. I conjure you to consider, whether you make your relief substantial and beneficial; you must not make it equal in amount to one-half, or, at any rate, one-third of the rent-roll of Ireland. If you enter upon this course of policy at all, you must not do it piecemeal; you must not dole out your charity in small driblets. Let it be as extensive as the evil, or do not attempt it at all. This, too, must be recollected—in the introduction of Poor Laws into Ireland you do not propose to establish any law of settlement. Now Poor Laws have been recommended for Ireland as tending to make landlords careful of the tenants on their estates; because, not taking care of them upon their estates they would have to support them by paying rates. But if you establish no law of settlement, you will not affect the landlord in that way. It is the union and not the landlord who will have to pay for the support of the poor wherever they are found, and whatever the burden upon the landlord, it will only be shared by him in common with his neighbours. Thus, the inducement to the landlord to take care of his tenantry will be wholly lost, unless the Bill be accompanied by a law of settlement. Yet, I am not asking for a law of settlement. I know the difficulties that would attend the introduction of such a measure. Mr. Nicholls, to be sure, thinks it would be easy enough,

because, says he, there would be no difficulty in procuring a certificate of births from the clergyman. That applies only to the Protestants. But how are the Roman Catholics, whose priests succeed each other with great rapidity in almost every parish, especially those that are sickly, how are they to obtain certificates of their birth? I mention this only to show of what materials Mr. Nicholls' mind is composed, when he says it would be the easiest thing in the world to do this or that. I approve of not introducing a law of settlement into Ireland; because, though there may be a *prima facie* case in favour of the introduction of such a law, the report of our own Poor Law Commissioners, as well as the experience of all foreign countries where a law of settlement obtains, proves that the effect of it is to enslave the paupers, by tying them to the soil where they are born, and hunting them like rats if they venture to remove from it, lest they should obtain a settlement elsewhere. Instances of this have been abundant enough in London, where women, actually in labour, have been trundled about from parish to parish by the overseers, each anxious to prevent the child from being dropped within the precincts over which he presided. A law of settlement cannot be introduced into Ireland; yet, by not introducing it, you prevent your Poor Laws from affording to the poor that security against the severity of the landlord, which you say you are anxious to establish.

There is another point for consideration. Any attempt to make labour productive by raising a poor rate will be abortive and end in disappointment. A labour rate has failed wherever it has been tried. I wish this to be fully understood before we proceed with the present measure. I have felt it to be my duty to spend a considerable portion of my time in reading everything I could get on Poor Laws, foreign and domestic. Perhaps my inquiries have led me into error. If so, I must certainly say that I have adopted my errors upon the most deliberate consideration that my mind is capable of bestowing upon the subject. To me it seems that no proposition has been

so fully demonstrated, both by theory and practice, as this : that you cannot make labour productive by means of any fund you may raise for the purpose, where that labour has not been rendered productive by the enterprise of private and individual speculation. In America the price of labour is 5s. or 6s. a day. The poorhouses are full. Why do they not send their paupers out to labour? Because it is found that slave labour nobody will buy. A man, labouring upon compulsion, takes a pickaxe and employs himself with it for half-an-hour, making a hole large enough perhaps to put in his finger. The Americans have now gone back from the old system of Poor Laws, and remedy the evils of poverty and distress, not by levying a poor-rate on the industrious, but by turning out the idle from their workhouses, and leaving them, if they like, to perish, which no man in America need do if he be willing to work. It is an idle dream to imagine that you can produce productive labour through the agency of a poor-rate. Neither can you produce a paradise in the midst of a wilderness by establishing colonies of the poor where there is an inch fertility. The attempt has failed in Holland as well as in Belgium. No; you may give relief in poorhouses, but never endeavour, for it is vain, to make labour productive at the expense of any poor-rate whatever. I have addressed the House at great length—greater, perhaps, than I ought to have done; but I feel a deep interest in the question. I have shown a case of great misery and distress in Ireland. I have traced it to political causes. I think, before you introduce your Poor Law, it would be wise to see whether, by other political measures, you may not do something for the good and prosperity of Ireland. I do not wish to introduce anything polemical into the discussion, but I ask you to pause and consider, whether by other means you may not do more good to Ireland; and would conjure you, in the first place, to try the effect of an enlarged system of emigration. If you will not do that, I will implore you to go back to what is called the evidence of your forefathers; go back to the reigns of the Plantagenets and Tudors, when it

was enacted that every man having an estate in Ireland, and not living half the year there, should be liable to a fine of 6s. 8d. in the pound on the gross amount of his rent-roll. Come out with an absentee law, and give me 6s. 8d. in the pound on the rent-roll of all absentees. This may be called a dream; yet, after all, I believe it would give more permanent and more substantial relief to the poor of Ireland than your proposed Poor Laws. I know full well that some political economists have talked of absenteeism as not being a mischief to Ireland; but the doctrines of those men are now, I believe, derided by all. The nobleman whose rent-roll amounts to £50,000 a year, in the course of twenty years draws £1,000,000 from the resources of Ireland, no part of which he ever returns. To procure this sum for him all the corn, all the cattle reared upon the soil of which he is the lord must be sent to foreign markets. In the regular course of things the value of the corn and the cattle so exported should be brought back again. But it is not so in Ireland; no part of the price of her produce ever returns; and as well for these districts who had to support absentee landlords would it be if the ships which bore their produce from their shores sunk half channel over. This, after all, is the dreadful feature in the domestic economy of Ireland—nine-tenths of the rent-roll of the country are spent abroad. We have all the degradation and misery of a province, without the benefit of provincial protection. But I will trespass no further. I will close by saying, that I have a very strong conviction upon my mind that you will find it as much in vain to attempt to create Act of Parliament charity in Ireland as it has been to create Act of Parliament piety. I do not think you can generate virtues, and make them spread by Act of Parliament. I have certainly a strong impression that a Poor Law has never done good to any country where it has been adopted. I make that avowal frankly. I look at the Poor Law in England. I see it reducing wages to half the amount they were before; yet I know that it has been introduced under the most favourable circumstances and in the most prosperous times—in the reign of

Elizabeth, when the recent discovery of the western hemisphere opened a source of the most extensive and wholesome emigration, and at the same time furnished the means of establishing a solid and secure currency in such quantities as the exchange of an active and enterprising people required. Yet the Poor Law of England, introduced under these favourable circumstances, arrived at length to such a pitch of abuse as to compel you, in spite of all the clamour and cry which even yet have not died away, to make a strong movement, and to repeal a considerable portion of that law. I do not hesitate to declare, then, that my own individual opinion is not favourable to a Poor Law, but least of all is it favourable to such a law as this which you propose to give to Ireland. I would only implore you, before the step is decisively taken, to have it fully, maturely, and deliberately considered in all its bearings—to give nothing to the unholy cry of those who hold themselves out as the especial patrons and friends of the poor, because they are favourable to these laws. I entreat you to yield to no clamour of that kind, but fully and maturely to consider the Bill in every stage. Then, be the result what it may, I shall feel that I have done my duty. I have not, I own it, moral courage enough to oppose a Poor Law altogether. I yield to the necessity of doing something; but I am not deceitful enough to prophesy that you will reap any lasting or solid advantage from the introduction of such a law into Ireland.

Subject, TITHES (IRELAND); Date, JANUARY 15, 1838.

Mr. O'Connell spoke to the following effect:—I can safely promise the House that, if they extend me their patience, I will not trespass long upon their attention. I rise after the right hon. gentleman, but not by reason of anything he had said—*post hunc, sed non propter eum*. The right hon. and learned gentleman is singularly liberal in his advances. He offers the noble lord, that if the noble lord will consent to do nothing, he

will help him. These are the terms of the proffered holy alliance. These are the terms on which the noble lord may insure the assistance of the right hon. the learned gentleman. As to the rest of the right hon. gentleman's speech, it was divided into two unequal parts, both of which, however, had equally little to do with the subject before us. The first part referred to resolutions which are not under discussion at the present time; the second contained the history of what was said and done on the other side of the House, and what was said and done on an occasion some time gone by, having no bearing on the present discussion, and just as interesting to us as the History of Cock Robin, which has been much spoken of to-night, or if the noble member for Marylebone prefer the comparison, as the Life and Adventures of Tom Murphy. The noble lord near me has asked the House to go into committee in order to consider the details of this subject. The right hon. gentleman might just as well have favoured us with his speech in committee; but as it is, I trust he will give us the benefit of the instalment. The question, however, before us is, whether we shall rescind the resolutions of 1835 or not. This is, I say, the only question before us apparently; but what is the real question? The real question is—and it is vain for shallow hypocrisy to deny it—the real question is, how shall Ireland be governed? Yes; disguise it as you will; put it as you will—under cover for your love of Protestantism, and your abhorrence of Popery; this is the question; this is the question which is now under discussion, and which has been under discussion for the last seven hundred years (*laughter; and "oh! oh!"*). Yes; you may affect to laugh and sneer; I make no blunder about the matter. I know as well as you that Protestantism was not your war-cry seven hundred years ago, as it is now; but I say that for seven hundred years back the question has been how dominant England shall treat subject and oppressed Ireland. This is the only question, and this is the real question between you—the Tory and the Whig—at least, as far as professions go, for most of you profess in other matters nearly the same principles as the

Whigs; the only difference is, in carrying these principles into effect. But the real great question ever is, how shall Ireland be governed—shall she be governed by a selection? (*hear, hear*). Oh! I thank you for that cheer (*shouts*). Yes, shout as you will; I care not for the shouts of an insolent and despicable domination (*Uproar, which drowned the hon. and learned gentleman's voice, until the Speaker succeeded in restoring partial order*). Oh! sir (continued the hon. and learned gentleman), let them shout; 'tis a senseless yell (*continued uproar*); it speaks the base spirit of party (*continued uproar, which prevented the hon. and learned member from being more than partially heard*). You may sneer at me if you please. I speak the voice of seven millions. Why should not the son of Grattan say to you that which he has told you (*order*). The English people are aware of your conduct—they know what you have done amongst them of late in order that you may command us hereafter. You may carry bribery further than ever it was carried before; you have gained your increase of strength by it. Never was there more extensive bribery than that which you have practised. Yes; you have practised it, and the highest amongst you have shrunk from investigation (*cheers; question*). If the hon. gentleman who cries "question" wishes to know what it is, I tell him it is as to the mode of governing Ireland—for it is impossible to think that such a paltry attempt as that which is included in the motion of the hon. baronet, the member for North Dover, can be the mode or the means of inducing us to wander from that which is the real question between us. Why, let me read to you what is the question; whether you will rescind this resolution is the nominal question; but in reality the question is, by what mode you mean to govern Ireland? Before I read the resolution, let me remind you that not only the people of England and the people of Scotland and the people of Ireland but the inhabitants of Europe are attending to the debates of this House, and the questions which you have reserved for your determination. From the camp of Don Carlos to the throne of Nicholas, they are attending to your proceedings; the world is

listening to you; and do you think that they will not look upon you with contempt if they find that you permit paltry party spirit to enter into your deliberations, and bearing upon your decisions, by which you will distinguish one nation from the other, and make those whose powers ought to be united, consolidated, and identified with each other, a division and a disunited people? But what is your resolution that you want to rescind? This is the resolution:—"That any surplus revenue of the present Church Establishment in Ireland not required for the spiritual care of its members ——" The scope and object of the resolution, then, are these: to provide for the spiritual care of the members of the Established Church. You say, then, that the money is not enough. This is what is said by the hon. member for Donegal, who has highly praised the establishment; but, then, how is this difficulty met as to the money being applied to political objects? It is declared that the surplus revenue "shall be applied to the moral and religious education of all classes of the people, without distinction of religious persuasion." Now, there is the resolution that is so terrific; that which is to come between us and justice—that which is to stop us—that which is so monstrous, which is so frightful, that the rev. clergymen of the Church of Ireland declare that they are afraid that the funds of the Church will be exhausted, that they never will be sufficient for all which the wants of the Protestants of Ireland may require. They are for the spiritual wants of the Protestants being supplied, and they declare that when they are supplied the surplus should not be employed in any other way. How; not employed in instruction—not employed in giving a moral and religious education to the people? Remember, it is for the moral and religious education of the people. Oh, you tell us it is not right to employ it in that manner! Why, how many of you are there who go about amongst us—how many of your missionaries are there amongst us—who tell us that it is the benefit of education and the advantages of intelligence that are wanting to us, to induce us to become Protestants?

If you believe yourselves, then, why not act upon the resolution? You tell the world we want education, and you show the world you do not believe what you say. You prove to the world that you do not rely upon the Bible, but upon the strength of your party. You prove to the world that the only riches of the Church that you value are those which you can bring with you in Judas's scrip. If we are to be benefited with education—if we are to be made Protestants by education—then why not allow us to be educated? If you believe that Protestantism is the religion that will be preferred by educated men, then why have you such a horror of the surplus fund of the Church being devoted to that education which you say is the best method for making men Protestants. But then you may tell us, that, though Protestantism may increase as education is acquired, yet it may happen that giving the surplus to education may not allow hereafter enough for the spiritual wants of Protestantism. What, in such a case, does the resolution provide? It says, "providing for the resumption of such surplus, or of any such part of it as may be required by an increase in the number of the members of the Established Church." And yet that is the resolution which you want to rescind. That is the resolution which has so frightened the parsons of Devonshire that they have put forward their member to move for its being expunged from the journals of this House. This, then, is the awful, this the dreadful, resolution. Oh! how I rejoice that in the struggle in which my country is engaged, and in which you are combined against her, that you stand before the world the parties to such an absurd, such a contemptible, and such an unjust resistance to her rights—that you, despite of the scorns and in defiance of the sneers of mankind, should stand thus before civilized Europe? That is the proposition you oppose, and that proposition goes no further than this—that the surplus is to be applied to the purposes of education, which education you yourself say will make men Protestants; and then if, in consequence of education, more Protestant clergymen are to be required, then the very resolution you

want to rescind allows the resumption of the surplus for all the purposes required by an increased number of Protestants. You object to that. The shout you gave awhile ago was, indeed, a fitting honour for the hon. baronet—not on account of his speech; for never in all my life did I hear anything more harmless than that was. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have given him credit for purity of intentions—they have spoken of the purity of his motives. Really, sir, when there was a rule of the House that no one member is to impute bad motives to another, no matter how bad his acts may be, I do think it ought not to be suffered to impute good motives to any man who has made a bad motion with impunity. And yet that is the position of the hon. baronet. He has brought forward an unjust, an unfair, and an absurd motion, and then we are told of his good intentions. Now if any man were to tell us that the hon. baronet was actuated by a desire of notoriety, that he was instigated by vanity, and that he was carried by the blast of Conservatism into a region which he never otherwise would have reached—oh! then the delicate and fastidious would have been shocked, and it would be said you are not at liberty to impute bad motives, nor to accuse another of having bad intentions. The hon. baronet has made a bad motion with good intentions; but did the hon. baronet never hear of a Dutch proverb, which declares that a very bad place “is paved with good intentions?” I impute no motives to the hon. baronet, and as far as Parliamentary language will allow me to go, I say, that I “laugh to scorn” any one who can say, that a man can come forward in this House and propose to expunge the resolution which I have now read, and that in doing so he can be actuated with good intentions. But after him came the hon. baronet, the member for Warwickshire, who told us that it was with delight he seized the opportunity of seconding the motion for expunging these resolutions. If that delighted him, I must say that it is very easy to please him. He said he would not consent to “give to the enemies of the Church the property of the friends of the Church.” Will he tell me whose property is

it? Will he also answer me another question, and tell me whose property it was? I have heard of one gallant officer on the opposite benches, the hon. member for Donegal, who endowed a church in Ireland. I do not at all doubt it, for I can easily credit the liberality and piety of the hon. and gallant member in this respect; but then, I ask, with that single exception, whose property was that of the present Church? Was it not the property of the Roman Catholics; and was it not given for the purpose of having prayers for the dead, for the celebration of Masses, for the invocation of saints, and for the maintaining of such other "superstitious and damnable doctrines?" Yes, you thought the doctrine was bad, but then, you said, "the money is good"—and, accordingly, you protested against the doctrine, whilst you took care anxiously to clasp the money to your hearts. And, having done this, you now refuse to do justice, under the paltry pretence of religion. It is a paltry and a hollow hypocrisy. There is a kind of morbid humanity abroad; it is to be found amongst men who affect philanthropy—who are tenderly alive to all the evils which may be endured by those who are not of an agreeable colour, and who are to be found in distant regions; they are men who overflow with the milk of human kindness for black men and women, but who can with patience, with equanimity, and even with approbation, look on, and see all the injuries you inflict upon Irishmen, and all the injustice you do to Ireland. I wish the Irish were negroes, and then we should have an advocate in the hon. baronet. This erratic humanity wanders beyond the ocean, and visits the hot islands of the West Indies, and thus having discharged the duties of kindness there, it returns burning and desolating, to treat with indignity and to trample upon the people of Ireland as enemies. The hon. baronet has used the words, "he would not allow the property of friends to be given to enemies." Is it to pay the priesthood of the people that the property of the Church is sought to be applied? No; for we, true to our principles, and finding the Catholic religion to prosper unconnected with the State, would not allow it to be

contaminated by mammon, and will only have it sustained as it has flourished, upon the voluntary contributions of its own members. The hon. member for Kilmarnock, who is not now in his place, but I suppose he is in the House, was kind enough to speak upon that side of the House also; and he, with a dexterity which was more to be admired than his candour, read half a sentence of mine, and took particular care to omit the other half. I alluded to the resolutions, and observed, that as Protestantism diminished, the contributions to the purposes of the State would be increased, and I also showed that the expenditure for the purposes of Protestantism would be enlarged with the increase of Protestantism. Was it fair, then, in this House, to quote the first part of the sentence and to omit the other part? The hon. member for Pontefract is not here, and I am, therefore, willing to pass by the philippic he was pleased to make on her Majesty's ministers. He told us, indeed, of "a cat lapping milk." But I shall not follow him; I shall only give him one line of poetry for his "cat lapping:"—

"The cat may mew, the dog may have his day."

But the real point to be decided is this—whether you are disposed to make the Union permanent or not. My hon. friend, the hon. baronet, the member for Drogheda, told you that which you would not believe me if I told you; but can you disbelieve him? He told you how deeply the people of Ireland feel as to the contest which is now going on. We may say we are eight millions. I say you may take the whole of the Protestants of Ireland—and it would be hard, indeed, to take them from the people of Ireland, for I am at this moment surrounded with Protestant friends who are ardent in the cause of Ireland—but if I give you all, you will have a million and a-half, including the Presbyterians, who do not love tithes. Taking, then, man for man, woman for woman, and child for child, there is a balance in our favour of five millions. You have a million and a-half—we have six millions and a-half; deduct the million and a-half, and then you find a clear balance of five millions.

"It is the total of the whole." For my own part, I never have disguised my opinion. I always have said that a nation of eight millions was too numerous, if they had common sense, to permit themselves to be treated as a province. We were not treated as a province for near 700 years, though we were misgoverned; and, for the last twenty-five years of her independence, Ireland was rising in prosperity unexampled in the annals of any nation. This, too, was happening at the time when you were running a course of profligacy; you were then sending your troops to America; you attempted to trample upon its liberties; but, thanks to the patriotism and spirit of its sons, they met you in arms, they defeated you, and they established their independence. (*Question!*) It is a question of which you will hear more than once. But, then, having fomented a rebellion in Ireland, you availed yourselves of the diminished strength of the people and the distracted state of parties, and with 150,000 troops in the country you carried the Union. I am ready to consent that that Union may continue. (*Oh! oh!*) You may sneer at that declaration, and show you do not value my consent; but then you sneered at America, and you got your answer. Let the hon. baronet tell the people of Ireland he does not value their consent; but I tell him that, if the Conservative faction, or the Conservative party, trample without hope of redress upon the people of Ireland, he may find that, though victory may not be inscribed upon the banners of the Irish, they never would consent to lie down degraded and willing slaves. The Union should be one in which there ought to be no distinction between Yorkshire and Carlow—between Waterford and Cumberland; there ought to be an identity of laws, an identity of institutions, and an identity of liberties. It may be said that I push the argument too far, when I make use of the word identity; for the Church of the State in England is the Church of the majority. I find that, in England, there are twelve thousand places of worship connected with the Established Church, and that the Dissenters have eight thousand meeting-houses. The religion,

then, of the majority of the people of England is that professed by the Church of the State. In Scotland, the religion of the people is recognised as the national religion. In Ireland, you have trampled upon the religion of the people, and you perpetrated your tyranny in the worst form and in the most odious shape, until at length the people of Ireland spoke to you in a voice too loud not to be heard, and too unanimous to be misunderstood, and you found yourselves unable to continue them in their former state of degradation. In Scotland, the people turned out upon the mountain side—they met you in battle, and have defeated you; you were obliged to yield in Scotland. In despite of you there the Church adopted by the State was the Church of the people. What, then, should be the effect of the Union? That the Church of the people should be the Church of the State. There is no principle—I mean no political principle—to prevent it; but there is a principle upon our part which must for ever prevent such an occurrence taking place in Ireland. It is this—that we are thoroughly convinced that it would be the surest mode of decatholicising Ireland. We believe that tainting our Church with tithes, and giving temporalities to it, would degrade it in the affections of the people of Ireland. Offers have been made before to the clergy of Ireland, and they have been rejected—the offer of any connection with the State will ever be rejected. But, then, treating Ireland as you do upon this very question, you tell her that there is no Union with England. These resolutions do not go far enough. I admit it. But, then, I am ready to accede to these resolutions. My disposition is for an amicable settlement. The Protestant landlords are now beginning to feel the weight of tithes equally with the Catholics. From the county of Cork we perceive vast numbers of petitions proceeding from all classes of politicians. The Conservative landlords are becoming heartily sick of the payment of tithes. They may call it “rent,” but the tenant understands it is an additional burden to his rent. If the tenant appeal to the agent for distraining for rent before the man is prepared to pay it, the agent

tells him that the clergyman of the parish is pressing the landlords for his tithes, and he is obliged to collect his rent sooner than otherwise it should be done, for the purpose of paying the clergyman's demand; and thus it is that, though you may call it rent, the people feel it to be tithes.

The Protestant landlords, and even many of the Protestant clergymen, are calling for a settlement of the question. Even within the last week the letter of Archdeacon Hoare has been published, in which he calls upon his brother clergymen to accept the admirable terms offered by the Queen's Government. Will it not be allowed to accept these terms? It is true that here Protestantism is mixed up with politics, and the interests of religion are apt to be overlooked in the advantages of party. Piety is combined with the love of place, and the tranquillity of Ireland neglected for the hope of the enjoyment of office. The Protestant gentry, as well as the people of Ireland, call for conciliation now. Let, then, Ireland be now tranquillized; and, as far as an humble individual can do, I have set the example already, and I am ready to follow it up. I have paid my tithes: I did not pay them for five years; I had four parsons attacking me at once. They have now been paid, because I wish to set the example of being prepared for an amicable settlement. But, then, the hon. baronet will not allow that: his "good intentions" will prevent it, and induce him to rescind a resolution to which common sense cannot object, but to which political Protestantism can offer some opposition. We want equality with you, and you will not permit us to have it. You gave us a Reform Bill—it was a stingy and despicable Reform Bill. Why? Because you would not trust us. Your political Protestantism again met us. We ought to have had the same franchises which you enjoy. We were entitled to them by the Union. Why not give us an equality of civil rights? Political Protestantism could not permit us to have them. England has Municipal Reform; Scotland has Municipal Reform; but Ireland has not obtained Corporation Reform. Why? Your political Protestantism again. How wisely do

you preach Protestantism in Ireland! You make it the pretext for depriving us of every species of equality with yourselves, and then, having rendered it odious, you send forth your missionaries to preach it amongst the people whom you have made its victims. It is despotism aided by hypocrisy, and yet you proclaim a Union, a Legislative Union, between subjects of the same realm. You may do so, but you will be laughed at and scorned. I am making an experiment amongst you, and frankly and fairly I tell you, I am convinced you will not do us justice. What prospect is there of it, when I find that, owing to the enormous bribery practised by you amongst the freemen, you have got such numbers into the Commons, that the Lords think nothing of a majority of this House. It is of no avail to her Majesty's ministers to bring in useful measures; we hear them taunted with the little they have done. Why, you won't let them do what they would. First, you taunt them with not doing more, and then, when they purpose to proceed, you place yourselves in opposition to them, and tell them that there is another place. We know that there is another place. And we know that it needs only to be said, that it is intended to extend political advantages to the people of Ireland to insure a veto being pronounced against the proposition. This is your triumph; yours is the power to insult; yours is the authority to oppress; you glorify yourselves in your haughty station; and while you pretend you wish us justice you exert all the powers you possess to prevent the identification of our rights and liberties with yours. I did not intend to occupy the House half so long. The question is simply this—are you disposed to do justice to Ireland? You make us an offer; you say you are disposed to go into the consideration of the resolutions with good temper, but first the approbation principle must be struck off. The meaning of this is plain: "Walk under the yoke, good gentlemen. Make the best of your way to the common place of execution; walk under it—bow your head to it—and then, forsooth, when you have rendered yourselves as contemptible as degradation can make you, when you have satisfied us of your unmanliness and

worthlessness, then we will consider you fit objects of conciliation, and entitled to participate with us in the enjoyment of rational liberty." That is precisely what the noble lord, the member for North Lancashire, promised us; that is the way in which the noble lord gave us to understand we might excite his good temper, and ensure to ourselves his countenance and all that is genial and winning about it. The hon. the learned Recorder also, protesting that he never made speeches as a judicial partisan, except at the monthly meetings of those liberal and enlightened men, the Corporation of Dublin, told us what mighty things we might expect at his hands if we would but submit to this degradation. Do the hon. gentlemen opposite taunt her Majesty's Government with not having carried this resolution into effect? Surely it is we who ought to complain of that. We are the parties who are entitled to ask why it has been allowed to slumber? No attempt, however, has been made to act upon it; and now the hon. gentlemen opposite deem even the sound of it too much for our Irish ears. Its being allowed to remain upon the books is too great a submission to the wishes and feelings of the people of Ireland; and, consequently, one hon. baronet moves, and another hon. baronet seconds, both with the best intentions, a motion to obliterate it from the Parliamentary records. Heaven preserve us from your English baronets. They are the oddest cattle I ever heard of. I find them voting for the principle of appropriation at one time, and calling for its condemnation at another. The hon. baronet who has seconded this motion has given a most unpleasant, I will call it a most awful, turn to the debate; it was in his speech that for the first time the distinctive appellations of religion were given to a party in this House. He said, "the Whigs in 1688 had driven away a Catholic king, and he in 1838 would assist in driving a Catholic Opposition from the Senate." If this be the way in which the hon. baronet pleases to talk of the Catholic party in this House, I beg to tell him that we have to the full as good a right to be here as he has. [*Sir E. Wilmot had spoken of Catholic domination.*] The

newspaper reports correspond with the note I took at the time; but I am content to believe, that Catholic dominion was the phrase used by the hon. baronet. There is no great difference between the two. What do we demand—what do we wish? We wish this resolution to remain in your books, and then the hon. baronet talks of Catholic dominion; for I must take him to have meant dominion, if he says so. Now, let me ask, is not this the first time the distinction of religious parties has been introduced into this House? I assure the hon. baronet that I am as little disposed to Protestant as he is to Catholic dominion; I beg to tell him more, that if Catholic dominion diminished his rights as a Protestant, there is not a man in existence who would more zealously and actively exert himself to destroy it than I would. At the same time the hon. baronet made that distinction, the hon. member for Malton, who is a Protestant, the hon. member for Armagh, who has belonged to the Presbyterian Church for twenty-five years, and another hon. member, who is a dissenter of one of the persuasions, sat around me; and we four, each differing from the other in our religious opinions, joined in one expression of abhorrence at such a distinction being introduced amongst us.

Shall we have polemical discussions in this House? I beg the hon. baronet to understand that I am quite ready to meet him for any such encounter, but not here. I am as prepared and as disposed as he can be to give reasons for the hope that is in me. But we sit here as the representatives of the people; and, as a representative of the Irish people, I call on you to remember that your Union is one of parchment; it may be one of cobweb, and it may be one of adamant, but the latter it will not be unless you do justice to Ireland.

Subject, CRIMES IN IRELAND; Date, MARCH 7, 1838.

Mr. O'Connell thought that this must be admitted to be a most remarkable debate—remarkable, if for nothing else, for the

total inapplicability of the speeches to the motion proposed. Any man who had not heard the motion read would never have conjectured, from anything that had been said, what the matter was to which the motion referred. There was another feature in the debate which ought to be remembered, though he doubted whether it would. Speeches had been made by four gentlemen, natives of Ireland, who, it would appear, came there for the sole purpose of vilifying their native land (*oh, oh*). Yes, of vilifying their native land, and endeavouring to prove that it was the worst and most criminal country on the face of the earth (*oh, oh*). Yes (exclaimed the hon. and learned member), you came here to calumniate the country that gave you birth. It is said that there are some soils which produce venomous and crawling creatures—things odious and disgusting (*cheers*). Yes, you who cheer there, you are—can you deny it—are you not calumniators? (*oh, oh*.) Oh! you hiss, but you cannot sting. I rejoice in my native land—I rejoice that I was born in it—I rejoice that I belong to it; your calumnies cannot diminish my regard for it; your malevolence cannot blacken it in my esteem; and although your vices and crimes have driven its people to outrage and murder —— (*order*). Yes; I say your vices and crimes (*cries of Order, order; chair, chair*). Well, then, the crimes of men like you have procured these results (*oh, oh*). The hon. and learned member then proceeded: What was the speech of the hon. and learned gentleman, the member for the University of Dublin? How applicable to the motion! How happy is its illustration! What was it that the hon. and learned gentleman quarrelled with? His quarrel with the Government was nothing more nor less than this—that it had been said in a public document that the landlords had duties to perform as well as rights to enforce. Then he quarrelled with the noble marquis, the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, because he had been weak enough, or, as the hon. and learned gentleman would have it, unjust enough to evince some sympathy and pity for the wretched multitudes who had been

subjected to the horrors of summary ejection; because he had betrayed some feeling towards the decrepit father, the aged mother, and the helpless children, who, driven from the warmth of their homes, were left to perish in ditches. Yes, the noble marquis dared to pity them; and the Government dared to say that the Irish landlords had duties to perform as well as rights to enforce. That was the whole ground of complaint. A matter of this kind marked distinctly the character of the people who complained. They said, "we will not be told that we have duties to perform—we have nothing but rights." Did any man ever hear such a complaint made gravely? Yet it had been made repeatedly. The hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Litton) made it the chief topic of his speech—he insisted upon it with emphasis—he advanced it with all the powers of his oratory, and claimed the attention of the House to it with many a blow upon the box. He trembled for that box, as with uplifted hand the hon. and learned gentleman exclaimed, "Behold the wrongs of Ireland! An excited multitude is told by the Government that the landlords have duties to perform as well as rights to enforce." How did the Government inform the people of Ireland of that fact? How did they seek to inflame their minds upon that point? The hon. member for Kilkenny (Mr. Hume) moved, as he was often in the habit of doing, for certain returns—for the production of certain papers; and the way in which this inflammatory declaration on the part of an officer of the Government was delivered to the people of Ireland was, that it was laid upon the table of that House.

The hon. member for Belfast (Mr. E. Tennant) had interposed in the course of the debate, and had talked of the evils of change of opinion, and the mischief that resulted from the mixture of parties. To be sure, of all men in the world, the hon. member for Belfast must be one who was best able to judge of what those evils and mischiefs were, for there was not a political party now in existence to which that hon. member had not, at one time or other, belonged. First, he was an agitator, then

a high Orangeman, than a desperate Reformer (*Mr. E. Tennant: Never*). Not a sworn one. Then he was a Republican, talking loudly of the folly of an hereditary peerage—

“The tenth inheritor of a foolish face.”

This was the man who talked of the evils of change. Where was the hon gentleman pointing now? He knew that at the present moment; but by-and-by, when the hon. gentleman was convinced that the speculation upon which he was now engaged was not likely to be successful, he had no doubt he would be seen going over to the Liberal party in Ireland, and joining the Precursor Society. To be sure, if anything were necessary to blacken Ireland in the estimation of England, it would be found in the charity and piety of the hon. member for Kilmarnock (*Mr. Colquhoun*). It seemed that the hon. gentleman had lately been a visitor in Ireland; but instead of directing his admiration to its green hills and verdant valleys, its broad lakes and bold blue mountains, he had employed himself, it would seem, in conversing with the lowest of its inhabitants, and picking up a parcel of details to be made the subject of a speech in Parliament. Hence, the statement that a village priest had denounced a man before he was murdered; hence, also, a number of the stories of the same stamp and character. He told the hon. gentleman that the whole of the details of his speech were false. Could anything be more unfair than the course now pursued? If this were a motion for inquiry, he could understand it. The charges upon which the motion was founded were, if true, charges against the Government. In fairness, then, the Government should have had some notice of them, in order that they might be prepared to meet them. But it was the fashion of the hon. gentlemen opposite to give only vague and indefinite motions, in order that their antagonists might be taken at a disadvantage. They placed upon the notice book a vague and general motion, then came down with a catalogue of tales and a list of dates, giving to the whole an appearance of exactness and truth; and then, when the Government,

unprepared to go into these details, replied only in general terms, they went away and complained that they were not met. This was a trick—a party trick—to prejudice England in favour of that faction which had so long oppressed and trampled upon Ireland; foul and malignant murderers—stained by blood and dishonoured by the breach of treaties—for three hundred years making religion the pretext for their crimes, and now again enlisting the sacred name of religion against right and justice. It was said that the present Government had distinguished none but agitators—had given to none but agitators the emoluments of place; nay, it was said that they had abused the seat of justice, and placed none but agitators upon the bench. Was Serjeant Ball an agitator? Was Mr. Wolfe an agitator? Was Sir Michael O'Loughlen an agitator? These were the last appointments made by the Government—appointments which the hon. and learned member for Bandon had done everything in his power to prevent. Yet, could the hon. and learned member for Bandon say that he was not himself an agitator? Had the hon. and learned gentleman never attended a political meeting? Had he not attended a meeting at Cork upon the subject of the Reform Bill? (*Mr. Serjeant Jackson: No.*) Then the hon. and learned gentleman's memory must be very short. At all events, that meeting was attended by a Counsellor Jackson, who spoke upon the occasion. The hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin had detailed a long list of horrors in Longford; but had the House heard of the late trials at Longford? had they heard of the trial of a widow named Murphy? An action of ejectment was brought against her; Mr. Courteney, a gentleman of respectability, was introduced as a witness. There was no doubt of the facts that the widow had a lease of the house, of which forty years were expired. She was the administratrix of her husband, and was in possession of the house. Of these facts there was no doubt. She was required to give up the lease, but refused to do so. What was to be done? The witness, Courteney, stated in his evidence that the landlord took a party to tear down the house; that the widow

and her daughter were borne screaming and weeping away, and that the son at last signed a paper, which, he was assured, should prevent his widowed mother's house from being levelled with the ground. But the assurance was a false one. The signing the paper did not prevent the perpetration of this piece of injury; the house was torn down, and the widow erected a hut from its remains. Afterwards, the case went to trial upon the ejectment, and the widow got a verdict. There was the Lord Lorton that they had heard that night lauded to the skies—there was the verdict of the jury—there was the Mrs. Murphy, with her house torn down over her head, and there was, also, the cause of the disturbances in the county of Longford. The learned Recorder had told them of the number of murders which had lately taken place in Ireland; the number given by the learned Recorder was fourteen since the 16th of November; but if the learned gentleman had called their attention to England, he would have found that there would have been twenty-five since the 16th of November, leaving no less than eleven to the credit of Ireland; and yet no English member had risen, and said, "What an abominable country mine is; what shocking people are the people of England." Besides these murders, however, there had been two cases of supposed murder—that is, their bodies had been found in a mutilated state; there had been thirteen distinct attempts to commit great personal violence, and there had been twenty incendiary fires, one of which, by-the-by, was at Shaw, in Berkshire. The learned Recorder, in his list, could not enumerate a single incendiary fire; and, notwithstanding this, Ireland was to receive abuse, and, above all, the abuse of her own children. He had calculated the number of crimes in England of the greatest enormity—those which had been punished by imprisonment above six months—and he found that the number in Great Britain was 6,259, whilst the total number in Ireland was only 2,577, though the population in Ireland was within a third as much as the population of England. He only asked those hon. members to apply the same charity to Ireland

as they extended to England; and if there were better stimulants to crime in Ireland, if there was in that country no general sympathy between the rich and the poor, if the inhabitants were considered aliens in their own country by those who abhorred their religion, let no censure be passed on the Government which, for the first time within the recollection of the people, administered the law fairly and impartially with every class (*cheers*). Hon. members might cheer; but if the Government had not done so, let hon. members point out a single case in which, as to the Government, there had been any defect. Let them trace up the neglect of its source—let the returns be laid on the table of the House—and then, if the Government were not able to vindicate themselves, they would not be vindicated by him. Why, in another place, a noble duke had admitted, and so had the Earl of Glengall, that no Government had, in this respect, been more vigorous in the execution of its duty. Was there any complaint that on the trial of a Protestant the jury had been packed, as it had been complained against the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they had been in power, and as there would be if they were in power again? The right of challenge gave a frightful power to the Crown; but since the present Government had been in office, they had followed the English practice, and no man was now set aside on a jury panel on account of his religion, or on account of his political opinions. And what had been the result? Had a single case failed?

On the trials at the late special commission, there were seven Catholics on the jury, or seven precursors, if that term pleased the noble lord better, and there were but five Protestants, and yet there had been convictions. The learned gentleman (the Recorder) had read an extract from a speech said to have been delivered by him (Mr. O'Connell) having relation to Lord Oxmantown; it was a double-distilled extract, for it had gone through the alembic of the *Evening Mail*, after it had appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*, and as it last appeared, it was totally misrepresented. The hon. gentleman produced this re-

port, which he called his speech; but what did he speak, he would repeat? What had Lord Oxmantown done? He was the lord lieutenant of the county, and he called a meeting, under pretence of discovering the assassin, but for the real purpose of expressing the vilest and most atrocious calumnies that were ever uttered against his country, and against the Government who had named him as lord lieutenant, and whose commission he then bore. He was seconded by Lord Charleville, not very ably certainly, which that poor nobleman could not help; but this same Lord Charleville had an admirable method of forgetting matters of fact. He stated that two men came out of the lodge, saying that Lord Norbury had been mortally wounded, and was dead; when, on referring to the evidence of the lodge-keeper, it appeared that she had just told them what had happened, and that one of them, so far from rejoicing at the circumstance, as it had been stated, being an old soldier, offered his services to stop the flow of blood, and to stanch the wound. The noble lord had treated the whole Irish nation as a nation of assassins. He had treated the Irish Catholic clergy as a body of men fomenting assassination; he did not even except Lord Norbury's own friend, and his (Mr. O'Connell's) friend, the Rev. Mr. Rafferty, and even he was thrown into the base accusation of calumny. He (Mr. O'Connell) had been happy to hear the explanation respecting the boot-mark, the other evening, and he, after inquiry, was now able to confirm the statement, that it was the mark of the shoe of Mr. Fitzgerald. Hon. gentlemen opposite had stated that it was the mark of the shoe of Lord Norbury's grandson; but it was his impression that in this they were mistaken. The point did not much signify in their present discussion, but if hon. gentlemen wished him to go into it, he was perfectly ready to do so. Lord Oxmantown had said that this was a conspiracy to turn the landlords out of their property; but could anything be more absurd? Was there not a son of Lord Norbury perfectly ready to step into the property at once, and nothing could be gained by the peasantry. He did, therefore, speak of Lord Oxmantown as he

thought he deserved. He was of opinion, that there was an attempt to blacken Ireland by those who had hitherto delivered her over to the dominion of a faction. It was an attack upon the noble lord, under whose government, for the first time, pure and impartial justice had been administered. The noble lord had earned the approbation of Ireland, the universal people applauded his acts, and he came back to this country with all the honours of a civic triumph (*hear, hear*). What! did hon. gentlemen think that it was not a civic triumph without the presence of slaves? He congratulated the country on the character of the successor the noble lord was about to have; he trusted that his successor would follow the example of the noble marquis, and work out the cure of Ireland's wrongs. He concluded by moving, that, after the word "Ireland," there be added the words, "also similar returns from England, Wales, and Scotland."

Subject, GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND—ADJOURNED DEBATE; Date,
APRIL 19, 1839.

The Speaker had undoubtedly a troublesome office. O'Connell accused the member for Kent of atrocious calumnies on the Catholic clergy of Ireland, and said there could be no excuse for it, except ignorance to the extent of brutality, which was familiar in Kent.

Mr. O'Connell—Did they know that the people of Ireland were more alive to their rights now than they were formerly?—that the Irish people almost universally were now readers?—that where newspapers formerly hardly went out of the great towns, they were now to be found in every village, and almost in every cabin? Did they know that the mighty mind of Ireland was excited?—that there were millions of arms to be conducted by that mind if they drove the Irish to insanity by their determination to continue the old system? What had been that old system? They wanted inquiry, forsooth! Assuredly they knew what the Orange system was. It was but right to

remind them, lest they should forget it, that in the Orange counties there was a word invented which was not known in England. If a man talked of wrecking houses in England, it would be thought that his hon. friend, the member for Birmingham, had seen realised his dream of the arrival of the Russians at Gravesend, and of that town being wrecked. But the phrase was familiar in Ireland. And why?—because the act was familiar. He could not avoid giving a few instances, to show the character of those to whom they were handing over the people of Ireland. He should come presently to their high-souled protestations of fairness and impartiality; he should come to them presently, if not with the contempt they merited, with the refutation which was so easy. In Ireland the word “wreckers” was a common phrase. He happened to have in his pocket a letter which was not there by accident. He was not exactly like the hon. member for Bandon, who did not intend to say a word during this debate, and who accordingly came to the House with five or six volumes of returns, with careful marginal notes, and with oranges ready. He intended to produce this letter. It was a letter of a gentleman, now more than twenty years dead, whose name stood high in the annals of Irish history. He was an independent member of the Parliament of 1782, and was related to some of the first families in Ireland, and his name was Mr. Todd Jones. The letter was addressed to “the Editor of the *Dublin Evening Post*,” and was dated, Newry, March 2, 1814. There, in the open day, twenty-eight houses were wrecked, and the house of the Catholic priest was fired into next day, because he interfered to obtain justice. But there was not a particle of chance of obtaining justice, and the foul deed was perpetrated with impunity. He mentioned this circumstance to show what that party was. He had documents to show that the same system still continued. During the last administration of the right hon. earonnet (Sir R. Peel), in January, 1835, a similar scene of outrage was exhibited at the town of Lurgan. Two Orangemen were assaulted and violently beaten on their return from

Armagh; the Government, of course, was perfectly ready to lend the aid of the constabulary and the army to discover the perpetrators and to bring them to punishment. The Orangemen were not satisfied, and what was the result? He would read the report of Lord Gosford, which was written in February, 1835. The report stated that seven houses belonging to Catholics had been burned, and that the most wanton and atrocious outrages had been committed, and that all attempts to discover the offenders had failed in the object. Seven houses during the very last time the right hon. baronet was in power were burned in open day; nay, he found in the report that this was done in the presence of a portion of the army; but the Orangemen and yeomanry were too strong, and Sir Frederick Stovin did not think it prudent to attack them, not wishing to waste human life. Yes, in the open day, and unavenged to this hour, seven houses of the peaceable and unarmed citizens were consumed to avenge a personal outrage of the day before, which the law was quite sufficient to vindicate. Was that all? He hoped the hon. and gallant member for Armagh (Col. Verner) was present; as in the presence of that hon. and gallant member, even during Earl Grey's administration, houses were similarly wrecked. That hon. and gallant member met the wreckers coming towards him. He was a magistrate, a captain of yeomanry, and an Orange dignitary, and possessed great influence in those capacities, which was still greater in consequence of the amiability of his private character, for no gentleman could be more amiable in his private life; but, notwithstanding all this, the hon. and gallant member met these people, the wreckers, in the road, and, as he himself stated, he did everything in his power to prevent the party from proceeding. When he arrived at Magheragh, the people had broken the doors of the houses, and completely wrecked the village in the presence of the hon. gentleman himself and of a body of the police. Having done this, they marched on with drums beating and flags flying in regular order, Captain Lloyd being at the head, and the hon. and gallant member himself bringing up the rear. He did not

charge the hon. and gallant member with a wilful participation in this transaction. He believed the hon. and gallant colonel did endeavour to prevent it, and used his best exertions for that purpose; but in spite of all his influence, this happened in the open day, and no man had ever been punished for that outrage from that day to this. And yet they talked of impartial justice to Ireland, when they could not control their own satellites. If any man could have done it, the hon. and gallant member would have done it. He had every recommendation that a man could have; yet in open defiance of him, in spite of his influence, and without dread of punishment, this horrible outrage was committed. And were the people of Ireland to be satisfied with the words of the House of Commons or the House of Lords, if they were handed over again to those who must act by and through that party.

He hoped the hon. member for Monaghan (Mr. Lucas) was in the House. The hon. member did him the kindness to inform him that he would bring before the House another transaction which had occurred as late as 1837. As to that statement he quite agreed with the hon. member. What was it? In June (the 28th), 1837, on the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, there was an ancient practice to light bonfires as a token of respect for the coming solemnity. This having given offence to the Orangemen, all the male population and the adults abandoned it; but it was taken up by the children, and at Miriash, in the county of Monaghan, ten or twelve children on that day made one of those little bonfires, and were dancing about it. There were savages found—yes, two savages approached as close as they could, levelled their muskets at those children, and fired at them. Two of the children were struck dead—two children of a widowed mother, and four or five others were wounded. And what did the hon. member reproach him with? Why, because he said that this deed was perpetrated by Orangemen. The hon. member said that it had been investigated and examined, but they had not been able to find out the murderers; and what right, therefore, had he (Mr.

O'Connell) to say that the murderers were Orangemen? He should be glad to know why the children were shot? There was no doubt of the massacre of the children; it took place on the 28th of June, 1837, and from that hour to this they had not found out who the murderers were. The murders were not committed by Catholics. They would not fire upon children for amusing themselves with a Catholic solemnity. It was not done by the Protestants, for the Protestants of that neighbourhood had not become Orangemen, and certainly were not animated with such rancour towards their countrymen. It was not committed by the Presbyterians, who were even still more liberal. He was wrong, then, in saying that it was committed by Orangemen. It was his conjecture, nothing else. He prayed them not to hand over the Irish people to a party capable of such foul and flagitious crimes. Leave them not to their tender mercies. If they took away the protection of Lord Fortescue's Government, these men would come triumphantly into office on the shoulders of the vote of the House of Lords. Defeat this by a vote of approval, negative the vote of the House of Lords, and say that they were determined that the principles of the present Government should be acted upon. The vote of the House of Lords was the proclamation of Orangeism; and had the Orangemen been idle already? It was only the other day that they met at Coleraine, thirteen lodges of them, to express their grateful thanks for the conduct pursued by the House of Lords. They never heard professions of Orangeism in the House of Lords—no, but the feelings crept out in their meetings, and in their lodges they showed what they were. Would the hon. and gallant member for Sligo (Colonel Perceval) tell the House who the present grand officers of the Orangemen were? [*Colonel Perceval knew just as much of them as the hon. and learned member.*] He was glad to hear it. There was then another set of officers substituted for the former. The society had two relays of officers. But this was not all. During the last six or seven years the grand jury had been decent enough to allow some few Roman Catholics to serve amongst them.

He had received a letter from a gentleman, who informed him that this practice was now put an end to, and that there was not a single Catholic or liberal Protestant left upon the grand jury. He had not the least objection to name the writer of this letter; it was Cornelius M'Loughlin. The fact was, the Orangemen were in office already. The hon. member for Coleraine had last night made a *pean de velours* speech. Did ever any one hear him make a moderate speech till last night? The hon. member was then gentle as a sucking dove, and he only rose to vigour when he praised the Orangemen. It was at Coleraine that this meeting took place, and the hon. member for Coleraine now lauded the Orangemen; but this was not all. A meeting took place the other day, on the requisition of a duke, and several other members of the peerage, 100 deputy-lieutenants, and a great number of gentlemen from various parts, for a limited and specific purpose, that of agreeing to an address to her Majesty in favour of the present Administration. Well, the Orangemen agreed to disturb the meeting, and were discovered with bands round their hats, and buckles in the front of them, as a mark of their fellowship. They sent one Archer, an alderman, to conduct the proceedings; and the waving of an Orange handkerchief was to be the signal for their attempting to rush upon the stage. Would they have done this a month ago? No, no! they looked to the bashaws of the House of Lords and the Conservatives in this country; and they waited for the signal from them. The hon. member for Coleraine had praised this alderman, who was once lord mayor of Dublin. He happened to recollect a story of this Alderman Archer, which he would tell the House. Alderman Archer summoned a carman for beating him. Both the alderman and the carman were examined upon oath; but in the end of the investigation his brother alderman, who heard the case, acquitted the carman, and convicted the alderman of an assault, for which he inflicted a penalty of £5; and forthwith afterwards the worthy alderman petitioned to be allowed to pay the fine by instalments of £1 a week. There's a leader for you. And yet you fancy

yourselves already in office, and begin incontinently to count the spoils of office. In expectation of office the Orangemen were again becoming rife in every species of tyranny and oppression, of which he would mention to the House one instance which happened lately, and the statement of which was contained in a letter which he would beg to read to the House. The hon. and learned member then read as follows:—

“I claim a little of your attention to the doings of the Earl of Glengall. Ever since we announced our adhesion to the Precursor Society, he has vowed vengeance against any of the tenantry who should become a member. But the election of guardians has at last afforded the opportunity of executing his threats. He made out a list of guardians for the Firlie union—of persons who were either noted partisans, Tories of the right sort, or nominal Catholics, who are tenants, and, of course, dependents, and might be managed. In the divisional district of Cahir he placed on his list three rank Tories, to the exclusion of 8,000 Catholics, and he has been signally defeated. His nominees were refused, and three honest, patriotic Catholics returned. He asserted it was a matter of indifference who should be returned, but as soon as Lady Day came on the mask was removed. It was not usual to call for the March Lady Day gale until harvest, but on this occasion orders were issued to have it paid in on the following day. The law agent, J. Barry, had instructions to serve latitats upon every person whose rent was not paid within four days. He sent letters through the post-office with this warning, and charged 7s. 6d. for the delivery. He went to Dungarvan and did not return till the fifth day. Several went with the rents to the land agent's house, who actually refused until they first settled costs with the law agent. One man called and tendered his rent. He was desired to go to Barry, the law agent. He did so, and while in the act of paying the money a latitat was served on him, the cost of which he was obliged to pay in addition to his rent. Is this legal? I know it is not just.”

True, these might be the rights of landlords; but, he would ask, was there a single English gentleman who heard him who could put his hand to his heart and say that he should not be ashamed to act in this way to any tenant of his? Would the House like to have his authority for this statement also? The letter he held in his hand was written by Michael Tobin, the respectable parish priest of Cahir. The gallant colonel opposite made a pathetic appeal to the House the other evening, and

said he could not go home at night. He (Mr. O'Connell) perceived it was after midnight. He would now beg to call the attention of the House to the circular of the society called the Irish Protestant Tenantry Society, the introductory announcement of which was as follows :—

“ Amidst all the exertions that are making to protect Protestantism in Ireland from the mine and assault of the Popish priesthood and their bigoted flocks, as well as from the artful attacks of the Tyrconnells and Phippses of the day, it appears never to have occurred to the leaders of the Conservative party that all the while the only lasting bond of success and security—a Protestant tenantry in Ireland—which forms the connecting link between the two countries, has been, and is, daily disappearing. Large districts of Ireland, which not very long since were peopled with those gallant and faithful men who form the vanguard of Protestantism and the British monarchy, have been weeded of them to such an extent that not a single Protestant is now to be found in them. Where the Established Church once stood, and the pure religion of Christ was once disseminated, now stands the Popish mass-house, pouring forth the soul-destroying doctrines and immorality of Maynooth. From these districts all rational hope of the revival of either true religion or civilisation, through all other means than the replacing of a Protestant tenantry, is utterly banished. What more immediately presents itself as a simple and obvious duty to the protection of the Protestant creed and constitution is, the prevention of the removal of the present Protestant tenantry of Ireland, through the operation of those well-known causes which drive them from the homes of their brave-ancestors to make way for the Papist, who introduces the misery, superstition, and conspiracy, of which his religious and political creeds are so prolific, and which ultimately are brought to bear against the constitution of England itself.”

Now, who was at the head of this society? The humane, the charitable, the religious Lord Lorton. Who were the other patrons? The Earl of Dunraven, who was once a Liberal. He (Mr. O'Connell) remembered when he was something more than an ultra-Radical, but he had since bolted into the other House. Then there were the Earl of Enniskillen, Captain Alsager, M.P.; Sir R. P. Glyn, Bart.; Henry Blanchard, Esq.; and the Rev. Arthur J. R. Preston. The hon. and gallant colonel who defended Lord Lorton's conduct to his tenantry the other day, said that his lordship's pretence was, that he had

wished to introduce a Protestant who should teach his tenantry the linen manufacture; but in so doing he had given the newly-arrived Protestant the dwelling of a Catholic; and if the noble lord wished to drive his tenantry to despair and crime, what better course could he take than this of casting them out of their cherished homes; and for a Protestant, too? Well, then, whatever might be the difference as to the facts connected with the ejection of Lord Lorton's tenants, and the sums of money which were given them as compensation for being deprived of their holdings, this document showed the spirit by which that noble lord was actuated. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefroy) had taunted him for having uttered a calumny as to Lord Lorton. But what did he state? The report of a trial given in a newspaper amongst other circuit reports. It was true the right hon. gentleman made out a very good case for Lord Lorton, by asserting that a lease for fourteen years to the widow was changed into one for eighty; but the question was tried by a respectable Protestant jury (he hoped there was a Catholic upon it, but he believed there was not); the witnesses were subjected to the scrutinizing eye of the counsel of Lord Lorton (who had the benefit, too, of an excellent active agent), and the jury unhesitatingly found a verdict for the widow. But what did Lord Lorton do? He got a right of possession from the son, who was not entitled to grant it, and he pulled down the house about the widow's ears, and drove her to seek shelter in a miserable sheeling by the roadside. He was showing the brutality with which the Irish people were treated on the approach of the time when, if the party opposite came into power, they might be trampled on with perfect impunity.

There were some hon. gentlemen opposite who were familiar with the Scriptures. When they saw the acts of their friends in Ireland, they should call to mind the denunciations there pronounced against those who trampled on the widow and the orphan. On what account? For differences in religion! Frank, avowed, direct bigotry. Because the

poor people were attached to "Popish superstition," therefore they were to be turned out of their dwelling. Oh, if you could produce such a document as the Protestant Tenantry Society Circular from a Catholic, what a hand you would make of it. How you would triumph and rejoice at it. The right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth, promised that he would govern Ireland impartially. He must act with his friends. Who were his friends? Would he show him a single moderate Protestant amongst them? He knew he could point out to him plenty of furious partisans and Orangemen, such as the hon. and learned member for Bandon. But the hon. and learned gentleman had that night made a moderate speech. Did they ever hear such a one from him before? (*Lord Stanley*: "Yes.") Well, he was sure he never heard more immoderate speeches, both in length and matter. The last time he discussed with the hon. and learned member a question of this description, he taunted the hon. and learned member with being at a Brunswick meeting at Cork. The hon. and learned gentleman utterly denied it, with great personal incivility. This was the report from the *Morning Post*:—

"He (Mr. O'Connell) had asked him whether he had not attended a meeting held in the city of Cork, in the year, 1828, and there made a speech against Catholic Emancipation? And he would answer him, that never in the county of Cork or elsewhere—at a Brunswick or any other meeting—had he made a speech against Emancipation. Had the hon. gentleman known him, he would have known, as his (Serjeant Jackson's) friends well knew, that his opinions were favourable to Emancipation in 1828; but, with the experience he had of late years, and a knowledge of the lamentable events which had occurred in certain quarters, were the question now before the legislature, he should ponder well before he gave his vote for the measure."

Well, he sent for the Cork papers of the date to which he referred, and he found that, on the 12th of April, 1827, Counsellor Jackson was present at a meeting of the Brunswick Club, and that he delivered the following speech there:—

"Counsellor Jackson said, it never before had fallen to his lot to have to return thanks for an honour of the kind after dinner. He assured them he was deeply sensible of the compliment conferred upon him. He should always feel interested for the success of the Brunswick Club."

Why, this was to be one of the judges under the new regime, and it was right before the time arrived for his appointment that they should know who he was. When the right hon. baronet said that he would govern Ireland with impartiality, he was bound in point of courtesy to believe him; but this he told him, that no man, woman, or child in Ireland would place the least faith in his word. The Orange party called to mind their former ascendancy on his return to power, the Catholics remembered the associations of his government, and trembled. And why should they not? Did they not see him taking up the motion of the Earl of Roden, the Grand Master of the Orange lodges. The noble lord possessed property in the town of Dundalk. The Catholics, from their numbers and the antiquity of their chapel, thought they were entitled to ask Lord Roden for the new site. They offered him any purchase money or rent he chose. He wrote them a taunting letter, saying, their worship was idolatrous, and that he could not consent to their application. And that was the man whose opinions and sentiments must be carried into operation under the government of the right hon. baronet. If it were not so late, there were many observations which he should be anxious to make upon those topics, for the introduction of which the gentlemen opposite had presumed to insult him. Was it supposed that the accumulating millions of Ireland would hear with anything but disgust the attempt now made to restore the ascendancy of that unholy power by which they had been so grievously oppressed. Let not the members of the different sectarian parties whom he saw waiting for that unrighteous purpose imagine that they would obtain an easy victory over the people of Ireland, who had now been taught

to agitate without violence. There was but one true maxim in politics—that of being right. The people of Ireland were right. They required not merely executive but legislative relief, and they would have it. English gentlemen (exclaimed the hon. and learned member), rally round an Orange ministry if you please, but mark the warning which I, as the representative of the Irish people, give you. I tell you that you may be tyrants, but we will not be slaves.



APPENDIX.

NOTE TO PAGE 403.

THE following is taken from the *Belfast Morning News*. It is worth grave consideration :—

“ We do not venture to absolutely and unqualifiedly condemn the Government for persevering in the maintenance of the constitutional—or, rather, extra constitutional—position that Ireland occupies in the United Kingdom ; we mean the continuance of what are called the ‘ Coercion Laws.’ The members of the Government say that they have information which compels them to believe that it would be unsafe to relax the rigidity of the unconstitutional laws. They say that, and we believe them. We have not the slightest doubt that information of that kind has been given them. That information may or may not be correct. It may be that there is somewhere in Ireland some secret proceedings that require on the part of the Government extra constitutional powers. But there is a thought in connection with that, and one that ought not be lost sight of—that is, the connection between Government itself and rebellious proceedings or conspiracies. A good many people must have read Carleton’s ‘ Rody the Rover.’ According to that work, the head-quarters of Ribbonism was in Dublin Castle. We had ‘ heard talk ’ of such things before, and we pressed Carleton to explain. His reply was —and this occurred in Hollywood—‘ I myself am in receipt of a Government pension, and I dare not explain the thing to you ; but all that’s in ‘ Rody the Rover ’ is true to my own knowledge.’ So much for Carleton’s testimony. There has been, if there is not now, a strong belief that the rebellion of ’98 was got up by Lord Castlereagh to afford an excuse for passing the Act of Union. There is another slight fact bearing upon this : the present writer’s own grandfather told this present writer that he himself was sworn in an United Irishman by a gentleman of high position in the county of Antrim, and who was at that moment captain of the yeomanry. The grandfather in

question was a United Irishman at heart; and when the gentleman in whose employment he was—a gentleman who had got into his hands the management of an estate belonging to an afflicted nephew—when he proposed the United Irishman's obligation on the person in his employment, the latter accepted it without hesitation. That same gentleman told the grandfather in question afterwards that he was employed by the Government to swear men into the then rebel organisation. Well, he swore them in, and he afterwards swore them to the gallows. That was done by the representative of one of the most important families in Antrim. He told the grandfather of the present writer that he was only acting by orders from the Government. The poor man—or comparatively poor and powerless man—to whom he made that revelation could do nothing. If he had revealed what he knew, the power of his chief was such, as captain of the yeomanry and head of the United Irishmen, that he could have hanged or shot the poor man! The character of that distinguished agent of Lord Castlereagh became known after the Union, and he had to fly the country. He remained in the north of Scotland or the isles for about forty years. At the end of that time he returned to Ireland; and the present writer saw him again and again walking about leaning on a staff, with the curse of Ireland and of human nature bowing him down. And every human creature that met him used to take the other side of the road. The children used to scream when they came in sight of him; and one of them who writes this now was so frightened at encountering at a sudden turn of the road what he thought to be the devil, that, though not then able to swim, he dashed into the river where it was five or six feet deep. There are other suspicious matters bearing on the relations between Government and treasonable organisations. The public at large are acquainted with the Fenian proceedings of Head Constable Talbot. There may be difference of opinion as to those proceedings, though we think there are not many who would like to play Talbot's part. But there is an episode in the life of that eminent spy that is not at all so well known as his Fenian performances, but that is right well known to us; and we may as well tell. It is how Talbot treated Henry D'Arcy Irvine, Esq., of Castle Irvine, in the county Fermanagh. Mr. Irvine was a good, kindly man, with more than average intellectual ability, and more than average accomplishments. But he had strong feelings and a somewhat wild imagination. He wrote many things in condemnation of the Government, and wrote them in a strange, strong way that attracted attention. Well, he was persuaded to believe his life was in danger from the Fenians, and to employ Talbot at 30s. week to be a sort of gamekeeper and body guard. After Talbot (who had then finished his notorious Fenian affairs) came to Castle Irvine, Mr. D'Arcy Irvine was continually receiving threatening letters. He was continually telling us about them, and we often asked him if he had the envelopes. No; it happened

somehow that he had none of the envelopes; and it happened also that the letters themselves (this is our belief) generally disappeared after doing the work of annoying their recipient. Mr. D'Arcy Irvine introduced us one time to his protector, Mr. Talbot, a fine-looking fellow; but we declined his acquaintance, and warned Mr. Irvine against him. He did not attend to the warning and he was driven mad—we believe by Talbot, the Government spy. He had to be arrested as a dangerous lunatic; and he soon died in the strange confinement. A gentleman of Fermanagh who had a peculiar right to feel interested in the matter remarked to us some time after:—"If that honest fellow in Dublin hadn't shot Talbot I'd have gone up and done it myself." No one in Fermanagh who understands anything of the circumstances doubts that Talbot maddened Mr. D'Arcy Irvine. Who incited Talbot to that course of conduct? We hope that what we have written episodically in appearance will not be regarded as impertinent to the question. We have stated facts that are not generally known; and besides these we have this other fact—a great many people believe that the wires and strings and pullies of even late disaffection are in Dublin. It is believed that James Stephens, when he burst upon the world full-grown, was a creature of the Castle. It is believed by many that Phœnixism and Fenianism were both creatures of the Castle. These things are believed; we do not say that we believe them. But we have these facts:—That William Carleton, to his own knowledge, was aware that the head-quarters of Ribbonism was in Dublin Castle; that many people think the head-quarters of Phœnixism and Fenianism were there, too; that the thing of which we have spoken took place in '98; that the atrocity of Talbot took place under our own eyes. All this means this—that if a Government have an object to attain they can find means of attaining it, and that moral restraints will not be permitted to interfere with political expediency.*

END OF VOL. I.

THE
SPEECHES AND PUBLIC LETTERS
OF
THE LIBERATOR;

WITH
PREFACE AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

BY
M. F. CUSACK,
AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE LIBERATOR,"
"THE ILLUSTRATED HISTORY OF IRELAND,"
ETC. ETC.

"I have struggled for happy homes and altars free."
Speech at Athlone, Aug. 1825.

VOL. II.

DUBLIN
M'GLASHAN & GILL, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
1875.

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

PRINTED BY M'GLASHAN AND GILL, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE STREET, DUBLIN.



THE UNPUBLISHED SPEECHES

OF

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.

Subject, CONFIDENCE IN MINISTRY—ADJOURNED DEBATE ;
Date, JULY 31, 1840.

MR. O'CONNELL—Sir, it is not my intention to trouble the House with any reply to the speech, the able speech, no doubt, which has just been delivered by the hon. and learned member for the University of Oxford. I certainly had not the good fortune to hear that speech throughout, and I therefore leave the unbroken force of whatever arguments the hon. and learned member has adduced to the benefit of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite ; and I leave the ministry to bear the whole brunt of whatever arguments the hon. and learned member had adduced against him. I solemnly assure the House, that it is with unfeigned regret that I feel it my inevitable duty to address them on this occasion ; and that regret is not a little en-

hanced by the circumstance, that, although various matters have been brought forward, so abundant as to tempt me to trespass on the House at greater length than the House would, probably, be willing to endure, and certainly, than I should be disposed to occupy, I do not think that this debate is likely to raise this House in the opinion of the public or of the statesmen of Europe. I do not think there has been any of that sagacity which might have been expected to have been exhibited by statesmanlike minds; on the contrary, a species of paltry controversy has arisen, undeserving of such an occasion as the present—this momentous occasion. The great question which the House has to decide is, how this great empire is to be governed and managed; because the manner of management in the present case depends on the men who have the conduct of public affairs. We have to decide upon what principles twenty-four millions of British subjects are to be governed. We have also to decide upon the fate of probably one hundred more millions of human beings dependent on our control. And how has this subject been discussed? Seven or eight gentlemen who have spoken, have talked of where I dined. Yes, this has been a fruitful subject of eloquence for the great statesmen who have addressed the House on this most important occasion. I really do think that the ridicule will be interminable, the laughter inextinguishable, when it goes abroad that the greatest question which has ever agitated this House has been decided by the frequency with which I have dined with the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The case, indeed, is twice as strong as it has been put, for I have dined twice with his Excellency. I am glad that the gentlemen opposite did not discover this sooner, for then, instead of five, we should have had ten discourses on the subject. If the gentlemen opposite only knew the excellence of the wines and the dinner, so as to have described them, there can be no doubt that they would have carried by a greater majority a motion in opposition to anybody who has dared to give them a good dinner. I dare say I keep a fair ledger account of my intimacy with most people, and I hope I have given quite as

many dinners as I have received. I will now pass to another subject. I have been the subject of many observations in the course of this debate. I have been called a Repealer; why, sir, I am a Repealer; and has anything happened in the course of this debate to shake me in that opinion? What said the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Liddell)? did he speak of this being the Parliament of the United Kingdom? He talked of English and Irish majorities. He stated as a charge against the present Government that they had an Irish majority. The question has been asked publicly, and I ask it again, is there any difference between an Irish and an English majority? And the hon. gentleman has introduced into this discussion the fact of my having been honoured with the offer of the Chief Baroncy of the Exchequer in Ireland. And what was the defence? Why, at that period the Repeal agitation had ceased in Ireland, because the people of Ireland had hopes that the House would do justice to Ireland. But I refused that offer, and I think that that is an example likely to be followed by the other side. I am sorry to speak of myself, but really I am forced to do so. I refused that offer upon two grounds: first, because I could not trust myself to accept it; for I own candidly that I was afraid that I should fall into partiality to one party or another, that I should either show favour to those who agreed with me in religion and politics, or, which is the worst partiality, that I should decide in favour of my opponents when they were in the wrong, in order that I might avoid the accusation of doing wrong myself. Thanking respectfully those who made that offer, I refused and rejected it on the ground stated. I have seen some men talk loud and long—men, violent in their politics, and truculent in their language—merely to enforce themselves into notice, in order that they might have the chance of such an offer. The right hon. baronet opposite (Sir James Graham) has done me the honour to notice me particularly, and with that candour for which he is so eminent, has charged me with having compared myself with Papineau; and then the right hon. baronet proceeded to state that Papineau was a traitor, who had fled from

his country, not daring to stand his trial when a charge of high treason was brought against him. I appeal to the House, whether the right hon. baronet did not assert that I had compared myself to Papineau. The right hon. baronet ought not to have forgotten, and if he had not learned, he ought not to have assailed me. He ought not to have forgotten to read the remainder of the passage in which I compared myself to Papineau. I did venture to do so. I said that we both had considerable popular influence, but that he had an advantage over me, because he had a majority in the Commons' House of Parliament in his favour; but I went on to say, that he was a traitor to the people as well as to the Crown; because, instead of using moral means when it was in his power to do so, he had resorted to physical force.

The right hon. baronet took care to omit the remainder of the passage which I have just quoted. I succeeded, Papineau failed, and for this very reason, that I looked to nothing but moral means, he resorted to physical force. I have said more than enough on this subject. I now ask the House, after this debate has lasted so long, what are the principles of government that have been held out by hon. gentlemen opposite? Their case is this: they come before the country and ask this House to turn the present ministry out, and let them in, not merely to declare a want of confidence in the present ministry, but to declare confidence in those who must replace them. That is a matter of course. What foundation do they lay for this? Have they declared on what principles they intend to govern? We have heard a great deal of attacks on ministers, of gibes and jeers at the result of the division, and yet we have not heard one distinct affirmative announcement of the principles on which the gentlemen opposite intend to govern. We have not heard what they will do in England, and, least of all, what they mean to do in Ireland. I ask, what are their principles? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the country is much disturbed, that disaffection prevails amongst numerous classes, that dissatisfaction is

widely spread, and we heard numerous accounts of the state of the middle counties from the hon. member for the county of Nottingham (Mr. Gally Knight). That account, I dare say was not exaggerated, however frightful it may be. Armed Chartists, secret lodges, organization of men, weapons of a most fearful character, and, worse of all, English conspiracies for assassination—yes, nine or ten victims marked out for assassination—such is the state of England, as described by the hon. member. We have heard of outbreaks at Sheffield and at Bradford, of rebellion in Wales, and that the situation of England is so bad as not to be described; and at such a period as this, have hon. gentlemen opposite no panacea to offer? Have they no cure? Do they think that the people of England have no grievances? Will they tell us that they will redress those grievances? Will they redress any of them? We have now been debating four nights, and we have not yet been told of any plan for the redress of those grievances. Talk of force, every constitutional force has been used, and whenever an outbreak has occurred, it has been met by the present ministers with more than abundant force to suppress it. What will hon. gentlemen do? Will they redress the grievances of the country? Will they turn Thorogood out of gaol and free the Dissenters? Will they prevent the gaols from being filled by those who follow Thorogood's example, and, acting under what gentlemen opposite call a mistake, but certainly what I call a conscientious feeling, offer resistance to the impost of church-rates? Will they do this? No, they talk not of doing it. They dare not do it, for if any of them thought of doing it, instantly the party would break up. How stands hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject, which is so interesting to Dissenters and Roman Catholics? Will the gentlemen opposite decide this question and give relief? When the present Government proposed a plan to ameliorate the law upon this subject, by a better collection of the revenues of the Church, having the additional advantage of giving

6 *Disaffection of the Working Classes in England.*

a fixity of title to the tenants of ecclesiastical property, and applying the surplus to relieve the country from the payment of church rates, this plan was successfully resisted by the gentlemen opposite, and they thus left that grievance festering in the country, and producing very naturally disaffection and disturbance. But hon. gentlemen opposite dare not do otherwise. The hon. baronet, the member for Oxford University (Sir R. Inglis) chuckles at this, and will no doubt point to the number of petitions he has presented in favour of Church extension. I tell the hon. baronet, and he will not deny it, that this means a grant of public money. I ask, at once, does the hon. baronet mean to give the public money to the present Church? You cannot give Church extension without public money. I ask, then, is this one of the cures, one of the emollients for the grievances of the country which the gentlemen opposite are ready to administer? If they give public money to the Church of England, must they not give it to the Church of Scotland, and with what face can the Protestant Dissenter and the Roman Catholic be called upon to support a party whose great object is to protect Protestantism by drawing out of the public purse the greatest possible quantity of money they can lay hold of? Perhaps, if the gentlemen opposite had not already stated it, they will now state what they are determined to do upon the Corn Laws? In the present state of the country, I ask them, do they think that the working classes, disaffected as they are, breaking out into rebellion as they are, do they think that those classes will be pacified by holding out to them the impossibility of altering the Corn Laws? Talk of difference of opinion on this side of the House, but what is it compared with the difference amongst the trading members on the other side on this subject, leaving to the present ministry this advantage, that with them it is an open question, and some of them voted for going into committee and making an inquiry, the first great step towards the repeal of an unjust law? but gentlemen opposite tell the starving

manufacturers, that they are to have no relief from the present graduated scale of duty—a duty increasing as the price falls; and diminishing as the price rises.

Will gentlemen opposite ask the country to rally round them on this question? I do not think they will be wise to do so. Let me remind the members of the House who may be disposed to place confidence in gentlemen opposite, to pause before they admit those gentlemen to be capable of curing the public diseases, and of putting an end to the disaffection of the operative classes. It is advisable first to look abroad, and inquire what are the feelings of the people. There have been three meetings held of late at the great town of Manchester. The first was a meeting of the middle classes, composed of three or four thousand men, and need I inform the House what was the result of that meeting? The second was a meeting of the operative classes, amounting to about five thousand men. Did hon. gentlemen opposite hear of the conduct of those men? of the propriety of their demeanour? of their respectful attention to those who differ with them in opinion? and of the distinctness with which they applauded everything that was argumentative, and rejected all that was mere declamation? Talk of danger to the Throne, and of the disaffections of the people; if that danger really exist, if there be that disaffection, if they place themselves in opposition to the general and just call for the repeal of the Corn Laws, see how they would aggravate the mischief and increase the disaffection. There was a third meeting at Manchester on Tuesday last—the very day on which this debate commenced. That meeting was composed of seven thousand persons, and the discourses there delivered would do no discredit to this House; and I ask, are such men to be shaken in their determination by those who refused any remedy? It is worth while to ask this question, when we recollect that what we have to consider is, whether we shall have as ministers men who will give no relief whatever to the manufacturers, or those who leave the Corn Laws an open question; we leave it for discussion and evidence, to convince even those who

are unwilling yet to yield. I say, choose between them; but before you choose, hear the voice of those who are principally interested, and hear the interpretation put upon those laws by the operatives. At the great meeting, to which I referred, an operative, of the name of Filligan, spoke in the following terms:—

“I, too, will say, that if I were to come forward, and say as a working man, that the repeal of the Corn Laws is a final measure of reform, I should deserve all the opprobrium you can heap upon me. I come forward to advocate the repeal of the Corn Laws, as a step towards getting what it is the inherent right of every individual to have who is a born subject in this country. I do not attend here to-night for the purpose of asking the aristocracy to pass a law to make bread cheap. I only ask for a repeal of that law which makes bread dear. I do not stand here to ask the aristocracy to pass a law that will infringe on the private property and vested rights of any individual, but I ask for a repeal of that law which infringes upon my private property and vested rights. The aristocracy say, that if you repeal the Corn Laws, you infringe upon their vested rights; but I ask every working man, has he no estate? Was I not born in a most noble estate—the industry of these hands? And I contend that any law which prevents me exercising my industry is an infringement of my private property. Consequently, I stand here to demand a repeal of the landlord's robbing laws.”

This language comes from a man who as yet has not joined the Chartists, but he calls the Corn Laws robbing laws. The gentlemen opposite tell this man that they stand by these laws, that they are necessary for landlords, that they are, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable, whatever be the consequences; and do they expect that such a man would give them his support? Is such conduct likely to allay this dissatisfaction of the country? And, I ask, are those wise statesmen, who, because the landed aristocracy and the clergy have joined their party, refuse to hear the working-man pleading for his just rights, and entreating to be allowed to earn the greatest possible quantity of bread by the labour of his hands? There is another topic upon which gentlemen opposite have no kind of hope. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been taunted with finality upon the subject of reform. The word “finality” dropped from them, and has been fathered on them by some

friends and by many enemies. There is no doubt of the finality of the gentlemen opposite on this subject. I cannot but regret the secession of the noble lord, the member for Northumberland; but in that secession, I do not know that he has shown as much of good sense as of nobleness of feeling. This I know, that this secession has shown that there is a desire for progression on this side of the House, for the noble lord has forsaken ministers. I know not the limits of their differences; but he has forsaken them because they were more progressive than they wished. With gentlemen opposite it is quite otherwise. There is to be no extension of the present franchise. Not one other Englishman is to be admitted into the franchise. No; the gentlemen opposite are determined to restrain the community within the paltry measure of the extent of the Reform Bill. What sanctity have gentlemen opposite discovered in the Reform Bill that they refuse to persons equally well entitled with those who enjoy it, a participation of the benefits of the franchise. I am not speaking to you alone, but to the people of England, whom you exclude from the franchise, and from whom, when they apply to be restored to it, you turn away, and refuse to listen to them. You place yourselves in the high and lofty situation of being solely entitled to political power, and you spurn from you those you would claim to share it with you. Now, upon what hereditary prescription do you lay claim to this exclusive authority in the State? The right hon. baronet, the member for Pembroke—he, to be sure, is of high descent; he traces his pedigree to John of the Bright Sword; and the noble lord, he claims descent from no less a personage than Edward the Confessor—and they tell the artizans, from their high and irresponsible position, not to come “between the wind and their nobility.” This might possibly be borne from them; but the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth, his case is different; he came from a lower but a more illustrious origin—his position and circumstances were the rich reward of talent and industry, which, however, would never have produced their fruits but for the high and unblemished integrity with which

they were accompanied. The industrious people of England had, therefore a right to complain of the hon. baronet, for he had belonged to their class, and now he turned about upon them, and would deprive industry and integrity of that participation in the legislation of the country to which they were as much entitled as himself.

Why, what was the theory of the constitution but this—that taxation was just because the people were represented, and were taxed by their own representatives; but that it would be a robbery if the people were taxed by other authority than that of their representatives? The party opposite said the people should not be represented; and yet their own writers told them that if they were not represented it would be a robbery. They had told the people of England that there are two classes in the state; the first, a master class, being householders of £10 a year, and that those should be represented; and a slave class, which did not come within their category, and who were not to be represented. These were told to begone; ample as were their grievances—just and equitable as were their claims, redress they should have none. And yet that party now dare to appeal to the country, and say they would govern the country supported by the sense of that people whom they would exclude for ever from the franchise. No; they do not even hold out a hope that at some future period the unfranchised shall be admitted to their rights. No; they have taken their stand upon this point, and they thought they would be right in taking the sense of the country upon it. And what said the people upon this subject? At the same meeting to which I have just referred, an address was agreed to to this House, in which he read the following passage:—

“Still we are burdened with sinecures and pensions, outraging the feelings of every honest and industrious man, a political state Church, that, by its extortions and intolerance, under the cloak of religion, brings the sublime and hallowed doctrines of Christianity into disrepute; a standing army as numerous and expensive as if we were at war with all Europe; a ponderous debt that presses most disastrously on the financial interests of the country; a new

Poor Law brought into existence whilst the cursed and abominable Corn Law exists, by which the food of the people is restricted, at the same time they are starving by thousands in the land of their birth; and in the midst of all this we are told that the reforms already effected are to be final, and that no further relief from our present state of political slavery shall be afforded us by you. Already has this doctrine of finality being productive of the most disastrous effects. A spirit of disaffection has exhibited itself in different parts of the empire, and the lives of some of our fellow-subjects have been sacrificed. We deeply deplore this; we are as much opposed to violence as yourselves or any other body of men in her Majesty's dominions. We have never joined in any effort that has been made to alter the present state of things by force. We are determined to seek for and obtain our rights by all lawful and constitutional means; but we hesitate not to express our apprehension that, unless such concessions be speedily made by you as shall meet the wants, the wishes, and the intelligence of the people, the recent outbreaks are only the forerunners of an amount of destruction and loss of life that will be productive of incalculable mischief to the best interests of the country, and will leave a stain on the character of its legislation that will not be easily obliterated."

This was their declaration. Now he would ask (the hon. and learned member continued), were these people to be excluded for ever from a voice in the state? and, above all, was the doctrine about illegal meetings to be pressed to this extent that it would be in the power of the Government of the day to prevent these meetings, which might probably be looked upon as the safety-valve in our political scheme, allowing the evaporation of passions which might explode and burst the whole machine. He did not advise an appeal to force; but when he found a total refusal to accord the just rights of the people—a flat denial of all redress for any of their grievances—when they found this producing irritation and disaffection throughout the country, he asked how could the party opposite pretend to undertake the administration of affairs under such circumstances? Yet the noble lord opposite said last night that he was ready to take office—that he was ready to assume this responsibility, and at this very moment. Let him do so—let him come into power; and then let him immediately proceed to increase the army, to increase the police force, and to arm the yeomanry throughout

the country; and with these materials risk the edifice of the state to its very foundations? But what would they do with Ireland? How would they govern Ireland? By whom, and for whom would they attempt to govern Ireland? Would they attempt to govern her by the party who had in this debate expressed their dissatisfaction of the present Government, by such perfect specimens of meekness and modesty as the learned serjeant for instance, and of course with a total absence of political feeling. He asked again, how would they govern Ireland, and by whom? He knew that the right hon. baronet would this evening give the House some very excellent phrases of conciliation, and make ample professions of his intention of doing justice, with impartiality, to all. But he had heard the same sentiments before from the right hon. baronet, and uttered, he had no doubt, with equal sincerity; and the right hon. baronet's entire sincerity he would not for a moment call in question. But was not the right hon. baronet the same man as when he was last in office? Were not his opinions the same? And the gallant officer, too, than whom a braver soldier did not live; he had not changed his opinions since he last governed Ireland; and yet when he went over to Dublin in 1834, where did the orange flag wave? It was hoisted as the right hon. and gallant officer's banner. No! The fact was the right hon. baronet had not the materials amongst his party to govern Ireland. Ireland was in a state of suppressed rebellion, which would break out into open insurrection at the very idea of such a Government coming again amongst them. The hon. member for Wakefield, whom he was sorry to see abandoning the protection which Ireland had been proud to receive from him, had talked in this debate as if there were two parties to determine between. But now, what were those two parties? There was a whole people on one hand, and a party on the other. If that party prevailed, the cause of the people was lost. He would entreat the House to consider something of the history of Ireland.

It would be taxing their patience too much to go back to

the times before the Union. Ireland had suffered for six hundred years (*ironical cheers and laughter from the Opposition*). Was that laugh intended to deny the fact? If so, he pitied their ignorance who uttered it; or if it were not so intended, and the fact once admitted, he could not respect the feeling which dictated it. Ireland had suffered six hundred years of oppression; and this was a fact which hon. gentlemen opposite laughed at. But what was the history of Ireland since the Union? For between twenty-nine and thirty years—for the Whigs had been in office but one year during that period—the Tory party had governed Ireland, and for twenty-five years out of that time the Habeas Corpus Act had been suspended, or the Peace Preservation Act had been in operation, depriving the people of their constitutional rights. Twenty-five years had they thus coerced Ireland, and why had they not quieted her? And how would they hope to quiet her now, if they came into office? Was there an individual of that party who would not raise the shout of exultation, if the right hon. baronet were to come into office—and would they not kindle bonfires from one end of the country to the other to signalise their new advent to power? The learned serjeant had been obliged to admit the present tranquillity of Ireland; and was ever such an admission made before in this House; was there ever a four days' debate in this House in which so little had been said about Ireland? How different from the serjeant's course on former occasions, when he came down with his hands full of lists and documents, and papers as bulky as a volume of the statutes at large, and gravely impeached magistrates and officers without number. But if tranquillity was shown to exist in Ireland, had the party of the learned serjeant done anything to promote it? Not by any act of their Government, for, thank heaven, they were not in power; perhaps they had done so by their recommendations; but was there any one who could get up and say, that he had heard anything of a conciliatory nature uttered at any one of their meetings? If there had been such, it had since been buried, and lost in silence. But, on the other hand, had they

not by their Press worked in a way directly the reverse, pouring out the vials of their wrath against every person and every principle dear to the people of Ireland? Their leading journal had gone to an enormous extent in order to assist in walking them into power to-night. What was the language used in this journal in respect to the Irish people? They were called "brutes," "ignorant savages," "worse than the cannibals of New Zealand." What was said of the clergy? That they were "surpliced ruffians," "sanguinary monsters," "a demon priesthood." Good heavens! Was he in a civilized—a Christian country? Day after day, and week after week, were these abominable insults poured out against the clergy of the people of Ireland; men who had clung to the cause of their suffering fellow-countrymen with desperate fidelity—who were their only comfort and friend when deserted and oppressed by all the rest of the world, and when, at the bed of sickness and death, the blood of youth was prematurely sapped by disease and poverty. He repeated it—the opposite party had done nothing to promote the tranquillity which existed in Ireland at the present moment; but, on the contrary, the very reverse. How had their clergy acted? The noble lord last night pronounced an eloquent eulogism upon Mr. M'Neile; he had spoken of his charity, of his eloquence, and of the admirable tenets which he had heard in a speech delivered by him. He (Mr. O'Connell) would now beg to read a passage from a sermon delivered by that reverend gentleman at Manchester. What said this reverend and charitable minister of God:—

"War, war to the knife. They tell you that you are ministers of peace, but where are we to find that, I ask? Not in any part of the Scripture that I know of. There is nothing like it in the Bible. We are the ambassadors of Christ." [*Oh, oh!*]

What! were they tired with so short a sermon?—

"We are ambassadors of Christ—Christ, who said, you think that I come to bring peace amongst you, but I come to bring a sword. What peace can you expect to have whilst the woman Jezebel lives in the land?"

This was one of their moderate supporters! But who was this woman Jezebel? He knew there were many persons who said it was the Queen. He did not say so himself, though he had thought it so when first he heard the observation; but its application in that manner had been denied by the rev. gentleman, and, therefore, he did not take it in that light now. But if it was not the Queen, who was the woman Jezebel? What could the term mean but the religion which was professed by the great majority of the Christian world? It was either the Queen, or the religion of Ireland, and of the greater part of all Europe. The Irish people were still tranquil, although the Tory party put the English clergy in the pulpit to preach down their clergy and their religion in this abominable manner. And this was the preacher who, together with Mr. M'Ghee, was invited by Lord Wharndcliffe, a gentleman not naturally given to fanaticism, but perverted to it by the baneful influence of politics, to meet the Protestant Association in Sheffield. Now, he wanted to know what had been preached here. Had there been no fanaticism directed against the Queen? Had there been no treason directed against her? The man who spoke of Victoria might say he did not mean the Queen; but he (Mr. O'Connell) could hardly lend credit to the assertion. However, when he came to the person whose speech he meant by-and-by to read, he would give him the explanation he had made or could make. But what were the sermons which had been preached? He knew that the House was averse to the reading of extracts, and he would not intrude upon it by any lengthened quotations, but he held in his hands a couple of documents from which he could not withstand the temptation of selecting a few passages. The first was a sermon delivered at Worcester on the 5th of November last, by a remarkable preacher, the Rev. Frank Hewson, who said:—

“ We see a striking resemblance to the dispensing power which James II. assumed, now pursued by the Government, in not enforcing the remaining laws against Popery. More, we see a striking resemblance to the foreign influence which James was under, in the present position of affairs at Court,

in the crowds of followers who infest the palace of our Queen, and fill her mind with Popish and un-English sentiments."

The orator went on to Universities, Education, Papists, the Privy Councillors, Dissenters, Horror, Town Councils, and winds up with—

"Lastly, there is a striking resemblance to the supposed birth of a Prince of Wales in the time of James II., to the supposed marriage of our Queen to a German prince, whose family are all Papists. When an heir was born to James, the hope of England fell to the ground. In the prospect of a nominal Protestant becoming the husband of our Queen, is the prospect any better?"

James II. lost his throne, and deserved to lose it; but what was the inference which this preacher would draw from the parallel which he instituted? Why, that as James II. lost the throne for leaning to Popery, so Queen Victoria should be deprived of her crown for marrying a pretended Protestant. He (Mr. O'Connell) came next to the sentiments of a man who took a higher tone. He was now going to direct the attention of the House to the celebrated speech at Canterbury. Before he did so, however, wishing to act with perfect fairness to the person whose name was at the head of this speech, he must observe that that person had declared that the object of his attack was not the Queen but the ministry. He would only observe, let those who knew that person best, believe him most. He would read the speech, and leave the House to judge of the person to whom it was intended to be applied. Thus it begins:—

"First, I shall direct your attention to the fearful growth of Popery, allied as it is with atheism, infidelity, and the voluntary, or anythingarian principle. Her Majesty's ministers have recognised this medley as their rule of faith, as exemplified in their precious scheme of education without religion; and I grieve to say, that her Majesty herself has shown too much countenance to the enemies of the Protestant Church. Brought about under the auspices of the citizen-King of the Belgians, the serf of France, and guided by his influence, the Queen thinks that if the monarchy lasts her time it is enough."

Meaning thereby, as the speaker afterwards explained, the ministers. Truly an ingenious innuendo; reduced to plain English, it was to read thus:—

“Brought up under the auspices of the citizen-king of the Belgians, the serf of France, and guided by his influence, the ministry think that if the Monarchy lasts its time it will be enough. But the people of England will never consent that the Crown shall be degraded and debased for the inglorious ease of any created being. [*Here there were tremendous cheers.*] Nor will they consent that the personal wishes and caprices of the Sovereign (the ministry again) shall direct the conduct of the executive. The Monarchy has its rights, but it has also its duty. The people of this country will not be trampled on by Pope or Sovereign (still less by the ministry); still less will they endure that a petty German prince shall hold the fair realm of England in fee farm. We have not forgotten the forced abdication of the second James (this, of course, applied to the ministry); nor are we ignorant that the title of the throne of these realms is that derived from a Protestant princess. No one can regret more than I do the growing unpopularity of the Queen (meaning the growing unpopularity of the ministry) and her court (meaning the court and the ministry). But, look at the composition of that court and its acts. The courts of former sovereigns have been as frivolous, more vicious even, than the present, but the government of the country and the direction of public affairs have been carried on by statesmen of known and recognised ability, honour, and independence; men who were neither the boon companions of the sovereign, nor the willing slaves of his follies and caprices (this was all the ministry). I believe, in my conscience, that the favourite equerries are younger, better looking, and better dressed men than Sir Robert Peel; that Lord Melbourne can tell a tale meet for a lady's ear far better than the Duke of Wellington; and that neither Lord Stanley nor Sir James Graham can compete with my Lord Normanby in getting up a pageant.”

He supposed that every loyal man in the House wished to have the Queen spoken of in that manner. Was there a gallant officer on the opposite benches who did not feel indignant that such language should be applied to the Queen. Was there a really loyal man in the House who would not deplore and denounce such ribaldry. 'Twas said that these observations were not intended for the Queen; that they were insinuations against the ministry. He would read a few more extracts, and leave the House to judge for itself:—

“Look at the appointments that these men and women have lately made. There is not one of them that is not a direct insult to the nation. See the Irish Papists preferred to place, to power, and to patronage. I shall take leave, on thus referring to them, to contrast the solemn oath sworn by her Majesty at her coronation with her subsequent acquiescence in these acts. This oath is the compact made between the sovereign and the people; its obligations are mutual. I will now read it to you, and be you judges whether or no they have been truly fulfilled. Here are the late appointments of Papist councillors. I take them together, and thus I cast them from me with disgust and indignation.”

One passage more he would be ready to read, which really related to the ministry. But, before he did so, he must observe that, as a man of conscience, he could not do otherwise than believe that all the passages to which he had just called the attention of the House related to the Queen, and to no one else. It was painful to him to contradict any assertion that any gentleman might make; but, was there a man in the House—was there one in the Opposition benches, who could not stand up and say that the passage he had quoted applied to the Queen? The speaker came forward to the minister, of whom he said:—

“His sheet anchor is the body of Irish Papists and rapparees, whom the priests return to the House of Commons. These are the men who represent the bigoted savages, hardly more civilised than the natives of New Zealand, but animated with a fierce, undying hatred of England. I repeat, then, deliberately, that the Papists of Ireland, priest and layman, peer or peasant, are alike our enemies; aliens as they are, in blood, language, and religion.”

The last remark he (Mr. O’Connell) did not attribute to the Canterbury orator. He admitted that it was a quotation from a much greater man, a quotation borrowed from a speech of the leader of that party which they were told made the ministry weak in the House of Lords, and gave to the Conservatives power—

“Aliens in blood, language, and religion. Yet on these ——”

Here, again, the speaker came back to the Queen—

“Yet on these men are bestowed the countenance and support of the Queen of Protestant England. But, alas! her Majesty is queen only by a faction, and is as much a partisan as the Lord Chancellor himself.”

The “partisan!” There was, of course, the ministry.

“But shall we quail at the impending danger, and meanly submit without a struggle? No; we will present the same bold front as did our fathers of old; and God defend the right.”

This was magnanimous, but nothing to what followed.

“We will resist to the death ill-government and unjustly usurped authority. Petitions to the Crown are an idle mockery. We will no longer submit to be governed by a profligate court. It is in your hands, my friends—it is in the hands of the people of England, that her destinies are placed for good or for evil.”

Some comment had been made in the course of the debate upon a reply which he (Mr. O'Connell) had made to that speech. He did not deny the statements attributed to him. He did say that against such a traitor—against the Tory domination of such traitors—he was able and willing to bring into the field 500,000 fighting men. He admitted that he said so, and he repeated it now. He had a kind of title to take such a course; for one of his ancestors, at the head of a regiment, fought and bled for the unfortunate James Stuart. He, therefore, had a sort of hereditary right to adopt this course. The hon. member for Maidstone, the other evening, entertained the House with some curious infelicities of literature. He spoke of the ruin of Charles I., and accused the House of Commons of that day having fantastically brought the Quaker, James Naylor, before it, adding, that the House had the barbarity to cut out his tongue. Now, it was hardly fair to accuse Charles I. of having any share in that act of brutality, because, in point of fact, it was committed five years after that monarch had been in his grave. The House of Commons who mutilated Naylor was

not elected under the King's Writ, but was summoned in soldier fashion by Cromwell. He was not defending the House of Commons which committed so barbarous an act; he was merely reminding the hon. member for Maidstone how it was that the fanaticism of which he spoke was brought about. It was brought about by M'Neils and M'Ghees of that day. Ministers of the Gospel were sent forth to preach of the Sovereign as a Jezebel. Thus it was that the fanaticism of that day took its rise, and he (Mr. O'Connell) would warn the hon. member for Maidstone, and the gentlemen who thought with him, that the fanaticism which, at that period, was guilty of such barbarous crimes, might, by the employment of similar means, be raised again in England. Had he not seen, within these few days, placarded on large carts ostentatiously driven through the streets of the town, "The horrors of Popery?" Were not meetings constantly held during the vacation? He could remind the House of dozens of them. Had not fanaticism been preached in every corner of the kingdom? Did they want to have another Bradshaw to preside at the trial of a queen? There was something ominous in that name. He called upon the House not to countenance by its votes anything which could lead to such abominations. But had this fanaticism no partizans, no organ by which it could appeal to the public; had it no newspaper press, no protectors? Why, he found that it was embodied in a volume, and dedicated to Lord Lyndhurst. The book was called, "The Metropolitan Conservative Press," and he found, on reading the pompous list of subscribers, that the names of the commoners began with that of Sir Robert Peel. Then came the right hon. F. Shaw, M.P., Recorder of Dublin, and, shortly afterwards, James Bradshaw, Esq., M.P. Then, turning back the page, he saw that the motto was, "Fear God—honour the Queen." He was aware that he had trespassed at some length upon the patience of the House; but he was anxious, if possible, to confirm, by his testimony, the fact that tranquillity, which, all admitted, now

prevailed in Ireland. He defied those who followed him in this debate—and he knew that he should be ably followed, for some of the ablest men in the nation had not yet spoken—but he defied those who should follow him to show that there was now anything of disturbances in Ireland. He was counsel for Ireland, and he appeared there to plead her cause. England was discontented and disaffected—Ireland was tranquil. England was distracted by lawless bands of physical-force Chartists—Ireland did not seek to attain her ends by violence, by resistance of the law, by destruction of property. In England, rebel bands were led against the armed soldiery; but those soldiers knew duty, and performed it. What were they? Irishmen. In England the lives of the gentry were threatened. A spirit of assassination had sprung up. The hon. member for Nottingham had described how the amiable fathers of families—respectable, unoffending men—had been marked out for assassination. Had the Irish in England joined the Chartists? Had they evinced a desire to link themselves with these assassins? With a few wretched exceptions, there were none. Had the Irish in England taken any part with the Chartists? They had grievances—they had sufferings—they had many causes of complaint. Did they join the Chartists? No; even the tradesmen of Dublin, whose combinations he opposed at the peril of his life, even they rejected Chartism. Ireland had become tranquil; no more calumnies would be uttered against her upon that score. Her military force was diminished, and why? Because the troops, which were necessary to struggle against rebellion, sedition, and treason in England, were not required to maintain the good order which prevailed in Ireland. Another speech of his had been referred to, or, at least, a part of it had been referred to, by the hon. and learned member for Coleraine, who had made extracts, and commented upon them, with about the same sort of candour as the hon. and learned serjeant (Serjeant Jackson) had shown in dealing with another speech. The hon. and learned member for Coleraine read that part of a speech of his (Mr. O'Connell's) in which he spoke of

the downfall of the funds, and so on. He asked, in that speech, what the three per cents. would be worth if Ireland were in rebellion, and the men of Kerry led on by himself, even though that news should be accompanied with intelligence that the chief agitator was put down, and the rebellion put down? How did he say that? What he said then he would repeat now. He was addressing himself to the Conservative party in England, and the purport of his address was this:—

“You, the gentlemen of England, who have property acquired, either by yourselves or your ancestors—who have all the blessings of this world surrounding you, Oh, send us not over a ministry that cannot govern us well—drive not the people to despair; let not an almost eternal civil war prevail. Oh! if you have mercy, stand between Ireland and an Orange ministry.”

He would now make that appeal again. He might make the appeal in vain. He knew that the party he dreaded—the party whose dominion in Ireland had been so fatal to all the best interests of that country—were surrounded on the present occasion, from every quarter of the kingdom, to see if it were possible, by a vote of that House, to regain something of their former ascendancy. He trusted he should never live to see that day. One of the most respectable amongst them had been chosen to be the leader of the attack. “Up, guards, and at them!” was their cry. Oh! he had seen these noble guards many a time; but he well remembered, that the meteor flag of England, borne by their intrepid hands, had never waved in triumph in the foughten field, where the commingling blood of the heroes who achieved the victory had not flowed in equal streams from the veins of the gallant Irish. He was a Repealer only when he could not get justice. He asked only for equality. If there was an Union—a real Union—he was entitled to ask for equality. If he had not equality he cared not for the Union. He wished not for repeal if he could get justice without it; but if he could not get it, then he knew of nothing that could prevent his applying for repeal. He had a right to do so; and if the

necessity arose, he would exert it. Never before had the House heard of the tranquillity of Ireland. But there was another feature in her case—a feature which had been slightly touched upon by the noble lord, the Secretary for Ireland. He had received a newspaper that day, which stated that more than 600,000 persons had given the pledge of temperance to Father Mathew. What was the result? A striking diminution in the amount of outrages and crimes. At Waterford, where the monthly return for outrages, for years past, had amounted to no less than 150, there was, during the last month, not one single case. They might think that its tranquillity was temporary. Oh! they did not know the tenacity of the Irish people. They had shown it in matters of war and contest, and they were capable of showing it in matters of the sublimest morality. It was that people who were now before the House of Commons, and who had been assailed only with the ribaldry of such as the learned would-be serjeant, the member for Coleraine. That people had come scathless from every one else. It was that people who now made their demand upon them. In the name of that people, (said Mr. O'Connell in conclusion) I present this ministry to you, the first ministry that ever did justice to Ireland. I present them to you in the attitude of our friends—ay, and of your friends also; for they enabled us to afford security to you; and though they were not permitted by you to grant us the Parliamentary franchise in so complete a form as they desired, yet they did all they could to administer impartially the law which they could not amend as they wished. In the name of the Irish nation I present them to you. Will you vote against them, with the Hewsons, the M'Neils, the M'Ghees, and the Bradshaws? or will you vote for them, as I demand of you, in the sight of heaven, and in the name of God?

Subject, REGISTRATION OF VOTERS, IRELAND ;

Date, MARCH 26, 1840.

Mr. O'Connell remarked, that the noble lord had concluded by saying that this was not a party question. He supposed that it was mere accident that brought together such a crowded assembly. There was no intention of treating the question as a party question; it was accident, of course. Passing from that, he was really astonished at the length of time during which the noble lord kept up his tone of moderation, and kept down the disposition supposed to be natural to him. But at length the noble lord came to excommunication. There was nothing of party in that; there was no bigotry in that; no, nor in the sneer about the chapel. Never was there a culumny so unfounded. He defied the noble lord to prove it. There was one asserter of it, and one only, he meant in the evidence given before the Fictitious Votes Committee, or the Intimidation Committee, he did not know which; but as a practice which could be traced as prevalent in Ireland, that he utterly and contemptuously denied (*cheers*). He was not to be put down by mock cheers. Having disposed of this preliminary matter, he would proceed, if the House would condescend to listen to him; if not, he would take some other opportunity. He would now proceed. It was scarcely worth while to notice some arguments employed by the noble lord founded upon matters personal to himself. Those arguments first came from the right hon. gentleman the Recorder of Dublin, who read a speech of his from one of the Dublin newspapers, in which he was made to say, that he defied the Government to pass the measure of the noble lord. Now, he had never said so, nor did he see the report in which this language was attributed to him until he was on his way over from Ireland, and the first thing which he did when he arrived was, to go to the noble lord, and assure him that he said no such thing, referring him at

the same time to the newspaper which contained an accurate report of what he did say. That paper was the *Freeman's Journal*, and in that paper it was stated, that he did set at defiance, not the Government, but the enemies of Ireland and the most malignant amongst them ?

As he was on the subject of chronology, he would refer to some supposed contradiction between the report to which the noble lord had alluded and the petition. It so happened that the report was prepared first. That report cost him sixteen hours' work, and it contained at great length the detailed objections against the bill. The noble lord had had that report before him for several days, and he had not shown him to be wrong in any one single particular. This bill, although he did not say that such an object was intended, was with a vicious ingenuity calculated to annihilate the franchise of Ireland. The situation of Ireland was extraordinary—he might say pitiful. What had happened in the other House of Parliament? Subjects of the greatest importance, and most nearly affecting the interests of Ireland, were staved off, because, unhappily, one noble lord was ill, and another fantastic and learned lord was elsewhere. Ireland was waiting for the convalescence of a noble and learned lord who had called Irishmen aliens in blood, in religion, and language. Such an insult was never offered to any country. Ireland was also obliged to wait for another noble and learned lord, who had a great deal of wit and talent, but no wisdom; while at the same time the mighty leader of hon. gentlemen opposite said, that he never wished for a postponement of any question without a sufficient reason. The noble lord had been reading, he did not know from what documents, a manuscript history of the Reform Bill, as it was brought into the House of Commons. He did not know who the writer was, but he was certainly no accurate historian, for he placed him in the position of one who was anxious to raise and limit the franchise, whereas, all his efforts were directed towards the object of obtaining a franchise at least as low as that of England, and when he found he could not get

that, he divided the House upon the question of a £5 instead of a £10 franchise. And yet the noble lord gave the House a manuscript history of the transaction, in a style which he could only describe as chit-chatting, and represented him as desirous of narrowing the franchise. The noble lord ought to look back to that period with great regret. If he had possessed as statesmanlike a mind as he had talent for debate, he would have seen that he ought not to have thrown away that great occasion. It was a great occasion. The Reform Bill presented an opportunity of placing Ireland in the position which she ought to occupy. But the noble lord, while he gave to England great advantages, inflicted on Ireland mighty wounds. He met the noble lord from day to day, but he had found the noble lord in the Cabinet the perpetual enemy of his country. To him was to be attributed the restricted franchise which was imposed upon Ireland. This made the people of Ireland shudder at any measure which the noble lord introduced. In England the Reform Bill took away both the rotten and the nomination boroughs. It destroyed the rotten boroughs in Scotland, and it gave to Scotland eight additional members. Even to Wales, with a population of 800,000 inhabitants, the Government gave four additional members; but to Ireland, with a population of 8,000,000, they gave but five, indeed only four, for one member was given to the University of Dublin, and that might well be said to be a vote against Ireland. The right hon. gentleman, the Recorder of Dublin, had said that the Repeal of the Union was a cry fit only for old women and boys; it was well that the right hon. gentleman did not enter into either category. But he did not think that the public mind would be dissatisfied when a contrast was drawn between the relative positions of England and Ireland as affected by the Reform Bill. He knew well how difficult it was to restrain that feeling. The Reform Bill annihilated no franchise that it found in England. The owner of a 40s. fee, and the owner of a 40s. life estate, were left untouched by the bill. Every franchise that the Reform Bill found it left, and it augmented the number. But in

Ireland it destroyed several franchises. In several Irish boroughs there were voters entitled by the ownership of a 40s. fee and a 40s. life estate, and there was a £5 franchise in Dungarvan and Lismore. These franchises were all annihilated. He knew that the noble lord was not aware of what he had done. In Dublin there were 1,300 40s. freeholders; there were now only 14. And yet the noble lord boasted that he had extended the franchise in Ireland. But then it was said that the county voters were augmented. Why, the leasehold voters only amounted to 8,000. But the noble lord said that he gave Ireland the same £10 franchise as England—a franchise of a £10 value. He would, however, ask whether a franchise of a £10 value was the same franchise in London and Ennis, in Manchester and Tralee, in Bristol and Portarlington? There was the name, indeed, but not the reality; and yet the noble lord called this placing Ireland on an equality with England in regard to the franchise. The noble lord had repented even of that, and had brought in a bill, the object of which was, to deprive Ireland of the leasehold franchise conferred by the Reform Bill. The noble lord came for that purpose to the House at a moment when, as it seemed, it would be more agreeable to the noble lord, and it ought to be, to be elsewhere (*interruption*). It was not I (continued the hon. and learned member) who invited the noble lord here (*interruption*). I know the cause of these brutal exclamations (“*Adjourn*,” and “*chair*”). Nothing will keep those who are inimical to Ireland from the indulgence of their hostility towards that country. It is not my fault. I have heard of other instances which may, perhaps, be found among those who are accidentally present to-night. I will now come back to the point on which I was enlarging. The hon. and learned gentleman proceeded to say, that the noble lord had, in that honest explanation of his, which he had given that night, admitted that it was his intention to assist the landlords of Ireland in their endeavours to prevent their tenants from voting. There was not the slightest doubt that the bill would very considerably limit the franchise. Members

on his side of the House computed that it would annihilate two-thirds of the constituency of Ireland. It was also agreed by hon. members opposite, that the effect of the bill would be to limit the constituency. There was, then, no question between the two sides of the House as to its actual operation. Let it, then, be avowed, without any paltry hypocrisy, that the object of the bill was to annihilate the franchise. He would deal with the measure as if that were the avowed object. Hon. members opposite complained of fictitious votes. Was the constituency so extensive that they had a right to complain that persons were on the registry who ought not to be there? Were the people so extensively represented that it was of no importance how many votes were struck off the register?

Why did not hon. members come forward and say, "There are so many registered voters for the country that it is impossible, looking at the population, that they can all be fairly entitled to vote." He would show the disproportion between the representation of England and Ireland. In Westmoreland, after the Reform Act, the population was 35,046, and the number of voters 4,392; while Cork, which had a population of 700,366, had but 3,835 electors. Yet, with that fact staring hon. gentleman opposite in the face, they came forward with this Bill to destroy fictitious votes. The right hon. baronet, the member for Pembroke, had said that base falsehoods were resorted to for the purpose of getting on the Irish register. Whoever supplied him with that information asserted the basest of falsehoods. But he would go on with his comparison. Bedfordshire, with a population of 88,524, had 3,966 voters; while the Protestant county of Antrim, with 316,909 inhabitants, had only 3,484. What had the Protestant county of Antrim done that it should not have an equal number of voters with Bedfordshire? The noble lord was extremely anxious to carry this Bill, and to remedy the abuses which had crept into the registration. Now, he would ask, was there any abuse equal to an abuse of principle? But the noble lord not only suffered this enormous disproportion between the two countries to exist, but

he came to the House with a proposition for still further limiting the constituency of Ireland. But he would proceed. There was Rutland, with 19,000 inhabitants, and 1,296 voters; Longford had a population amounting to 112,391, while the number of electors was but 1,294. He knew he should fatigue the House by going on with these illustrations, but they were powerful for his object, and would operate powerfully on the honest hearts and common sense of the people of England, or, at least, they ought to do so. The noble lord was not acting of himself, but was propelled by others. He supposed the hon. member for Belfast had furnished the noble lord with law, as he had done with evidence. The hon. member came to the noble lord, and his name was put on the back of this Bill; or, in the phrase which the noble lord had applied in connection with Ireland, the Bill was branded with the names of the noble lord and the hon. member for Belfast, who had come reeking from his Orange lodge, his Orange toasts with nine times nine, the Kentish fire, and "No Surrender." Now, to return to the comparison between the number of voters in England and those in Ireland. In the Isle of Wight, with 228,731 inhabitants, there were 1,167 voters. In the county of Mayo, with 366,328 inhabitants, there were only 1,350; and in the county of Tyrone, with 310,000 inhabitants, only 1,151. So that Protestant Tyrone and Catholic Galway were mixed up in equal disfranchisement, not having so many voters as the Isle of Wight. Was he an Irishman and to say nothing on that point? Was he not bound to respect their sorrows, while more mischief was threatened to them? He would now take the two largest counties: Yorkshire, an agricultural county, with a population of 913,713, had 33,154 voters; whilst Cork, with 713,000 inhabitants, had only 3,385. Now, ought that proportion to remain? Ought they not to struggle to give to the people of Ireland an equal proportion of voters to the population, as there was in this country? He should be very short in his comparison of the cities of the two countries; but even there the same proportion existed. He had forgotten to give the noble lord

credit for having annihilated in the cities of Ireland the votes of joint tenants. Mark how important that was; for in Ireland no gentleman could have a vote for the premises which he held with his partners, although they might be worth £300 a year. He was told that Exeter Hall had furnished no less than eighty-five votes in the first year of the registration; while, in Ireland, if premises were of the same value, not a single vote could have been registered if they had been held by partners; and yet that was one of the things for which the noble lord taunted the law officers on his (Mr. O'Connell's) side of the House, because, in the Bill they had brought in, there was a clause to redress such a monstrous hardship. Ought they not, then, to put the franchise on a better footing before they talked of registration? Now, in Exeter, there were 27,000 inhabitants and 3,420 voters; but in Waterford there were 28,000 inhabitants, but only 1,278 voters. In Worcester there were 27,213 inhabitants, and 2,608 voters; in Limerick, 66,554 inhabitants, and only 2,850 voters. In Cork there were 110,000 inhabitants and 3,650 voters; while, in Newcastle-on-Tyne, with only 42,000 inhabitants, there were 4,952. He had shown, then, in the towns as well as in the counties, that there was a miserable defalcation of voters in Ireland. And now, having read those Parliamentary documents, he would turn round on hon. members opposite, and ask why they had spoken of that small and paltry number as fictitious voters? What scope was there for it? If, however, they succeeded in this Bill, then would Ireland be still more restricted in the number of her voters. Having made these preliminary observations, he would now state his objections to the Bill. He objected to it in principle, independent of its details. His first objection to it was that which the noble lord had called one of its merits. It was because it was purely and simply a registration Bill. He said that, in the nature of things, there ought first to be an explanation of the doubts as to the franchise before they entered into the question of registration. The great difficulty was the franchise. Nine-tenths of the struggles in the registration courts would never have

arisen if the franchise had been properly defined. They ought, while they defined it, to extend it; but to talk of registration with an undefined franchise was an absurdity. The great question at present was between the solvent and beneficial interest tenant. He knew there were some who contended that they meant the same thing; but they who were in Ireland knew that the battles in the registration courts chiefly turned on the question between the profit rent made by the solvent tenant and that of the beneficial interest. Some judges decided one way; some another. Some assistant-barristers held the one opinion, some the other. Now, suppose some assistant-barrister took the profit-rent mode of the solvent tenant, and allowed a vote, and that the judge was of the same opinion, and the oath was registered; while in another town the barrister took the beneficial interest mode, and the judge decided in the same way. Thus there would be two decisions directly opposite. Ought there to be that difference?

The hon. and learned gentleman, the member for Exeter, had given his opinion on this point. A more able lawyer there was not in the House, or out of it. A more agreeable, he would say, fascinating speaker he had never heard. But he regretted to find him always in the van when an attack was to be made on Ireland. He would not say that the hon. and learned member did not adhere to his principles; but he might be permitted to deplore the way in which they were exercised. When the Spottiswoodes, with their gang of conspirators, threatened to turn out every Liberal member from the House, who was their great and successful advocate? Who was it who found out particular cases in which similar practices had been pursued on particular occasions, and had drawn this inference from them, that it might be done on a great national scale? Who, but the hon. and learned member for Exeter? It was very fit, then, he should be one of the supporters of the noble lord. He was very much surprised, however, at something that had fallen from him. The hon. and learned gentlemen said he had heard of a judgment given by the judges in Ireland, on the question of

test, and said that that ought to be final. How could so able a lawyer have made that mistake? Where did he find one single clause in one single Act authorising the judges to meet at all on that subject, or that gave any appeal to them? No; if they had, then they must have heard counsel on both sides, pronounced their judgment, and given their reasons at large, and the public would have heard what that judgment was. He would not pretend to dispute with the hon. and learned member for Exeter upon a point of law; but this was a plain and palpable matter of fact. No judgment was given by the judges. There was, indeed, a sort of consultation among them, from which the clients themselves were excluded, and from which counsel also were excluded. He need not point out to the honourable and learned member the value of able and learned counsel in assisting judges to form their decision. This could not be called a judgment, it was a mere private consultation, and nothing else, and had been considered in that light by the judges themselves. The right hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin might assert that there could be no such things as political judges, that it was impossible for judges to be political partisans; but he (Mr. O'Connell) was of a different opinion, and thought that he who was a violent politician at the bar, would be a politician, more cool, more cautious, perhaps, but on that account more mischievous upon the bench. There stood he who had refused a high judicial office, solely because he would not trust himself to take a course by which there was a possibility of the administration of justice being polluted with political feelings. What were the opinions of the judges themselves, as to the weight to be attached to this decision of theirs, as it was called? Why, on one point, it was generally said, and generally believed, two of the judges dissented from the other ten. Did these two acquiesce in the decision of the majority? On the contrary, one of them said afterwards, he did not consider himself bound by such advice, for judgment it was not. On another point, five judges were supposed to have dissented from the rest, and, on this point, the

Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the case of George Pratt, Queen's County, had given judgment in a manner inconsistent with the conclusion to which the judges had come at the private meeting to which he had alluded. So far was the question from being settled, and settled by judicial decision, it could not be said that it was at that moment settled at all. And yet the noble lord opposite wanted to introduce the Regulation Bill, which would leave that important question still open. The noble lord had struggled to get out of his own declaration in 1829. "How should I," said the noble lord, "recollect what I said in 1829?" But it appeared from what the noble lord said in 1832, that he then had some scant recollection of what he had said in 1829; for then it was that the noble lord himself invented the beneficial interest test, and, having struck out the true principle, proclaimed it manfully. The question afterwards came to be considered in the House of Lords, in the discussions upon the Reform Bill, and there the principle met with the disapprobation of the Earl of Roden, a man who had never changed his opinion, on which account those who thought with him gave him their confidence, and those who differed from him respected him for his manly bearing. The noble lord then said that the introduction of such a principle into the Irish Reform Bill was effected by his (Mr. O'Connell's) manoeuvres. The noble earl did him too much honour, although he had certainly done his best to help the noble lord opposite in the course which he took. And yet the noble lord attempted to fritter away the effect of what he had done on this occasion, by bringing down some manuscript papers, for the purpose of showing that his (Mr. O'Connell's) opinions had been in favour of enhancing the franchise, when it was well known that he was anxious to lower it as much as possible. Was this question then still to remain undetermined? Every other bill contained a clause respecting the right of voting in the case of joint-tenancies, and tenancies in common, and another clause defining the beneficial interest to be the tenant's profit, and not the landlord's rent. But the noble lord took a

different course; he was content to leave litigation where he found it. This arose from his anxiety to exclude from the franchise as many as possible. That was a bad principle, and would not long be supported. Chartism had frightened many into the support of such a principle. But the Irish people had refused to join the Chartists. Chartism, he trusted, had passed away; but while it was at its height, and while timid men trembled at its progress, he reminded the House that the Irish people had refused to make common cause with the Chartists in demanding universal suffrage. And how did the noble lord propose to reward the Irish people for their conduct? Why, thus: he said, "I find your franchise small and miserable, and I will give you such machinery as will render it impossible for you to realise even the franchise which you possess." His (Mr. O'Connell's) first objection to the bill was, that it contained nothing to define or to enlarge the franchise.

It was said he had once been in favour of an annual revision and an appeal both ways; but why might he not change his opinion as well as the noble lord? He certainly had at first thought that the system which prevailed in England ought to be adopted in Ireland; but who then opposed him? Why, the noble lord himself. Who spoke against him on that occasion? The noble lord. He was then for an annual revision; but the noble lord was against it. It had changed sides since that time. But the reason why the change had been reciprocal was, that there had been great experience upon the subject; and how had that experience told? It showed that there was an organized resistance to an annual registry of the franchise; and he did not believe that it was practicable. His next objection was, that this Bill would disfranchise all Ireland at once. Every man who registered on the 20th of November last would lose the benefit of that registry. After six weeks' battling in Dublin there were registered in his interest a majority of three hundred votes. The entire registry consisted of from 1,100 to 1,200 voters. They went through the ordeal; attorney, and counsel, and witnesses were brought on both sides; and now they were

to be deprived at once of their rights, and disfranchised by this Bill! Where could they find such a sweeping measure of disfranchisement as this? Where was there exhibited such a contempt of vested rights as this? Would any one turn upon him and say, "Were there no such sweeping clauses in the Bill of 1835?" Why there were in that Bill those redeeming qualities which, if they were put in this Bill, would make him content to let it go into committee. But he would never consent in the absence of those or more explicit clauses. Was it reasonable or fair to have this sweeping disfranchisement? The voters already registered were to come up again to the revising court; the notices were to be served again; witnesses were to be examined as to the notices, and as to the facts, and as to the value of the property. Everything was to be tried over again that had been tried within the last year. Was there ever greater injustice offered to the electors? They would have no advantage from their present register; not even a *prima facie* case could be made from it for them. They were to be treated just as if they had never been on the register. No man need give notice of objection. Every man was at liberty to come forth and object, without giving the slightest warning. Uncertainty and disfranchisement were to be thrown over the whole register. Oh, shame upon those that would commit that gross, that glaring, that palpable injustice! His next objection was to a matter apparently of detail, but really of the essence of this Bill. He meant the notice required to be served. Why was it so complicated? A notice containing so many things, and requiring so much precision, never was yet introduced into any bill of this description. He was unwilling to fatigue the House by going into all the particulars, but he would mention two or three things which appeared to him to be most monstrous. Notice was to be given at the distance of thirty or forty miles, the name was to be written at full length, and the particulars of the nature of the qualification, the parish, and place in which it was situated were to be specified, and its situation within that parish or place; there must be the local description of the pro-

perty and the name of the tenant or tenants, and the names of all the lives in the original, and in any renewed grant. Why, the best franchise in Ireland were those that had passed through a century of renewals for life; for in every one of those leases must be specified every renewal; or else the party, through the omission of one of them, could be defeated. Then, again, the right to the property must be specified, and that in every case, even in cases in which an assignee was concerned, and where it would require a competent lawyer to ascertain the right. Yet all that must be stated, and that the party believed what he stated. He mentioned these details as proof of the noble lord's anxiety not to touch the franchise in Ireland. The very first proof that must be given of the franchise before the assistant-barrister, must be the proof of every one of these particulars. Here was another singular contrast afforded between the case of England and that of Ireland. At present a residence in towns and boroughs in Ireland entitled the parties to vote as in England. But in England, if the voter changed his place of residence before the registration, his vote could be retained by him. In Ireland, in the case of a change of residence, the party must begin *de novo* to recover his vote. With respect to the matter of the certificate, he thought the bill of Mr. Woulfe would remove every difficulty. His next objection was to the appeal both ways. He knew that the hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin would quote his speech against him which he made in 1835, wherein he spoke in favour of the appeal both ways. But even then he expressed his mistrust of the judges; and now he was more impressed with a want of confidence in them; and that, with other considerations, led him to object to the appeal against votes already inserted on the register, because the franchise was sufficiently curtailed already. He had not exhausted all his objections to this Bill; but he deceived himself much if he had not stated sufficient to induce the House to reject a measure, which, if it had not been so intended, must practically operate to diminish the franchise of the Irish people, to

make less what was now little, to diminish what ought to be augmented, to disfranchise the people, and be another blow to the liberties of Ireland. He conjured the House, respectfully, at once to throw out the Bill, which would perpetuate injustice in Ireland. He feared it was vain to ask either side to do justice to Ireland. But, whether he might be blamed or laughed to ridicule, he would say it was impossible the present state of things should continue. The people of Ireland were too numerous not to attain peaceably and loyally, but firmly and constitutionally, an increase of rights. This attempt to spoil them would be met with a firm and manly indignation. They were now carried away by an unnatural excitement. They were exhibiting another instance of their high excellence among the nations of the earth. They had, of all others, been the most faithful to what they believed the true creed, amidst war, plunder, desolation, and blood; and now they were rising in the might of a giant morality. They were now universally avoiding every species of intoxicating excitement. Prudence was marking their steps and their conduct. Indiscreet marriages, formerly a blemish in their character, had altogether ceased. The moral lesson was becoming a practical one. Dispose of them as England might; insult them if she chose; in his humble opinion they were her equals in constitutional rights; he believed them to be her superiors in morality and political integrity.

Subject, REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—ADJOURNED
DEBATE; *Date*, MAY 20, 1840.

The same subject was resumed on the 11th June, and a fiery scene ensued. O'Connell declared in angry tones "that this was a bill to trample on the rights of the people of Ireland." Uproar and laughter followed, and he reiterated his words, adding: "If you were ten times as beastly in your uproar and bellowing, I should still feel it to be my duty to interpose to prevent this injustice." Sir T. Canning rose to demand a retraction of the word "beastly." The unfortunate Chairman was appealed to, but the noise was so great he

could not be heard; when he could, he apologised for O'Connell, saying it was no doubt an "inadvertent expression."

O'Connell replied: "I used the words bellowing; did you ever hear any other bellowing than beastly? What sounds were they? Were they human sounds?" Mr. Lambton rose to call attention to the way in which O'Connell had been treated before he used the words complained of. He said, "it was disgraceful to an assembly of English gentlemen to attempt to tyrannize over one individual member." Mr. C. Butler said that O'Connell was interrupted by whistling, and that those who introduced "the manners of an ale-house" must take the consequences. Lord Clements stood up boldly for O'Connell, and said he was insulted to his face in the grossest manner. Lord Maidstone said he would not be satisfied until O'Connell retracted, and O'Connell replied that he was perfectly content with the noble lord's dissatisfaction. Lord John Russell, much as he hated Popery, could not do without Papists, and threw the balm of an oily speech on the troubled waters.

Mr. O'Connell—Instead of feeling annoyed at the unnecessary allegation of a fact by the hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Thesiger) which, if I thought it necessary, I could show to be different, I am ready to concede to him that he has made out a case, to a certain extent, in his attempt to prove, that this Bill is favourable to members, and to persons petitioning. It is equally advantageous to the £50 freeholder and to the clergy of the Established Church. It is a good Bill for the clergy; it is a good Bill for the £50 freeholder; it is a good Bill for those who have obtained seats, or those who struggle for them; but it would be hard to show that it is a good Bill for the poorer classes. Sir, the noble lord under whose patronage this Bill was introduced, exhibited last night a good deal of his excellent resentment against me. He threw it completely away. From the state of the House at present, from the open hostility of the enemies of Ireland, and the lukewarm zeal of her friends, I have no fear that I am safe in adjourning any retaliation I may be disposed to make on the noble lord's vituperative attacks to another discussion. I think it obvious that we shall have opportunities enough of carrying on our disputes before the forty clauses of this Bill are disposed of in committee. I therefore adjourn the quarrel to some future occasion. Before I proceed I must take notice

of one quotation which the noble lord has made. The noble lord has made a statement, attributed to me, out of the *Mirror of Parliament*, which he read correctly, and in which it is alleged that I favoured £10 franchise in counties. The noble lord states his recollection of the matter being canvassed in 1832, and he says I have changed my opinion since that period. Now, I wish just to tell him that, in 1832, that passage was quoted against me by the noble lord's solicitor-general, and I said it was arrant nonsense. To be sure, that was not conclusive of my not having uttered it; but I ventured to show Mr. Crampton, who was not very remarkable for his candour, that it was wholly unintelligible, and was a mistake of the reporter which he might have naturally fallen into from not having the Act of Parliament before him. I also asked Mr. Crampton whether he was prepared to deny the accuracy of my recollection of what I had really stated. His answer was, "I have no recollection of the circumstance; but I make my statement from the records of the period." I asserted in a more solemn manner than, perhaps, was necessary, that the passage had been misstated; but here, again, it is brought up in judgment against me. I do not blame the noble lord for not recollecting these details, but I hope he will not quote this passage again without bearing in mind the contradiction I gave it in 1832. At all events, this explanation disembarasses the discussion of that point. One remark more before I go into the merits of the case between the noble lord and me. He accuses me of having unjustly and untruly—I don't mean with any want of courtesy—alleged that no franchises were annihilated in England, and he maintains that there were several. The noble lord instanced burgage tenure. Not being a lawyer, it was not difficult for him to fall into this error; but if he looks to the 31st clause of the Reform Act, he will find it gives the franchise to such persons without reference to value or occupation. He also stated that the freemen's franchise was annihilated, whereas it remained, the non-residents only being disqualified. I am glad I have got rid of these preliminaries.

[*Lord Stanley*: "Where do you leave the potwallopers and scot and lot voters?"] I'll show on a future occasion the amount and nature of that loss. I prefer now, if the noble lord will consent, going on with an examination of the merits of this Bill. I denounce this Bill as one for annihilating the franchise, under the pretence of revising it. How is that to be effected? By unnecessary trouble—by multiplied vexation—by enormous expense—by hazard costs—by inducing a repetition of the landlord's power of intimidation and persecution—by throwing every obstacle in the way of the elector's registration—in short, by a dissolution of all the powers with which the oppressor can harass the victim of his wrath, and of all the authority which wealth can exercise over comparative poverty. Who will take up this Bill and deny that these are its characteristics? The hon. member for Halifax seems to disapprove of every material section in it. He is not even satisfied with its title, and yet he votes for going into Committee. He is like the man, who denied that his knife was a new one, though he had changed both the blade and handle. He disapproves of all the details, and yet votes for the entire bill. There are some English gentlemen here who are ignorant of the machinery by which the franchise is opposed in Ireland. They do not know the extreme lengths to which some persons go to prevent the people from registering. There are two documents I wish the House to attend to. They will show the object which the Irish electors have to contend with. The first of these is the circular of Mr. Nettles, who, it was said last night, bore an opposite name. This is the letter:—

"*Nettleville, March 25, 1839.*

"SIR—I have been directed to state to you that the person whose name is mentioned on the other side has served notice to re-register his vote at the ensuing Cork sessions, which will commence on the first of April. As our being able to return Conservative members for this county entirely depends on our preventing the re-registry of our own tenants, the committee trust that you will exert yourself to effect that desirable object, and that you will have the goodness to inform me as soon as possible whether his certificate has

been forwarded to our opponents, or any authority given to produce it at the sessions, as in such case it will be necessary for us to have a notice served on him requiring his presence at these sessions, where, if he does not appear, the re-registry cannot take place.—I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

“ROB. NETTLES, Hon. Dis. Sec.”

Do you understand now, gentlemen of England, the position to which the Irish claimant is reduced? I will give another Conservative specimen, and I venture to say that no English gentleman would treat voters thus.

This is the Report of the Quarter Sessions in Westmeath, January, 1840:—

“COUNTY WESTMEATH.—THE FRANCHISE.—At the quarter sessions for this county, which have just closed, there were notices served for upwards of five hundred persons as claimants to register, yet between Moate and Mullingar—the two divisions where the sessions were held—only about one hundred answered. Of those, the numbers registered were—at Moate, fifty-two Liberals, six Conservatives; at Mullingar, eleven Liberals, five Conservatives; and this result affords not an unfair criterion to estimate the relative force of each party in the county. Yet there is a permanent staff of paid witnesses, who attend at every sessions against the Liberal claimants as counsel and agent to oppose them at the Moate sessions. One of these witnesses, William Bell, a frieze-coated countryman, was called to disprove the qualification of Thomas Brennan, of Rosemount (Brennan being a tenant of Sir Richard Nagle), and Bell having, upon his direct examination, deposed to the acreable value of the holding far below the amount stated on the part of Brennan, and who Bell admitted to be a respectable and faithworthy man, the following facts appeared upon cross-examination by Mr. Plunkett, counsel:—

“COUNSEL: Pray, Bell, what other source of income or livelihood have you beside the farm you hold?”

“BELL: I have an annuity.

“COUNSEL: An annuity! Is it a rent-charge—who pays it?”

“BELL: The Conservative gentlemen of the county.

“COUNSEL: What amount?”

“BELL: Forty pounds a year.

“COUNSEL: For what?”

“BELL: For this I am doing—valuing votes.

“In the case of another claimant, Cormack, of Bracknahoile, Joseph

Murdock, who is also one, or, rather, the chief of the permanent staff, swore that he viewed and valued the claimant's farm; and a Mr. William March deposed that he had viewed and valued it, and that it was not worth £10 a year above the rent. Upon cross-examination, and upon confronting Murdock and the claimant, Murdock said:—I viewed what I think to be his farm, but I don't swear positively, because I do not know it.

"THE BARRISTER: You led me to think that you knew it; or what do you mean by valuing and viewing the farm of the claimant, if you did not know it? Let the claimant be admitted."

"Joseph Murdock, William Bell, George Dickson, and George Ronaldson (the last a Scotchman) are our franchise valuers."

Is this the system you are to encourage? Is this the system that incorporates all the honour, all the intelligence, all the religion of the country; but we will come to that presently. He who valued the man's farm upon oath is contradicted upon oath, and then he admits that he only believes—that he does not know of his own knowledge—that the value of the farm is that which he had stated upon oath. I read this to show that there shall not be the shadow of an excuse for the passing of this Bill. I protest against this disfranchisement in the name and on behalf of the people of Ireland. I protest with as much solemnity as if I was assured that my protest would be received. If you succeed in this disfranchisement, you repeal the Reform Act for Ireland—you repeal the Catholic Emancipation Act—not as relates to the wealthy part of the Roman Catholic population, but as relates to the middle classes. The Irish people bid me tell you that they impute this Bill to two distinct and separate reasons. The first is a national antipathy to the Irish people. Yes, they say so. They say, also, that it has originated in the virulence of malignant bigotry. Now, I am bound to show upon what grounds they attributed this Bill to these causes. If those grounds be satisfactory, you ought to reject this Bill; if they are not, my argument goes for nothing. Have they not a right to say there is a national antipathy? Are there not multitudes of those on the other side, and their supporters, who, in their speeches, their election tirades, their after-dinner harangues, have expressed themselves in the most vile way of

the Irish people? I have a bundle of them here, but I will not disgust myself or the House by reading them. Yes, I say they have expressed themselves thus of the people of Ireland in their election speeches and their after-dinner harangues, where—in *vino veritas*. Then what say you to your Press—your favourite Press—your pampered press—wealthy because you patronize it—to the vile *Times*, and the rest of that gang (*laughter*). You laugh when I say the “vile *Times*,” but was it not that print that designated the priesthood of Ireland, “surpliced ruffians,” and her population “shoeless and shirtless vagabonds?” Think you the Irish people know that you receive not this foul slander with condemnation, and that the press which uttered it is under your protection? Oh! they have reason to say there is a national antipathy. But have they any reason to doubt that the Bill is founded on motives of religious bigotry? The hon. member for Londonderry county spoke the other day in high commendation of a meeting, held on the 2nd of May, at Belfast, and in speaking of the wealth and respectability of the gentlemen that attended it, selected one individual for his particular praise, and that was Dr. Stewart, a Presbyterian clergyman. Now, on the objection to this Bill—that its operation would be unequal as between Protestants and Catholics—that rev. gentleman admitted that such might be the case, but that it did not arise from the principle of the measure, but from other causes, one of which was, that a greater regard existed among Protestants for their oaths than among Catholics. Does the hon. gentleman, in the presence of the Catholic gentry who surround him—does he, I say, presume, in the presence of some of the first gentry—to tell me, with miserable bigotry, that the Roman Catholics have no regard for their oath? Have not Catholics lost advantages and power and honours? Why, there is not one Roman Catholic, except the young gentleman immediately before me, who has not been excluded from power and dignity for years. The rev. gentleman further said:—

“If a Catholic committed perjury in aid of the Church, it was held to be

44 *Malicious Misrepresentations of Catholic Belief.*

no perjury; and it was not to be doubted that, when a Catholic was driven by the priest to the registry, or to the hustings, he would act upon the same principle, particularly as he had the priest of the parish to give him absolution at his elbow."

The noble lord may ask, "How do you bring all this home to me?" I will tell him. Who was the principal orator at the late meeting? The hon. member for Belfast. And what do you find on the back of this Bill? That it is brought in by Lord Stanley, Lord Granville Somerset, and Mr. Emerson Tennant (the hon. member for Belfast). These names were selected by the noble lord. Am I wrong in attributing the Bill to a spirit of malicious bigotry? Then the noble lord, the member for Liverpool, made an eulogium upon the respectability of the signatures to the petition he presented. I have looked at those signatures, and among the foremost I find that of the rev. Hugh M'Neile, of Jezebel notoriety. Here is an extract from his speech:—

"Some of us have been giving warning to this country for the last ten or twelve years; we have been telling plainly, and pretty clearly, that the conscientious members of the Roman Catholic Church are not bindable by an oath administered by heretics. We have been making it plain that perjury is not to be considered a crime, committed by a few individuals belonging to the system, in spite of the system; but that it is a part, a deliberately organised part of the system itself."

And that is what is said of the Roman Catholic religion. This is what was said in the presence of some of the most accomplished gentry on the face of the earth. This is the petition brought up from such a meeting. This is the petition which the noble lord, the member for Liverpool, went out of his way to give us an abstract of. But that is not all. The rev. gentleman quotes a story, and from that story states that a multitude of perjuries were suggested by the priests at elections. He gave the story in detail; it was met at first with laughter, and ended with long continued shouts of applause. I am told that the Irish people are blunderers; that they do not understand what you are about. The hon. member for Caithness, amongst

the ludicrous capers he thought proper to cut, was, at least, candid; he called them assassins, and their priests supporters and prompters of perjury. I appeal to all liberal-minded English gentlemen whether they will give their countenance to these atrocious calumniators of the most numerous religious persuasion in the British empire; or, if it be disputed that they are most numerous, at least a very large proportion of the Queen's subjects. I do believe that there is even yet too much attachment to Ireland left in you, or, at least, too much liberality of feeling to allow you to sanction such calumnies. When Mr. M'Neile said there would be no peace as long as the woman Jezebel lived, I do not mean to impute to him that he meant the Queen (*question!*) I am speaking to the question—let the followers of Jezebel be silent. It was asserted in the Irish, and in some of the English newspapers that the expression was so meant; but I saw the disavowal. And what was that disavowal? He said he meant the Roman Catholic religion! Cheer that. That was the explanation given by the rev. gentleman, who is one of your leaders. I appeal to this House, in sight of the Catholic multitudes of the continent, and ask, shall it be said that doctrines of this kind are proclaimed by your leaders, your supporters—those whom you boast of as giving numbers to your petitions. Shall it be said that you countenance men of that stamp? If you do, I envy not your feelings; but this I say, that the people of Ireland are right in believing that malignant bigotry is at the bottom of this Bill. I ask the noble lord will he venture to bring in such a Bill as this for England? When he does, I will believe his sincerity. He never would attempt it. He is a bold man I know; but he is not bold enough to make such an attempt at the liberties of England. No; he reserves his kindness for the people of Ireland. Those who believed that in virulence and injustice there was a binding power, and a strength to unite, might vote for the Bill if they pleased. England and Ireland had now been united forty years. Did not the Union give the people of Ireland rights? Did it not give them a claim to equality of rights with the

people of England? For twenty-nine years of the Union the people of Ireland had been compelled to struggle for religious equality. For twenty-three years of the Union, the constitution was suspended. The people of Ireland assisted the people of England in obtaining the Reform Bill. How were they treated? Did they obtain the same franchise as the people of England? By no means. Their franchise was more limited; and now it was sought to contract it further. The rural population of Ireland amounted to 7,000,000—the registered electors of the whole kingdom amounted only to 60,607. This was of importance—a matter that could not be thrown over lightly. Before the Reform Bill, in January, 1829, the electors of Ireland numbered 216,871, being in the proportion of one to thirty-five of the whole population; whereas, at the present moment the proportion of electors to the whole population was only 1 to 117. Compare the proportion of electors in Ireland to the proportion of voters in any of the counties of England, and mark the difference. In the whole of Ireland there were only 60,600 electors, whilst in one riding of Yorkshire alone there were 33,000, being five per cent. more than one-half of the registered electors of Ireland. How, then, could the noble lord (Lord Stanley) talk of swamping the constituency of Ireland? He asked was this a Union? Were these the rights of a Union? Was not this a case calling upon the Legislature to give up every other labour until it had commenced and completed that which should be a labour of love—the placing of the people of Ireland on an equal footing with the people of England. What was the principle of this Bill? (asked the hon. and learned gentleman).

The Legislature might pay no regard to the inferiority of Ireland, it might pay no attention to that which made the iron enter into the souls of Irishmen, though it had not yet ground them down to be slaves; but was it thought that the number of electors in Ireland was too many? He had shown that the number for the whole country did not exceed double the number of a single riding of the county of York. What, then, be-

came of the noble lord's allegation that the real and sound constituency of Ireland had been swamped by fraudulent and perjured voters. It was said, that great fraud and much perjury were committed under the existing system; and the noble lord (Lord Stanley) read letters that he received, describing undue registries. The noble lord stated this fact about Stephens—that he registered in October, 1832—that, consequently, his registration and his certificate would last till October next—that, notwithstanding that fact, in March last he came in before the assistant-barrister with his certificate, and got a renewal of it for eight years, although his title expired that very hour. He did not accuse the noble lord of suppressing a fact, but he blamed him for not being more cautious of his correspondents. He had looked into the case of Stephens, and found it to be this: Stephens was a tenant of the Marquis of Lansdowne, and a Protestant; he came forward at the sessions to register, and when the barristers told him that his former lease had expired, he showed a letter from Mr. Robert Franks, the agent of the Marquis of Lansdowne, giving him a fresh term at the original rent. Let it be remembered that there was a clause in the Reform Bill expressly providing for cases of this description, a clause in which it was distinctly stated that any renewal or new lease should be considered as a continuation of the same qualification. Who was the assistant-barrister who admitted the claim of Stephens to be placed on the register? Mr. Blacker. This then showed what credit was to be placed in letters which came upon a sudden, and were intended to serve a particular purpose. He wished the House not to be led away by statements of this description, statements that were not authenticated, and which, upon investigation, in nine cases out of ten, turned out to be without foundation. It was said that the object of the present bill was to prevent fraud and perjury, and that the object of those who opposed it was to preserve and perpetrate those evils. A committee of the House upon fictitious votes in Ireland sat nearly two years ago, but it gave no report. Why? Because a case of fictitious votes was

not made out. Occasional errors might be discovered in every system; but anything like a systematic creation of fictitious votes was never discovered in Ireland. How different was the case in Scotland. There was a committee to inquire into the fictitious votes in that country. That committee made a report, and their report showed fiction and fraud to an extent that was horrifying. Four hundred votes were manufactured upon one small property, without a shilling being paid in the way of rent or annuity. Eight hundred votes were manufactured upon another small property. In short, the system in Scotland appeared to be general and most extensive. Why did not the noble lord try his hand upon Scotland? To be sure it was easier to attack Ireland. Scotland had friends, and true friends; Ireland had enemies—hearty and haughty enemies. The hon. baronet, the member for Caithness (Sir G. Sinclair), talked of fictitious votes in Ireland—why did he not look at Scotland? There was high authority for this recommendation—"Hypocrite, first take the beam out of thine own eye, then mayest thou see clearly to take the mote out of thy brother's eye." Then the noble lord talked about the frauds committed upon certificates. He admitted that the facility was great, and that frauds had been committed. But was not the noble lord cautioned that it would be so? Had he proposed the certificates? No; he opposed them, and showed the facilities which they would open to fraud and perjury. The noble lord, however, overruled the whole of his objections to the certificates; and having succeeded in introducing them, the noble lord now availed himself of the evil which he had originated as an engine to operate against the franchise in Ireland. Was that fair? When the noble lord was asked to give the same system of registration to Ireland as had been established in England, his answer was brief but distinct: "I cannot consent to introduce the English system of registration into Ireland as long as doubts exist as to whether it will work well in England." The noble lord had now found out that the system worked badly in England, and thereupon he proposed to introduce it into Ireland. Oh! if it

had worked well in England, it would have been long enough before Ireland got it. But it had worked for evil, and therefore Ireland was to have it. When he (Mr. O'Connell) pressed upon the noble lord his objections to the certificates, the noble lord gave him an answer which was not distinguished by his ordinary modesty and diffidence.

"The subject," said the noble lord, "has undergone a great deal of discussion out of the House, and I feel perfectly satisfied it is the best plan that can be adopted." That was the whole of the noble lord's reply; curt, certainly he would not say contumelious, but brief enough. The noble lord was "perfectly satisfied." He had never known the noble lord to come forward with any proposition upon which he was not "perfectly satisfied." The noble lord overruled his objections by an overwhelming majority, and this "best possible plan" was adopted. But now the noble lord came forward, and sought to rid himself of the mischief of his own creation by an instrument to contract, if not to extinguish, the franchise in Ireland. Nobody had suffered more from the abuse of the certificates than he had. He admitted that a remedy was required, but not such a remedy as that proposed by the noble lord. The way in which he would deal with the evil would be to pass a short Bill to do away with the certificates. That would be one remedy; but there was another. Extend and define the franchise in Ireland as it was extended and defined in England. Give to the people of Ireland the same franchise as was given to the people of England, and let them have the same proportion of voters. With respect to the decision upon the question of "beneficial interest," at the present moment the judges, if divided by political feelings, would be six to six; for there was another Liberal judge who would vote with the five on the former decision. Yes, he would call it voting, for it was putting that to the vote for which the statute gave them no jurisdiction. Why did he go into this argument? Simply to show that it was a question capable of being decided by the judges either way, depending upon the political bias, and certainly upon the

individual opinion of individual judges. Therefore, it was idle for hon. members to talk of this being a settled question. If ever there was a *resata quæstio*, this was one. What he wanted was, that the House of Commons, which was the proper tribunal for judging of the franchise, should settle it. He wanted the noble lord to give the same franchise as the Reform Bill intended to give. Upon this subject he should move an instruction to the committee to give as full a franchise to the people of Ireland as was given to the people of England. In fine, this was a Bill proceeding from the worst motives. He spoke not of persons in that House, but of persons out of it. It would not be parliamentary to impute motives to hon. members. It was a Bill proceeding from a spirit most hostile to Ireland. It was a Bill widening the space that at present separated the Irish from the English people, and enlarging and aggravating the distinction now existing between them. It was a Bill that branded upon the Irish nation the name of slaves. It was a Bill, in short, to transfer power, and to extinguish the Liberal representation of the people of Ireland, and lay them bound hand and foot at the mercy of the Tories. The noble lord called himself a great reformer, and accordingly he brought in this Bill, and yet he took care to forget the only great source of fraud on the Irish registry—namely, the freemen. They were preferred in everything, and yet the greatest abuses existed in the nomination of freemen. Every species of deception was practised to get the names of men on the register as freemen. Men, notoriously born of English parents, and in England, had been passed off as the sons of freemen in Dublin, and registered as entitled to their freedom. There was lately in Dublin the case of a person who was represented as the relative of a person named Latt, of the city of Dublin, and registered as a freeman by birth, who was born of English parents, and in England, and whose real name was Coulson. The noble lord, however, proposed to retain his wholesale system of manufacturing votes. If it were not too late, he would show the House that this fabrication of votes extended to the amount of thousands in the city

of Dublin alone. No man could get his freedom in the city unless the Corporation chose it. Before the Reform Bill, they considered birth or service as the two modes of entitling persons to their freedom. A title by marriage was never heard of until after the Reform Bill. But then they said that marriage was a new right conferred by the Reform Bill, and accordingly the son-in-law—that was the husband of the daughter of a freeman—was entitled to be admitted to his freedom. Did the noble lord come forward and require that the freeman should be examined upon oath as to his title, in the manner that was required from the unfortunate householder? But he would do the noble lord this justice; he did not believe the noble lord had ever heard of this part of the subject before, or understood it now. At all events, the Bill of the noble lord provided no remedy for this evil. In the cases proposed to be met by the noble lord's Bill, the utmost fraud that could be committed was an over-estimate of the value of the premises claimed by the voter, and the only question would be whether one person had formed too low or too high an estimate of that value, the fraud consisting in giving a higher value than the property was really worth. Now, he would appeal to the hon. and learned member for Ripon (Sir Edward Sugden), from his professional experience in the courts of equity, whether he ever knew a subject upon which there was more contradictory swearing than upon the subject of value. And yet all this battling was going on upon this question of surveying in order to obtain the franchise. If the temptation to over-estimate the value was considered too great, why did not the noble lord increase the franchise? In order to take from the people the temptation to be dishonest, let the noble lord lessen the value of the vote. By this means he would be accomplishing two things; he would do away with the temptation to perjury, and would be increasing the elective power of the people, which was now too stringently curtailed. This Bill was favoured by accidental circumstances. The noble lord had somebody's luck besides his own. [*Name.*] Oh, you know him very well. He could read to

the House from the history of Ireland's wrongs, page after page, proofs of the deepest treachery, of the blackest ingratitude, of the grossest violation of treaties that could distress a government or impoverish and crush a people. But he would once more call on the House—though he might call in vain—to do towards Ireland that which they would do to England. If they wanted assimilation of the laws, let it be so; but he exhorted them, at their peril, not to attempt to do that towards Ireland which they would not dare do towards England.

Subject, MAYNOOTH; Date, MARCH 2, 1841.

Mr. O'Connell would commence what he had to say by stating, in the most distinct and emphatic manner, that he implicitly believed in all that was taught at Maynooth. He would not for a moment shrink from making this avowal in its completest extent; and he was only checked by his respect for the House from expressing most emphatically his contempt for those aspersions upon that college which had been so shamelessly uttered by several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It was said that the charges brought that night against Maynooth had already been frequently made in that House; he had been longer in the House than the hon. gentleman who had made this statement, and he could tell the hon. gentleman that at least never had any charge against Maynooth been brought in so indecent a manner. Never had any charge against Maynooth assumed a character so reckless, so malevolent, so utterly calumnious. It was said, that such charges had been made elsewhere: they had, in places and by orators exactly in unison with the disgraceful and disgusting slanders poured forth. But it was said that allegiance to the Crown was frittered away at Maynooth. He would fix the hon. gentleman to this daring assertion, and he would prove to him, whenever he wished, that never was there a more groundless

assertion; never did bigotry instigate a calumny or utter anything more grossly devoid of foundation. The hon. member speaking to gentlemen, his equals, at least, presumed to talk of Roman Catholics disregarding their oaths. He hardly knew in what terms to answer this assertion in the House. Were it said out of the House, the answer that would best fit the statement would be that the assertion was false as hell. The hon. member had quoted passages and phrases, but he had carefully abstained from quoting either book, chapter, or verse, for it would have been easy to have sent for the book, and at once to have confuted him. The only two passages for which the hon. member had given the precise authority, consisted of expressions which no Christian need be ashamed to utter or avow, and which were perfectly consistent with the charity which belonged or ought to belong to every Church. The hon. member quoted Dr. Slevin, but he had not cited the particular pages, and the reason was, that the hon. member knew very well that if he had done so, he would have been contradicted and confuted in a moment. The hon. baronet, the member for the University of Oxford, had expressed himself on the subject with his habitual good humour, candour, and straightforwardness, but he was not satisfied with the answer which the hon. member had given. The noble lord, the Secretary for Ireland, when he talked of Puseyite doctrines, had not imputed them to the University of Oxford, but to persons, clergymen, and among these, a bishop, who had been connected with the University. For his part, he confessed, he greatly rejoiced to see the advance of those doctrines. It must be admitted that those were acting contrary to their oaths, in teaching Popery, while they were paid by the Protestant Church. The hon. gentleman did not deny that, for he could not; but, blessed be heaven! the swearing to the Thirty-nine Articles and afterwards evading them was not Catholic. This was a fellowship he did not desire, though the movement was, he was glad to perceive, in the direction of the true Church, and would tend to the triumph of the true religion. There was not a single feeling of heartfelt religion to redeem

the malevolent tirade and abandoned calumny which characterised the speech of the hon. member for Kilmarnock. If the suspicion of thorough hypocrisy could be laid aside, the vituperation of the hon. and learned member would have been amusing. He could not help wishing that a few Catholic theologians had been present, as they would have been delighted with the dissertation on the Cisalpine quarrel, and his running commentary on it. This was a case in which the State wanted to invade the rights of the Church, and France supported that design. The French Parliament was opposed to the liberties of the Church. What was the consequence? The infidelity which led to the revolution and the trampling on all Church institutions. There was, however, no agreement in religious principles between the gentleman who made the motion and him who seconded it. No Ultramontanist and Cisalpinist could have differed more than the hon. member for Kilmarnock and the hon. member for Elgin. One was an intrusionist, the other a non-intrusionist. He saw the other day a speech in which the hon. and learned member for Kilmarnock spoke with indignation of the attempt of the State to interfere with the Church of Scotland; but his colleague in attacking the Catholics was a zealous intrusionist—in fact, there was not a single point on which the two hon. members were agreed, except in hatred to the old religion. The one relied upon the authority of John Knox, the other contended for the supremacy of the State over the Church, but they agreed to hunt the couple against Popery. He was sorry for the Church of Scotland. The present quarrel would not be soon over; and really, he must say, it was as pretty a quarrel as he could desire to see. But the Ultramontanist question was now at an end. All Catholics now in every State acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the Pope to its just extent. You could not show a State in Europe, or in the world, where the Catholic religion was not extending itself, or one where Protestantism was on the increase. He (Mr. O'Connell) was sorry to dwell on these subjects, but a polemical discussion had been forced on them, and he should be ashamed

if he did not maintain a reason for the hope that was within him.

The hon. and learned gentleman talked of getting published the Bulls that had been addressed to the Catholic bishops. He might do so. The Catholics struggled for emancipation in Ireland. It was offered to them if they would give the State the power of appointing their bishops; but the Catholics would sooner lose their rights than permit an adulterous connection between their Church and a temporal party. But the hon. and learned gentleman talked of a difference between Irish priests educated in France and at Maynooth, and he quoted Inglis to prove his contrast. This reference proved the discrimination of the hon. member for Kilmarnock. Now, Inglis was in Ireland in 1831 and 1832, talking, as he said, familiarly with priests who had been educated in France. But the education of Catholic priests in France ended in 1792. No one could go from Ireland to France, unless he were first ordained, and he must be then twenty-four years of age. He could not return until he was thirty; but they must all have returned before 1792; and yet Inglis stated that he had been talking familiarly with those priests thirty-eight years after the time when they must have attained the age of thirty. Now, considering the laborious mission of the Irish priests, he (Mr. O'Connell) would put it to the House, how many of those rev. gentlemen could be alive when Inglis was in Ireland? He had been a great deal amongst the Irish priesthood, and he knew that when Inglis's book came out, there were only four of those gentlemen living, not one of whom that writer had seen, and of the four there was but one living now. But there seemed to be no discriminating faculty in the hon. and learned member, and he could not discern truth from falsehood and error from fact. The hon. member next told them that the late Lord Castlereagh was an exceedingly great theologian, a faculty which he (Mr. O'Connell) had never before heard attributed to that nobleman; but he was quite willing to make the hon. member for Kilmarnock a present of all the benefits of that authority. Then the hon. mem-

ber came to Emmett, and his evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords, after he had acknowledged himself to be a traitor. He (Mr. O'Connell) did not mean to speak slightly of Thomas Addis Emmett, whom he remembered as the accomplished gentleman, a man of talent, adorned with all the virtues of private life, who was rising fast in his profession, and full of the gifts of science. Emmett embarked in the fury of the French revolution; but he was no authority on Catholic opinions. Scarcely a Catholic gentleman took part in the rebellion. All those who were executed were Protestants or Presbyterians. So the quotation from Emmett was another instance of the faculty of delusion which seemed to distinguish the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Kilmarnock next went into a long dissertation on the intimidation of Catholic priests, which, he ventured to say, he had proved to a demonstration that would admit of no denial: another instance of his faculty of delusion and assertion. But more astonishing still, the hon. member seemed determined to quote anything, except only what was true. Now, there had not been less than thirteen committees before whom causes of alleged intimidation at elections were tried. Six of these were tried by Tory committees, and the popular candidates were unseated; but not a single attempt was made to prove misconduct on the part of the priests. The charge had been made out of doors, it was true; the committee furnished an opportunity to prove it; and he implored the House to attend to him, while he stated that those opportunities of sifting the alleged misconduct, upon oath, were neglected and finished from by those who had raised the calumny, and who continued to propagate it. To be sure, the Catholic priests took a part in the elections, and why should they not? They spoke from the altars against perjury and bribery; but he defied the hon. member to show that they went further. The hon. and learned member quoted Singleton; but was Singleton ever in a Catholic chapel, or before an altar? All his evidence was mere hearsay, picked up from those who stated that they were present at what they described. But he

turned with contempt from these calumnies on the Catholic priests. Did they imagine that Exeter Hall was the only place where all that was low, filthy, grovelling, and false against the Catholic religion was spoken? It was not. The meanness, virulence, and calumny, which had been so long considered as exclusively congenial in Exeter Hall, were now transplanted into that House. He repudiated those doctrines; every one of them had been already repudiated and confuted over and over again. His eternal salvation depended upon the sincerity of his belief; and, standing as he did, in the presence of that God who was to judge him, he there asserted that he never would abandon one particle of his creed. And he now told the hon. member for Kilmarnock that a more calumnious and more false assertion was never made against any Church than had that night been alleged against the Roman Catholic Church by that hon. member. Of what Church did the hon. member elect to call himself?—the idol whom he appeared to set up and glorify being John Knox. The hon. member for Newark, had he remained in his place, would hardly allow that the hon. member belonged to any Church at all; and he would say to the hon. member: “Have you ordination in your Church? and who was John Knox?” Had the hon. member read Mr. Tytler’s work? That Protestant-Presbyterian historian proved that John Knox was accessory, before the fact, to two murders. A notable idol for the hon. gentleman. And he talked about the Roman Catholic doctrine inculcating the violation of faith, even to Protestants! The hon. gentleman’s idol, John Knox, indeed, said that no faith was to be kept with Catholics. But to assert that Roman Catholic doctrines, in any place, or in any manner or degree, inculcated the abominable principle that faith was not to be kept with Protestants, was a preposterous and utterly unfounded calumny. It was the doctrine of the Roman Catholics that faith was to be kept with everybody; and that he violated the faith of God, whatever he called himself, who violated his faith with man. And what was John Knox’s first act when he came into power? He procured an Act of Par-

liament to put Roman Catholics to death as idolators. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, who glorified John Knox, assailed the Roman Catholic priests, because, said those hon. gentlemen, they were intolerant. They were assailed, too, because it was said they inculcated the violating the allegiance to the Crown. But, who was so open a teacher of rebellion as John Knox? The disciples of such a man were to be regarded with feelings of pity, guarded by a large share of distrust.

He had been unwillingly forced into this polemical discussion. His religion had been attacked, and it was his pride and duty to defend it. It is the ancient religion of this land—it is the religion of Alfred and of Edward, of Fenelon and of Sir Thomas More. It is a religion, as had been eloquently said, which existed during the early persecution of Christians, and has survived the flames and wild beasts of the Roman amphitheatre, and it will exist when “some traveller from New Zealand shall take his stand in the midst of a vast solitude, and on the broken arches of London Bridge sketch the ruins of St. Paul’s.” He did not provoke this discussion, but he was sorry it had arisen. Could anything exceed the bigotry of the petitions which had been presented? Did they not breathe all the rancour of the Early Reformation, as it was called? And was not that rancour exhibited by the gentleman who gloated over the bigotry of those petitions? “It was time,” said the hon. member, “that the House should respond to the sentiments that had so long existed abroad.” He knew there were millions in this country who scorned such sentiments. The hon. member talked of a response in this House, and the hon. gentlemen on the other side cheered the most malignant and unfounded of his assertions. Blessed be God! the people of Ireland knew that bigotry so foaming and boiling over never polluted that House before. He wished he could prophesy it never would again. It should not with impunity. He would ask them to judge of the priesthood of Ireland by the people, and the people by their priesthood. Nothing could be more just than the tribute which the noble lord near him had that evening paid to the Irish nation:

Most true was it, that, of the people of these realms, the women of Ireland were amongst the most pure, her men among the most temperate, the most religious; none were more regular communicants with their Church, none more zealous for their religion, nor of more practical piety. The hon. gentleman said he had been in Ireland? His visit was not one of mercy and charity, but to discover what he could blame. In his own evidence there was no mark of candour, or he would read it for him. He had been there; and did he know any people on the face of the earth so many of whom are communicants every Sunday in the year? The altar-rails were thronged with them; and let hon. gentlemen remember how they regarded the solemn mystery there consummated; and where, on the face of the earth, was there a people with so much zeal for their religion, with so much practical piety as the poor people of Ireland? True, they had their errors—revenge was perpetrated amongst them, and, under its influence, many were scattered abroad and met with untimely deaths; vengeance had broken through the restraints of religion and the feelings of humanity; but he could, with pride, in comparing his country with either England or Scotland, affirm that in Ireland crime was infinitely less in aggregated amount, and infinitely less in individual atrocity, than in either of the other portions of Great Britain. Never was she dishonoured by these horrible pecuniary murders—those assassinations, committed merely out of a thirst for gold, which were of such dreadful frequency, that cast a foul blot both upon the people of England and Scotland. The Irish were a religious and moral people, and true religion and morals were still spreading through the land. He held in his hand a document from which he would read what the state of the population is. You talk of Protestant Ulster. There are 976,088 Protestants of every description in Ulster, but there are 1,092,828 Catholics, giving a majority of 116,740. In Leinster the majority was 1,334,014. In Munster it was 1,975,964; and in Connaught, 1,166,280, deducting only 57,750 Protestants. Was it then in that House that the cry

of bigotry was raised and propagated against that country? It was not wise—it was not prudent—above all, it was not Christian-like. Would to God an end were put to these polemical discussions; and they would be put an end to if the hon. member would mind his own religion more and that of others less. Let him study Presbyterianism—let him study the principles of the English Church; it was said he communicates with it. I hope it is a calumny, as he is a Presbyterian. He conjured the hon. member, therefore, to look at his own religion and not to the religion of others—of others, who were no more than himself tainted with any other doctrine inconsistent with the pure morality or the precepts of the Divine law, either expressed or implied, and whose ancestors had the courage to sacrifice the last drop of their blood rather than abandon, by deed or word or insinuation, one particle of their faith. He begged leave to support the hon. member in asking leave to bring in his Bill, but he believed the hon. member would never bring it in.

SAME SUBJECT; SAME DATE.

Mr. O'Connell said he hoped the House would allow him to trespass on its attention for a short time, as he had been strongly alluded to by the noble lord and the right hon. gentleman. He should be sorry that his hon friend, the member for Kilkenny, should persevere in his intention to divide the House. It was totally unnecessary; for if he would look at the clause he would see that it was an affirmative clause, and, therefore, that he might, after the present one, add the clause, giving even tenants-at-will the right to vote, provided they varied the sum by only one shilling; so that it was totally unnecessary for him then to divide the House. It was not very material whether he took that immaterial division; for an immaterial division it would be, because, as the right hon. baronet and the Government would vote against him, he had

no chance whatever of a majority. He (Mr. O'Connell) had heard what had fallen from the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) with great pleasure, yet not without regret. There was in his speech an exposition of some of those principles applicable to the Government of Ireland, which, if carried into effect, would be eminently useful; but he did not think the noble lord's vindication of the conduct of the Reform Ministry in 1832 was satisfactory. The noble lord went into the history of the 40s. franchise, and of its abolition; but he was not accurate in saying that the 40s. franchise was abolished on his (Mr. O'Connell's) evidence; nor was the right hon. baronet quite accurate in saying that the 40s. freeholders had been abolished in consequence of the evidence given by the advocates of the Roman Catholic claims, and more especially of that which he (Mr. O'Connell) had himself given. The right hon. baronet, in referring to the evidence in support of his assertion, had omitted to read the first answer which he (Mr. O'Connell) had given. In that answer, he only spoke of the abolition of the 40s. freeholders under leases, and not of those similar to the English freeholders. He stated that with those nobody wished to meddle; and, so far as the perpetual interest was concerned, he had not said one word to justify the abolition of that tenure. It was material for Ireland that this should be understood. It was now admitted by the right hon. baronet opposite there was no compact between the Government of 1829 and those gentlemen who advocated the Roman Catholic claims in regard to the abolition of the 40s. freeholders; so far from that being the case, they had now the fact that at a meeting of sixty-three noblemen and gentlemen, the supporters of Catholic claims, held at the Thatched House Tavern, a resolution was unanimously agreed to to petition Parliament against the Catholic Bill, if the passing of it was to be the sacrifice of the 40s. freeholders. Such a petition was presented by Mr. Spring Rice. The right hon. baronet had called his abolition of the 40s. freeholders a measure of Reform. It was the only instance in

which he had shown himself to be a Reformer. He had consented to their abolition, not because they were Catholics but because he considered the system a social evil, and his mode of reforming was by totally destroying. This, however, could never be any reason for refusing an extension of the franchise to a similar class. The abuses in the old system of 40s. freeholders were partial, and did not extend to whole counties, nor did they continue up to the period of their abolition. Between 1825 and 1829 every one of the abuses described in the evidence had vanished. The right hon. baronet opposite, and those who acted with him, refused to correct the abuses, and to grant emancipation at the proper time. Had they done so, a century might have elapsed before the people of Ireland would have found it necessary to make any further struggle. But the auspicious moment was allowed to pass by. What then followed? The people of Ireland compelled the Government to grant them Emancipation, unconditional and unfettered by any terms whatever. The 40s. freeholders shared in the battle, but they were not allowed to share in the triumph; they were annihilated—they were destroyed. Then came the Reform Bill. He had opposed that Bill by reason of the limited nature of the qualification sought to be established by it. He argued that the franchise was too narrow, and that the number of electors would bear no reasonable proportion to the population. Time had shown that he was not mistaken in this; he had underrated the number a little, but it was not much beyond his calculation. They had been told that Ireland had got a Reform similar to England. But how stood matters in that respect? In Bristol any man who rated at 1s. was a burgess, while in Dublin no man could be one who was not rated at £10. Why make such a difference? Why persevere maintaining such a distinction, unless it was their wish to tyrannize over Ireland? They did, however, persevere in exercising their power in all the plenitude of an insolent domination, without any reason, and in defiance of that principle which said that both countries

should be identified as one. He would now point out to the House an instance of the difference between the proportion of electors to the population in the two countries. The county Galway, containing 685,604 inhabitants, had only 2,085 voters; Donegal, with a population of 298,491, had only 1,462 voters; and Mayo, with 366,000 inhabitants, had only 950 voters. In England, the county of Hertford, with a population of only 95,977, had no less than 5,349 voters; so that this county, with a population of 95,977, had more voters than the three counties of Ireland he had stated, the aggregate population of which was upwards of 1,000,000. Now, would any man, either on the one side of the House or the other, say if the case was reversed—if 95,000 inhabitants of Ireland were represented by 5,000 voters, and upwards of 1,000,000 of Englishmen had only 4,000—was there a man among them who would endure such a state of things? If there was, he despised that man; and should he not despise him? he ought to despise himself. He appealed to them for redress. If they refused to grant it, he would appeal from them to the people of Ireland.

He would only give another instance of this inequality. Wales, with a population of 305,000 had 36,833 electors, while the county of Cork, with 703,000 inhabitants, had only 3,835 electors. There was no equality in this. Now, no doubt, they had the power to continue this gross inequality in the representative system between England and Ireland. Was it prudent to continue it? Was it just to continue it? Was it safe? It might be safe just now, but who could say that it would be so that day three months? Let them not lay the flattering unction to their souls, that the people of Ireland were regardless of this question, or that they did not understand it. The question of how they were to govern Ireland was a serious one for the representatives of Scotland and England. They had continued the system of exclusion long enough, and they ought now to give way, and treat the two countries as one. He was not contented with the Bill of the Government, and he supported it merely because he would not get a better. He regretted ex-

ceedingly that Government had departed from their original proposal of a £5 qualification. He had often been obliged to accuse the enemies of Ireland of injustice, but now he felt more inclined to say, Heaven protect her from her friends! The people of that country were every day more alive to their rights, and better able to maintain them. They had set an example of religious fidelity to every other nation. In spite of persecution, they had had the firmness and integrity to abide by what they believed to be the true religion; those who thought otherwise ought to remember that an error of faith was no disparagement of virtue in practice. In no other country in Europe were the duties of religion more attended to, and there were more weekly communicants in Ireland than in any other country on the face of the earth. This religious feeling, instead of diminishing, was augmenting. He would put it to the House, whether they ought to tamper with the feelings of such a people, of whom upwards of five millions had pledged themselves never to taste the cup of intoxication. If they wished to further the Repeal of the Union, they could not do so more effectually than by refusing to conciliate the people of Ireland. If, however, they insisted on the continuance of that union, let them establish an equality between the two countries. Do not allow Ireland to have only 4,000 electors out of a population of upwards of a million, and England to have 5,000 electors in a population of only 95,000. By voting for the Government Bill, they would take the first step, small as it was, to remedy the evil by abolishing such differences between the constituencies of the two countries. There was another advantage attending the measure; it might be indiscreet in him to avow it. If rating was made the test of the franchise in Ireland, he had no doubt it would soon become the universal mode of ascertaining the qualification. Independently of this, however, he thought the Bill would do much for Ireland. It would get rid of all the charges of perjury which had been brought against the people of Ireland, by destroying all temptation to false swearing by either party. He should, for many reasons, vote for the

Government proposition. If for nothing else, he should do so in order that the real question between the two parties might be decided; namely, whether the Government system should be adopted or not. One word as to the extension of the right of voting to tenants-at-will. If made sufficiently extensive, so as to exclude the dictation of landlords, he would have no objection to the franchise being conferred on them. It was because the present motion was not extensive enough that he objected to it; it would leave the tenant at the mercy of his landlord, from whose tyranny he could never be protected, except by a widely-extended suffrage, or vote by ballot, neither of which the House of Commons, at the present moment, were inclined to give. He could vote conscientiously for the Government Bill, because he knew that they were making a struggle in the right cause. If they should fail, it would not be their fault; their doing so, through the influence of party, would only give an additional incitement to the people of Ireland to join in a universal struggle, in order to obtain justice for themselves.

Subject, LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND);

Date, JUNE 7, 1841.

Mr. O'Connell gave notice of a motion for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the laws relating to landlord and tenant in Ireland. He would take that opportunity to allude to a matter personal to himself. The House was aware that, a few evenings ago, the hon. and learned member for Bandon (Serjeant Jackson) made a very serious charge against him (Mr. O'Connell) of oppressing his tenants in Kerry, by distraining in April for rent due in March. Not having been in Kerry of late, he (Mr. O'Connell) did not know whether some agent of his might not have distrained some of the tenants from malicious motives; therefore, he did not rise at the instant to contradict the statement. Since then, however, he had requested his son (Mr.

Maurice O'Connell), who had the honour of being acquainted with Mr. Serjeant Jackson, to call upon that gentleman to inquire the name of his informant, and his authority for the statement he had made; and, with the permission of the House, he would now read the letter he had received from his son, describing the result of his interview. It was as follows:—

“16, PALL MALL, *Monday, June 7, 1841.*

“MY DEAR FATHER—I have just seen Serjeant Jackson. I told him that I came from you, to ascertain the name of the person whom he quoted in the House, the other night, as having stated, that he had known tenants of yours to have been distrained in April for rents due on the 25th of March previous, and also, if possible, the names of the tenants.

“He said that he did not know the names of the tenants; that a gentleman called on him some time since, in Dublin, and said he was a Kerryman, and his name Twiss; that Serjeant Jackson recollected having seen him on juries in Kerry, but does not know his Christian name or address; that this man then made allusion to a speech of yours about Irish landlords, and said that you yourself were a bad landlord; that he had been in Iveragh some time previous, had seen a number of cattle in pound in the month of April, and, on inquiry, that he was told that they belonged to tenants of yours, and had been distrained for the March rent. I asked what year this was in? Serjeant Jackson did not know, but said he had a memorandum of it somewhere, and promised to let me have a copy thereof. According to him, Twiss said he would swear to the facts.—Your affectionate son,

“MAURICE O'CONNELL”

He was able to state that, up to the month of January last, when he was last in Kerry, no such thing had occurred; and, therefore, up to that period, as well, indeed, as up to that to which the hon. and learned gentleman had referred, he was enabled to contradict the statement in the strongest possible terms. It was not for him to comment on the manner in which the charge had been made against him. The man's name from whom the information was received was not known—his address was not known—the only allegation was, that somebody had told the hon. and learned serjeant that so and so had taken place. He (Mr. O'Connell) begged to take that opportunity of denying, in the most distinct terms, that anything of the kind had occurred.

*Subject, ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO SPEECH—ADJOURNED
DEBATE; Date, AUGUST 27, 1841.*

Mr. O'Connell said—The noble lord has distinctly admitted, beyond controversy, the deep distress of the manufacturing classes. The noble lord spoke of that distress with becoming feeling, and said that a most difficult problem to solve was how that distress could be relieved. I will furnish the noble lord with a simple and efficacious remedy; give the distressed classes a loaf of bread. The noble lord has not leisure to discuss the awful consequences of that distress, but whether the pleasantry which the noble lord has indulged in be good in taste or not it is not for me to say. This is a subject of the utmost importance, and I claim this deference for my opinions on the Corn Laws, that I stand here as the representative of two of the largest agricultural communities in the country. I am the representative of more than one million of the people of the Irish nation. Yes, I have been returned for two counties, without canvass or solicitation, without my personal presence, or my asking for a single vote, and with my opinions on the Corn Laws being well known. My opinions I am not in the habit of concealing; and no opinion of mine is better known in those counties than that I am for the total abolition of those laws. There is another testimony in my hon. friend the member for Waterford, with respect to the feelings of the Irish constituencies, for he fully informed his constituents that he would vote against those laws. This is a proof that the Irish people do not estimate the advantages which the agricultural interest derives from the Corn Laws. Indeed, Ireland illustrates the fallacy of some of the topics used by the supporters of these laws. It is said that they increase the rate of wages. If they have that operation anywhere, surely it is in Ireland. Ireland has the full benefit of the Corn Laws, and yet there is the lowest rate of wages in any part of the kingdom. Ireland is an agricultural country; you have taken care she shall not be a manufacturing country; but people see distinctly that Corn Laws do not raise the rate

of wages, and they feel, and I feel, that it is a robbery upon the operative to make him pay more for his bread than his earnings enable him to pay. Yes, they feel that these Corn Laws are an aristocratic impost upon the food of the poor man. If the Corn Laws did not increase the price of bread to the operative they would not contend for them; no, they contended for them in order to increase their rents. What is the problem so difficult to be solved as to the mode of relieving the existing distress? I ask, is there any proposition more clear than this, that having cheaper bread, and a greater quantity of it, would be an immediate mode of relief? But you want to reduce that quantity. You want to increase your rents, and not to give cheaper food, and then you come with your doleful lamentations about the state of distress. The people understand and feel it to be a mockery. They ask for bread and you give them a stone, and then you come and boast of your triumph and your overwhelming majority against ministers who propose an alteration.

For my own part, I only agree to the ministerial plan of 8s. protection as an instalment of the debt of justice due to the people, with the full determination of getting rid of it ultimately. The question between you and the people is, whether there shall be a tax upon their bread, whether there shall be an impost upon their food, and whether there shall increase your revenues by increasing the price of that without which existence is insufferable? (*No, no.*) I say, Yes, yes. And you insist upon continuing this plan of starvation in spite of the evidence read by my hon. friend, the member for Wolverhampton, showing an accumulation of disease and death, following the dearness of provisions and the scarcity of food. You may talk as you please; you may boast of your triumphs as you like, but you must come round to this. The question between you and the people of England is, whether they shall pay millions more by the year for food than they can get it for from other countries. It has a double aspect of iniquity; for, while it increases the price of the poor man's food, it impedes the progress of our manufacturing interest. If

you allow foreign corn to be imported, we shall at once find immediate payment for our manufactures and an increased demand. At present you diminish labour by increasing the price of food, and then you come with lamentations about the state of distress, and about the difficulty of solving the problem of how that distress is to be relieved. I recollect a story of a Frenchman, who complained that he never fattened his horse. He had tried a thousand remedies; he had fed him with spices and tobacco, and different other articles; when, one day, a friend asked him, “Did you ever try oats?” He declared he had not. Now, I say to you, by way of experiment, in order to solve the problem as to the best mode of relieving the present distress, try bread. Give the poor man food, and then, if he does not thrive and prosper, go to any quack doctor that chooses to set up, and, for my part, I should not interfere. Everybody knows that the great mistake in the Reform Bill was that of augmenting the representation of the counties and not giving to the better instructed town population a more adequate share in the representation. I do not ask for a preference. I ask for equality. You, however, gave the preference to the £50 tenant-at-will clause, and I ask how much of your triumph is owing to the fatal policy of having thus augmented the members for the counties of England. Your majority consists almost entirely of them. I complain that the Whig ministers did not go far enough. They halted too soon. They did not answer the just expectations of the people by working out their own measures so as to give the people of Ireland a fair representation. I complained because of the unequal preference given over the manufacturing and commercial classes. The supporters of dear bread, however, succeeded, and they have again succeeded in obtaining a majority. What, then, are the merits of the two great parties who contend for the government of the country? I will contrast them. What fault, I ask, is to be found with the Government for the last ten years? They have done much to increase the franchise. They have almost totally abolished the hideous, uncivilized punishment of death. They have done

more—and I speak of my own profession—they have wiped out the stain of injustice in the criminal law which permitted the counsel for the Crown to address the jury, shutting out the prisoner's counsel. That is a measure of great importance, although shorn of part of its utility in the House of Lords, where they introduced a clause, giving two speeches to the counsel for the prosecution, and only one to the prisoner's counsel. Although, therefore, there was such an unjust diminution of the benefit conferred by that measure, I think the ministers deserve credit for going so far in ameliorating the law, and merit the gratitude of the country. They have done more. They have increased the circulation of information of every kind, by diminishing the stamp duties on newspapers and periodicals from 4*d.* to 1*d.* It should not be forgotten that they did these things. There was another great advantage arising from this measure, namely, it got rid of the temptation to a violation of the law by the sale of unstamped publications. Ministers cannot be deprived of the glory of having accomplished these things, even though their career be about to terminate. There is another measure of great public utility, namely, the penny postage. The reduction of the newspaper stamp duty allowed the circulation of the information. The reduction of the postage duty allowed the circulation of the effect of that information. It keeps up the tie between parent and child, between brother and brother, and for the first time places within the reach of the poorest person the easiest mode of communication. Before that measure the poor man paid one-third of his weekly earnings for a single letter, and was in this painful contrast with the man of fortune—that the man of fortune could hold communication for the ten-thousandth part of his income. Again, the present ministers opened the trade with India and China. They had also advanced the principles of religious liberty. They have relieved the Catholic and Dissenter from the necessity of bowing before a clergyman whose tenets they did not believe, and whose mission they deny. They have allowed them to celebrate their baptisms,

and marriages, and to preserve their burial services free from intrusion. The present ministry have made a great step towards the abolition of tithes in Ireland. They have succeeded in striking off one-fourth of the entire burden. They would have gone farther; they would have appropriated the surplus, had the Parliament permitted, to purposes of public utility. I do not reproach them for having given up that clause, for I was one of those who, despairing of carrying it, urged their giving it up. I do not shrink from my share of the blame, but I say that in abolishing one-fourth of the odious impost they have set an example, and established a principle, which may enable, at no remote period, a future Parliament to abolish it altogether. But that is not their only claim. Were they not the persons who introduced reform into this House? Did they not abolish 115 rotten boroughs in England and thirteen in Ireland? Have they not done more for England, and have they not abolished the restricted, narrow, and self-elected corporations? Have they not almost identified the electors with their representatives in the new corporation. They have done so, and it affords a painful contrast to the conduct pursued towards Ireland. They have done more, and let the fact be proclaimed to the world, they have emancipated 800,000 slaves.

Early in Mr. Pitt's political life, he joined with Mr. Wilberforce in pressing for the abolition of the slave-trade. He succeeded in every other measure he undertook, but in this he was in a minority, and these minorities continued until the Whigs came into office in 1805. They were only eight months in office, but they signalised themselves by the abolition of the slave-trade. They gave a lesson to the nations of the earth; and the generosity with which the British nation made such sacrifices was compensated by the perfect safety which attended their humane experiment. The party which did this deserved popular support. That party had called upon Englishmen to estimate all these valuable and important ameliorations in the law, both as regarded religious liberty and human freedom. I will not dwell upon their conduct in Ireland. They have given ten years of

almost complete repose to the people of that country. They have, for the first time, taught the people of Ireland that the Government may select persons, not for their creeds, but for their virtues; not for their religious opinions, but for their merits; that exclusion shall no longer be the fate of one party, and that offices of power, honour, and emolument shall no longer be confined to a faction. I thank them, in the name of Ireland, for what they have done, and for what they intended to do. I thank them for the good they have performed, and for the greater good they were prevented from effecting. I ask why a party of this kind should be thrown out of power? I will not stop to argue upon the question, whether they fall short of their own undertakings. I will not stop to discuss how many of the more ardent friends of Reform have been disappointed and irritated. I will not stop to ask why they did not carry out their own principles, by extending the representation to the operative classes, to whom it must soon be extended. But I say this, that you, at least, ought to be the last to complain of their labours not having been more extensive in that direction. What are the claims of the Tory party on a liberty-loving people? What has the Tory faction ever done for public liberty? When were they the advocates of freedom of conscience? Never. They have been exclusionists from first to last, and only yielded to the impulse of the pressure from without, adhering to the principle of exclusion still. I have spoken of a few instances of the benefits conferred by the Whig party in ten years. I will give the Tories a century, and I ask them to tell me what they have done for public freedom to put in comparison? They opposed the emancipation of the negro as long as they could. They opposed Parliamentary Reform. They supported the abuses of the old corporations. And yet, this is the party, it appears, which the people of England prefer. This was the party that all along opposed religious liberty; that kept the people of England in chains until their limbs grew too large, and they burst their fetters. When they could no longer keep from the people of England their liberty, they revenged themselves by diminishing

the franchise of the people of Ireland. That franchise was so restricted, that the curse of the noble lord's Bill was scarcely necessary to effect its early annihilation. You gave to England corporate reform, under which every man rated to the poor-rate, however low, became a burgess. You gave Ireland a corporate reform, obtained only after four years' struggle; but it was at last conceded by the hon. gentlemen opposite. How did your leaders treat the Irish people? In the city of Dublin there has been an enumeration to the poor-rate, and the number of ratepayers on the books is 15,000. Every one of these, if he resided in Liverpool or Bristol, would become a burgess; but, happening to be on the other side of the Channel, 5,000 of them are excluded. Heaven help us!—misery makes us acquainted with strange company. The hon. member for Evesham has condescended to patronise Ireland. But, first, all agitation must be put down. Has the hon. gentleman wit enough to know that agitation is impotent, unless founded on a just cause? And I ask anyone possessed of the old spirit of Englishmen—a spirit which I believe has considerably evaporated—would you endure that Ireland should have got a corporate reform, giving to every ratepayer the right to be a burgess, whilst England was restricted to one-third? How would the old spirit of Englishmen prompt him to answer that question? If he answered that he would bear it patiently, I will not say that I would treat him with contempt, but I should think he deserved to be so treated. If, on the other hand, he said he would not endure such injustice, I would hail him, and say to him, neither will we, the people of Ireland, endure it. I want to know what the Tory party have done to recommend them to the good will of the people of England? It was said formerly that no people in the world were more desirous of public freedom, or more attached to the privileges and the rights of freemen, and they carried them out, in the madness of their zeal for liberty, by dragging one monarch to the scaffold, and driving another a wanderer and a beggar through the nations of Europe. What party was it that supported these

monarchs in their attempts upon the liberties of the people? It was the party that was now coming into power. Their very name dated its creation from the period of the Revolution, and from that period until this, what proof have they given of their love of liberty? They opposed the House of Hanover, as long as they continued attached to principles of liberty; they opposed them to the very verge of rebellion, and they became loyal only when they got the Crown into their custody, in the reign of George III. Have the party shown no disposition to return to their ancient disloyalty during the present reign? They have not as yet the Crown in their custody. Accordingly, the loyalty of the party out of that House is expressed in base calumny, and the vilest, and, need I say, most unfounded slanders.

One would have imagined that the youth and sex of her Majesty might have awakened some feeling of sympathy and regard. Yet it was you who framed these calumnies against your young and beautiful Queen—you deny that, at your orgies, you insulted her by your marked preferences. What said the reports in the newspapers—your own newspapers? “The health of the Queen was drunk with the usual honours;” and the health of another person—need I name her? “with nine times nine, and loud and long continued cheering,” accompanied by that music invented by the saint of Canterbury, and entitled “the Kentish fire.” And what is there in you to countervail all this? What public good have you ever done? What cause of public liberty have you ever advocated? I have read your history, and I am astonished that the people of England should be so fallen as to consent to give you their confidence. And how was that seeming confidence obtained? Never was such gross bribery known since the world began. Take the great leading organ of your party, the *Times*, which states the fact distinctly, and no other paper has contradicted it. The *Times* is the authority on the point of bribery; and somebody belonging to it has tried his chance at elections two or three times, and has succeeded once, and was sorry for it. You

may boast your majority, but take it with this reflection, that it was all owing to gross and unlimited bribery. The *Times* is a liar of the first magnitude, and yet he admits as much. Another cause of your temporary success is your antipathy to Ireland, and the use you made of it. Look at the late speech of your champion, the Earl of Winchelsea: shame on you for listening to it. This, your hatred of Ireland, was one of the leading topics in all your addresses, from Chester to Canterbury. And yet, with all these foul and hateful means, you could not have succeeded but for the sordid and selfish interests of the owners of land and those dependent upon them. Yes, the farmers were brought to believe that their interests were knit up with those of the landlords, and that the alteration of the Corn Laws would depreciate both, and it was in a sordid, selfish feeling that they combined to obtain a majority against those who proposed the scheme. And with this majority, there you stand the enemies of civil and religious liberty, and hating from your heart that country which, from its heart, returns your hate, despising as she hates. There you stand the haters of your right hand in war; with respect to whom you delight to make odious distinctions of political and moral rights—denying her the same franchise, the same representation, and the same corporation reform as you yourselves enjoy. You refuse her also that equality in religion, which, if your parchment Union were a real Union, would be hers by right. And now you are going again to govern Ireland. Who is to go over there? Is the Orange flag again to wave over the Lord Lieutenant's head? On your last advent to power you sent us a gallant officer—brave as his own sword—and a noble earl, who took the first opportunity to exhibit himself in public, when the Kentish fire was set up to greet him, and the Orange flag waved over his head. True, the man who did this was punished. But how? Three years afterwards the hon. baronet called him in this House a vagabond. He had three years of perfect impunity and enjoyment of office, and at the end of that time he was signally punished by being called a vagabond—and the vaga-

bond holds his office to this day, And now for the future— what is your plan, what is your prospect? Is it possible to suppose that Ireland can be governed by mere good works? The county of Cork has a population of 750,000 souls, and a constituency of only 3,000. Of this Ireland complains. I have often gone over statements of this kind (*hear*), and on each occasion I have met with the same cries of derision which I now hear. But do you think that, as an Irishman, those cries can have any other effect than to inflame my spirit to defy, and move my energies to oppose and resist the enemies of my country who utter them. Do you think that, because you have got a majority you will put down the spirit of Ireland? Do you think that, with this bribed brute-force majority, you can reconcile her to a rule of injustice at your hands, or drive from her memory and her affections a Government under which she has made such advances in moral feeling and tranquil happiness? But this tranquillity, which she has enjoyed under the present ministry, is, indeed, in your estimation; her only fault. It is a picture which you cannot bear to contemplate. True, there have been, as there are in all countries, and in all times, some instances of sanguinary outrage in Ireland. But before you make a sweeping condemnation for the faults of a few, look nearer home, I pray you. Look at the fact that, in Liverpool alone, at the last assizes, there were as many offences of a serious nature for trial as in the whole of Ireland. Ireland has calumniators, and always will have; and, shame to say it, too many of them men born upon her soil; children thus hating and reviling their country; and can we wonder at it, when the enemies of Ireland have always received all the rewards of place and favour which power and authority could confer? Will you continue to follow this system now? You may pretend to administer the affairs of Ireland impartially, without this unfair regard to persons, but if you do, you will find that you will not have a single member of your party voting for you. And if you do not attempt to act impartially, I will not say that you will lose Ireland. God forbid that you should; but you will

deserve to lose her, and you will assuredly lose place and power. But can you act impartially—have you the men and means to do so? Look at the ranks of your party, and who do we see? Look at the noble lord opposite, who, as he has made himself most profoundly hated in Ireland, is, I suppose, by the principle that action and reaction are equal, most beloved in England. How will it be with the noble lord who calumniated the honour and integrity of the people of Ireland, in order that he might deprive them of their franchise?

When I reflect what endeavours I have made to purify the stream of justice in Ireland, that I have voted, night after night, in support of a ministry who did not go half as far in the good cause as I did, solely with a view to accomplishing, through their hands, the purifying of the stream of public justice—I look with dread and sorrow to what we may now expect from you. Do you mean to restore the sheriff of Fermanagh? No doubt you will find means to initiate him; no doubt you will try means to tranquillize Ireland; and then you will think you have made all safe. But you will find yourselves wrong; there is but one safety-valve for a great and suffering people, and that is, to afford them the means of giving expression to their distress and their grievances. Your majority will carry you into power; but how long will you remain there? Look at the starving and unemployed millions of your fellow-countrymen; your factories desolate, and your cities rendered hideous by squalid misery and thick contagious mortality. Look at your declining commerce, the result of your unjust and pernicious system of legislation. Do you suppose that the people of this empire will be long before they form a fair estimate between the friends of freedom and its foes? You are coming into power; how long will it be, I wonder, before you will have cause to regret it? Power is in itself always unpopular, and you will not be long in office before your acts are criticised with severity, and the warmth of your temporary friendships begin to decline. Your alliance with the Chartists will soon be at an end. Anything but the Whigs for the hon. member for

Winchester; and this was precisely the cry of the Chartists, who said, "Let us bring in the Tories, and we shall soon multiply the number of Chartists." The Tories consider themselves a distinct and superior class, and look upon all the rest of the community as slaves. Seventy-five per cent. of the population of this country is entirely unrepresented; the people begin to feel this, and see the effect of it in the Corn Law, of which they now so bitterly complain. They begin to see the misery which results from want of freedom and insufficient food. They feel that the Reform Bill has been a failure, and that that measure which would best secure them from intimidation and corruption—namely, the ballot—is denied them. There are abundant distresses, abundant causes of complaint in the country; and how do you propose to meet them? Will you impose new taxes? I do not wish for evil in order that good may come of it; but if I could do so I should wish that you should try some of these new taxes. Never did a party come into office surrounded with greater difficulties and dangers, and with less of that *mens divini* of civil and religious liberty to recommend them; and I can only conclude by observing, that, "as men's infirmity is God's opportunity," the party now coming into office may be compelled, in spite of themselves, to do justice to Ireland.

Subject, PARTY CRIMES (IRELAND); Date, MARCH 7, 1841.

On the 4th of March, O'Connell had called attention to the subject of religious intolerance in the army and navy. Only those who had carefully studied his Parliamentary career can estimate the vigilance, the promptness, and the tact with which he dealt with every subject of Catholic interest, with which he defended and protected every individual right, civil, social, and political.

Lord Elliot replied, and O'Connell, for answer, briefly said, "that the Orangemen were armed with deadly weapons, while the Catholics were not. He did not know whether they would remain so."

He could certainly hint significant threats when he considered it necessary. On the 11th of March, when a Bill was brought forward to increase the in-

come of a Protestant colonial bishop, he said the Protestant Bishop of Nova Scotia had an income of £2,000 per annum; the Catholic bishop had only £75 per annum, and claimed that the spiritual wants of one denomination had as good a right to attention as the spiritual wants of another.

Mr. O'Connell would take that opportunity of noticing a misrepresentation of his speech on the conduct of General Espartero towards the Spanish clergy, imputing to him the sentiment, that if the cruelties of which he had complained had been visited upon Carlist priests he should care nothing about the matter. He had reprobated the conduct of the present Spanish Government equally as applied to the Carlist and Christina clergy as a religious persecution; but he had said that he should not have complained had any Carlist priests been punished according to law for their political offences. He would then proceed, in pursuance of the notice he had given, to move for a return of the names, numbers, and descriptions of persons who had registered arms in the county of Down, Ireland. He was induced to make this motion in consequence of a most deplorable event that had occurred in that county, and which must equally be lamented by both sides of the House. He meant the murder of a young man of the name of M'Ardle—one of the most cruel atrocities ever committed. The circumstances of the case were these:—An exceedingly fine youth, six feet three inches in stature, and proportionally well made, of most excellent conduct and temper, having been, on Christmas evening, with a friend called M'Kevron at a public-house at Ballyrany, kept by a man named Copes, a quarrel arose between M'Kevron and an Orangeman, who was also one of the company. M'Ardle interfered, put an end to the quarrel, and took his friend out of the house. A person named Thomas Scott, one of the accused, left Copes' house about the same time as M'Kevron, and proceeded to another public-house, three quarters of a mile off, where were assembled a number of young men who were armed, and had been practising with ball cartridge in the neighbourhood.

These fellows, who had assumed the ridiculous name of

" *Yellow Tulips,*" were drinking in a barn, their arms being piled up in a corner, and when a messenger arrived, they took their arms, proceeded to the house where M'Kevron had been, and demanded that he should be turned out. On being informed he was gone, they proceeded to search the house, firing into it, breaking all the doors and windows, and making an indiscriminate attack on such within as were known to be Roman Catholics. M'Ardle, however, escaped to a house distant about a mile, and owned by a man named Ward. Thither they pursued him, and attacked the house where he had taken shelter. He again effected his escape; but before he got a mile further, he was overtaken, lying near a lime-kiln, and shot dead. The trial for the murder took place at the last Down assizes, and the result was an immediate acquittal of the parties accused. He did not impute blame where blame did not lie; but that blame rested somewhere was perfectly evident. When the verdict was delivered, there was a shout in court, "To hell with the Pope"—the usual Orange cry. Although the Attorney-General prosecuted and the judge charged for conviction strongly, the jury, without hesitation, acquitted the accused; another jury having convicted the very same men of a riot on the very same occasion. There had been another murder since at Ballyrony, and he had received several letters requesting to know what the people were to do—whether they were to be obliged to protect themselves. He should not dwell one moment on these melancholy facts; but what he complained of was, that the magistrates did not at once prevent such a party from spending Christmas-day in firing ball-cartridges. It was altogether a most indecent occupation. He also complained of the shout in court immediately after the acquittal of the accused; but, without at all entering into these questions, he contented himself now with moving for the return above mentioned.

Subject, THE NATIONAL PETITION—THE CHARTER;

Date, MAY 3, 1842.

Mr. O'Connell—As I do not wish my vote to be misunderstood, I hope I shall be allowed to state in a word or two why I support the present motion. And first let me say, that I do not vote for it because the petition asserts that the Repeal of the Union is one of the parts of the objects of those who have signed it. That is a subject on which my opinion is fixed; but this insertion in this petition forms no inducement with me to maintain its prayer. In short, I do not wish to identify my views with all the doctrines promulgated by this document. The ground on which my vote shall be given is, that I am—though I may be mistaken—a decided advocate of universal suffrage; and I rest that opinion on the total failure of every man I ever heard discuss this question, and in that particularly of the right hon. member for Edinburgh (Mr. Macaulay), to say where the line should be drawn which determines that servitude should end and liberty commence. I do not think that the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) was more successful in resisting the claims of the working men, by instituting a comparison between the demand of every man of twenty-one years of age to be a jurymen as well as to vote for a member of Parliament. There was no analogy between the two cases, because the jurymen is called on to decide on the property or personal liberty of others, a voter to defend his own. For my part, I repeat, until some rational line can be proved for stamping certain classes of Englishmen as of a degraded nature, I shall never consent to their degradation by law. The condition of this kingdom is one that inspires awe. I do not wish to draw any declaration from the Secretary for Ireland on the state of things there; but, if I am not greatly misinformed, she is in a perilous state. There certainly is no security for the continuance of the present orderly and peaceful habits of the working classes of this country; and if you did

nothing more by consenting to this motion than to gratify the wishes of a large mass of your countrymen, you would not go too far by admitting them to your Bar, and hearing their grievances under any restrictions you may think fit to adopt.

Subject, THE BALLOT; Date, JUNE 21, 1842.

Mr. O'Connell—And that was a recommendation of a system generating mean, paltry, dirty, and cowardly conduct. Why, no one could tolerate such a system for one moment. No man can be a party to such a recommendation. Does such a system require discussion or argument—is not conviction immediate? And yet the right hon. gentleman was conjointly of one of the few who recommended it. Oh, but there was to be full discussion; there was to be deliberation before the ballot was embodied in the scheme. (*Mr. Shiel: "Adopted."*) Was "adopted" the word—could it be possible? Yes, it was. The words were: "It is suggested that the vote by ballot be adopted." And this was his mean, dirty, paltry, cowardly system. Oh, yes! it was easy to use those words; but he wanted to know this—was it the poor wretch who was forced to give his vote unwillingly; was it the poor individual who was forced to give his vote to support his family that was all this? It might be so; but who made him so? It might be so; but who continued him so? (*cheers*). Aye; he was proud of that ironical cheer. He knew they were not the people to stand between the trembling victim and he who would sacrifice him to his love of wealth. They were not the people to adopt the ballot—an honest system (*oh! oh!*). Yes, he repeated it—an honest system. Aye, they thought no system honest unless in a commercial point of view—to give their money, and get the full value for it. And had they no compunction at the bribery which prevailed under the system? Had they no horror at the perjury which followed it? He had read to them the other night,

when the Newcastle case was discussed, how a father took his son to the polling-booth and saw him perjure himself, and when asked why he permitted it, replied, "So many others were perjuring themselves also." That was their system. That was the system that did not engender aught, mean, dirty, paltry, or cowardly. Was it in England that the hideous, horrible, and extensive bribery took place which had been exposed before the Sudbury election committee? They talked of conscience, and refused justice to others who differed from them in faith; but, fortunately, they were all agreed as to morals; and yet there were those who would not consent to a measure which would take away from the wretch, who was willing to be bribed, that which gave value to the bribery. There was a plan for doing away with perjury by abolishing bribery; but the very remedy denoted a foregone conclusion, and showed how extensive was the perjury which was thus to be provided against; but still the corrupt voter would remain the self-degraded wretch, and the same hateful miscreant same as under the present system. The highest value, however, which he set upon the ballot was that if the voter was not to be bribed, the question arose how was he to be influenced? He could, then, only be influenced by the public worth and services of the candidate, and the consequence would be that in endeavouring to win the suffrage in his behalf, the candidate, instead of endeavouring to corrupt the public by bribery, would recommend himself by his virtues, and become noble, generous, and humane. The discussion taking the shape which it had done, spoke in favour of the original principles of the Reform Bill, as it showed that the majority in that House had the modesty, at least, to shun the test of the ballot-box, well knowing what would be the result. The degrading effect of the ballot, he meant of the present system, was well known; and, indeed, admitted by all, for none stood up to deny the extent of the bribery which had been alleged; and in the Bill of the noble lord, the member for Dublin, that bribery would be stamped in perpetual record.

Subject, DISTRESS OF THE COUNTRY; Date, JULY 8, 1842.

Mr. O'Connell said that if he thought, in rising so early to address the House, he could influence their determination, he should be guilty of presumption and vanity. He knew well that he could not hope they would do anything when they had resolved upon doing nothing, but meant to repose in the hope that something better might occur hereafter. If he could hope to excite them to exertion, he might point to the present state of things as sufficient to arouse them; he could tell them that there was much peril in their present position. He might warn them that the state itself was in danger; that evil was around them, and a still greater evil impending. There could be no doubt that distress pervaded England. He never knew such an unanimity to prevail upon any subject as upon the allegation of general distress in England. Ireland, too, was suffering; but that, alas! was now nothing new. She was, however, suffering extremely at present. There were two sources from which sprung the misery of Ireland—one was in its nature temporary, but was constantly recurring; and the other was more permanent in its nature, and the relief not possible at present. To give relief, however, to Ireland, they must first have prosperity in England. The first species of distress in Ireland was the consequence of the three bad harvests. They had an exceedingly short harvest last year. He had reason, however, to believe, to have the confident hope, that the poor man's harvest this year was likely to be very abundant. That was information which he received from every quarter. Of course he was sure that there was nothing that he could announce to the House that would give more general satisfaction. He feared, however, that a very contrary intimation must be given of the wheat and oats, which were of ~~the~~ the greatest importance to Ireland. He wished it might not be so; but he was afraid there was great accuracy in the statements he had received, conveying the intelligence. The other distress which was most permanent

in Ireland, was the distress of those engaged in all kinds of trade, and especially the retail dealers. The business of the shopkeepers was diminishing daily, their debts were increasing, their profits disappearing, and their embarrassments continually extending. He did not see the possibility of this state of things being relieved, unless he could find it in the common interests which Ireland had in the prosperity of this country. He had, then, a nation's interest in relieving the distress that now prevailed in England. To show the distress that prevailed in Ireland, he should read an extract from an Irish newspaper. It was to the following effect :—

“ It would appear from the Galway, Roscommon, and Tuam papers received yesterday, that the sufferings of the destitute have been but slightly, if at all, alleviated by the exertions of the local communities, and for the simple reason, that the wealthy have neither aided them by their personal influence, nor contributed in proportion to their means, the whole weight of the burden has, as usual, fallen on the middle classes—the small resident gentry, the shopkeepers, and farmers, have subscribed largely and generously towards the relief funds; but the absentee landlords have done nothing, or next to nothing for the miserable wretches who are literally dying of hunger in the immediate vicinity of their castle gates. ‘The distress of the people,’ says the *Galway Vindicator*, of Saturday, ‘is far from being abated. Throughout several districts of Mayo, and in this county, the people are pining under an amount of suffering unprecedented in the annals of even Irish misery. The calamity is aggravated by the heartless brutality of grinding and oppressing landlords, who have no bowels of compassion for the poor.’ That the people are in the condition described above is unfortunately too true. Famine is stalking over the land, and the calamity, as the Galway paper observes, is aggravated by the heartless brutality of the possessors. On Saturday last, a poor man came before Mr. Brew, the stipendiary magistrate at Tuam, and voluntarily made oath that neither he, his wife, nor his two young children, had partaken of any description of food since the preceding Monday; in other words, that, for five days and nights, a whole family had been subjected to the most horrible torture which human nature can endure?”

There was nothing worse than that in this country, but still there was not the least doubt of the fearful extent of the distress here. Not a town was spoken of without a description of

the distress which existed in it. The statistics of misery had been over and over again gone through. This had not been a question of relief, not of hopes of prosperity, not of anything like ordinary or temporary distress; but it was a question of what places were most deeply afflicted; what trade laboured under the greatest depression; what class of operatives were worst off; in which town was the greatest number of families pining under the influence of want and despair? And this was the way in which this country was spoken of—this great country, which had so long held its proud state, the first among the nations, the first in arts, in science, and in arms; the first in commercial industry, acuteness, and in that mental power and vigour which had given its skill free scope and field; which had made it the “envy of surrounding nations, and the admiration of the world.” What was its condition now? A condition of distress; of despair; of people, of families famishing. He felt he could not depict in language strong enough for the occasion the extent of surrounding misery. But were they safe in remaining thus? Was the social state safe in remaining thus? He had listened the other evening with the most profound attention to the speech of the right hon. baronet, the Secretary for the Home Department. He had listened with equal attention to the speech of the right hon. baronet at the head of the Ministry, and to that delivered by the noble lord, the Secretary for the Colonies. He had listened to them all with the utmost anxiety, to hear whether they held out any hope to the people; whether they held out any consideration to come between them and despair. The speech of the noble lord was characteristic. It was a reply, and, of course, an able one, but it had no more to do with the distress of the country, or the mode of relieving these distresses than it had with the late cabinet of Shah Soojah, or a convocation of mandarins at Canton.

The noble lord referred to a whole catalogue of causes, to which different people attributed the distress, and sorry was he to see a smile upon the faces of some hon. members at the recital; but the noble lord had given them no cata-

logue of means of relief; he had suggested no hopes—had held out no expectations of relief. The noble lord had talked of the causes of distress; but the question was, the means of relieving that distress. On that head the noble lord said nothing. The right hon. baronet, the Secretary for the Home Department, likewise had suggested no measure of relief. He had told them of the impropriety of using language in that House which would have the effect of exciting the people. But if hunger did not excite them, what signified language? Then came the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government. And what did he say? The right hon. baronet objected to the terms of the amendment with all his great ingenuity; but out of these objections, supposing the right hon. baronet to have been triumphant, could he not have framed a resolution of his own, which the House might adopt. There could be no difficulty in getting ready the words, provided they got the things. But the right hon. baronet had concluded by stating that the quantity of cotton which had been entered for home manufacture this year was as great, if not greater, than last year; that some mills were about to be opened, and some foundries put in blast. But had any man ever held out a hope of the general distress being alleviated by these means. The right hon. baronet's speech was a mere piece of mystification, not applicable to the question, and presenting no consolatory topics. His answer to the mystification was, that the people were starving. The right hon. baronet boasted of his tariff as being superior in conception and extent to the proposed commercial plans of the late Government; he had entered into the details of the subject, but had they healed the evils in the land? His answer to the tariff argument again was, that the people were starving. He did not mean to speak of the right hon. baronet's speech or those of his colleagues with disrespect, but they contained no matter for hope—no suggestions thrown out with a view of producing even partial relief. And if the Government could not even give them hope, ought not they, for the sake of the people, consent to an inquiry. The fact of the distress

was undoubted. It was undoubted, too, that it was not a distress which had suddenly sprung up. It was certain that it had been approaching gradually, that, like the stealthy progress of the in-coming tide, it had been pursuing its gradual course, and year after year, going on increasing more and more until it had now arrived at its acme, a deplorable and unendurable height. This they had on all hands admitted. And was it not most melancholy to think—was it not most deadening to hope, to look back upon the gradual approach of that misery, proceeding by degrees, and overwhelming everything which came in its way? Day after day more operatives were being discharged, and want was increasing. Nobody denied all this, and yet there were they sitting, talking coolly upon the subject, while the country was starving. He did not know if it was a superstitious feeling, but he could not divest himself of the idea that there was something fatal—fearful—approaching. Why did he think so? It was from this. Did they forget that they were class legislators?—did they forget that there was a landed class in this House—that there was also a class having great commercial wealth? and did they forget that the people knew it as well as they did? Did they forget that this House had been thronged with those who had obtained their seats by means of the grossest bribery? Did they forget that it had been admitted that bribery had everywhere existed; and did they forget that the people believed that they owed their seats to the worst and foulest means? They all knew that the Anti-Corn-Law League was at present holding sittings in London, and he supposed there was no man so insensible as not to read the speeches which had been made there (*a laugh*). Ay, they laughed—they had not thought of doing so. That laugh with which his words had been greeted strengthened his impression of impending calamity; for could he entertain other feelings when he saw the misery of the people treated with ridicule and laughter? But he would read the following extract from one of the speeches delivered at the Anti-Corn Law League. It was this:—

“Had not the working classes and the middle classes reason to speak with unqualified contempt of the House of Commons? Had it not been returned by gross bribery? Had they not all of them declared such to be the case in the House of Commons? Had not the aristocracy of England, and also the money-bag aristocracy, brought about their consummation? Had they not caused thousands of honest and independent minds, by threats and intimidation, to commit mental treason against their country; and would they not abominate that system that scared men into vassalage, and cursed them with slavery—that maddened them into lunatics, and drove them to acts of incendiarism, and if they did not die upon the scaffold, they were sent to foreign lands, or else they were made paupers and buried as such.”

Was it not something new that language like this should be uttered—not by a constant agitator—not by one who made such pursuits his business, and was often therefore stigmatised as a demagogue—but that it should be uttered by industrious persons of the middle and wealthier orders, who, under the pressure of grievances, were driven to use language which, in their more calm moments, they would have avoided? Was not such a state of things pregnant with danger? The right hon. baronet at the head of the Government had told them that in many towns and districts there were individuals who openly tried to excite the people to acts of violence. The right hon. baronet had told them this, giving them, at the same time, the melancholy consolation that they possessed sufficient military power to put down any sudden outbreak of violence. It was indeed true that they should be glad to hear that the social state had some means of protection. But was it not melancholy that there did exist in society materials of such an inflammatory nature that the destruction of property might soon commence as a sort of revenge for misery and distress; and that even in these suffering districts the people were not left to the mere incitement which hunger or their own bad passions might lead as to acts of violence, but that there were persons among them instigating them and urging them forward. Those great proprietors—those who have lived a life of luxury and ease—did they not hear in the groans of the people a voice of prophecy, a threatening voice, warning them that their state was not secure;

announcing to them the perils by which they were surrounded? Would they wait until manufactories were blazing and farmsteads on fire? With such a prospect would they stand still—would they do nothing for the people? Much of the fear, of the forebodings which he felt was founded upon the simplicity which, in political subjects, existed among men naturally humane and generous. He was not accusing them of insensibility in their individual characters, but the more kindly and generous they usually were, the more astonished he was that this insensibility should sometimes prevail. Their not rousing themselves to put some bounds to the country's misery stamped insensibility upon them.

They (the Opposition) were often asked, what means of relieving the distress they would resort to. He would, at all events, make an experiment. The state of the country was such as to warrant them in trying any experiment from which they could hope to reap beneficial results. But there appeared to be a simple plan. The simplest housewife could adopt it. The people were hungry—let them eat. But they said there was no food. Let them tell him no such thing. There were at this moment upwards of 1,500,000 quarters of wheat lying in bond, waiting until higher prices became high enough for the landlords to allow the people to be fed. Let them take care, for a time might be at hand in which no rents would be forthcoming. If this was an ordinary time of distress he would not urge them to make the experiment; but they were in a woeiful state; the whole social state was in danger. Make the experiment, then. It must injure the landholders, but it would hold out some prospect of relief. The people knew that food was within their reach. They knew that it was locked up from them, in order that one class amongst them might prosper. The monopolists, indeed, said they continued the system for the benefit of all; but the people said they persevered in it for the benefit of themselves. The monopolists said that their object was the prosperity of all classes. The people's answer was, "You are prospering, but we are starving." And their complaint had

the likeness of truth; nay, it was true. That was the condition of the country. And he addressed the House with a solemn conviction that something terrible was in store if they did not rouse and exert themselves. Yet they stood rigid, immovable, refusing to give relief. Let no man tell him that he had not proposed something definite—something practical. He had proposed a plan which, even if it failed, would enable them to say to the people, "Your distress is not our fault; as far as we can we have relieved your starvation." But they still persevered in even refusing to attempt this. If their minds were not made up upon the effects which the adoption of his plan would produce, let them inquire. Let them inquire into the bearing of the adoption upon the markets. That they could easily find out. He, therefore, in the name of the people, called on the Government to make the experiment. He did so with the conscientious conviction that at this moment the State was in danger, and he could not see how those who allowed the distress to be as deep, as extensive, as it was on all hands admitted to be, could believe that the people could long continue patiently to endure the misery in which they were plunged. Let them remember that this was not the first time in which the country had been placed on the verge of revolution. He remembered the fearful state in which the country was left when the last Tory administration went out of office. The southern counties were in a state of insurrection. Well he remembered that, night after night, houses were attacked; that lives were lost; and that a special commission was obliged to be issued; that the law was disobeyed; that the judge and the hangman were left to be the sole vindicators of social order. He could remember all that. They had escaped the main danger then; but would they continue to escape it? Was the distress which existed then at all comparable to that which existed now? No; the state of things at the period in question was plenty and happiness to what it was now. Did they want to wait until another insurrection should take place? There was no country which would suffer more from acts of revolu-

announcing to them the perils by which they were surrounded? Would they wait until manufactories were blazing and farmsteads on fire? With such a prospect would they stand still—would they do nothing for the people? Much of the fear, of the forebodings which he felt was founded upon the simplicity which, in political subjects, existed among men naturally humane and generous. He was not accusing them of insensibility in their individual characters, but the more kindly and generous they usually were, the more astonished he was that this insensibility should sometimes prevail. Their not rousing themselves to put some bounds to the country's misery stamped insensibility upon them.

They (the Opposition) were often asked, what means of relieving the distress they would resort to. He would, at all events, make an experiment. The state of the country was such as to warrant them in trying any experiment from which they could hope to reap beneficial results. But there appeared to be a simple plan. The simplest housewife could adopt it. The people were hungry—let them eat. But they said there was no food. Let them tell him no such thing. There were at this moment upwards of 1,500,000 quarters of wheat lying in bond, waiting until higher prices became high enough for the landlords to allow the people to be fed. Let them take care, for a time might be at hand in which no rents would be forthcoming. If this was an ordinary time of distress he would not urge them to make the experiment; but they were in a woeful state; the whole social state was in danger. Make the experiment, then. It must injure the landholders, but it would hold out some prospect of relief. The people knew that food was within their reach. They knew that it was locked up from them, in order that one class amongst them might prosper. The monopolists, indeed, said they continued the system for the benefit of all; but the people said they persevered in it for the benefit of themselves. The monopolists said that their object was the prosperity of all classes. The people's answer was, "You are prospering, but we are starving." And their complaint had

the likeness of truth; nay, it was true. That was the condition of the country. And he addressed the House with a solemn conviction that something terrible was in store if they did not rouse and exert themselves. Yet they stood rigid, immovable, refusing to give relief. Let no man tell him that he had not proposed something definite—something practical. He had proposed a plan which, even if it failed, would enable them to say to the people, “Your distress is not our fault; as far as we can we have relieved your starvation.” But they still persevered in even refusing to attempt this. If their minds were not made up upon the effects which the adoption of his plan would produce, let them inquire. Let them inquire into the bearing of the adoption upon the markets. That they could easily find out. He, therefore, in the name of the people, called on the Government to make the experiment. He did so with the conscientious conviction that at this moment the State was in danger, and he could not see how those who allowed the distress to be as deep, as extensive, as it was on all hands admitted to be, could believe that the people could long continue patiently to endure the misery in which they were plunged. Let them remember that this was not the first time in which the country had been placed on the verge of revolution. He remembered the fearful state in which the country was left when the last Tory administration went out of office. The southern counties were in a state of insurrection. Well he remembered that, night after night, houses were attacked; that lives were lost; and that a special commission was obliged to be issued; that the law was disobeyed; that the judge and the hangman were left to be the sole vindicators of social order. He could remember all that. They had escaped the main danger then; but would they continue to escape it? Was the distress which existed then at all comparable to that which existed now? No; the state of things at the period in question was plenty and happiness to what it was now. Did they want to wait until another insurrection should take place? There was no country which would suffer more from acts of revolu-

tionary violence than Britain. The state of society here was so complicated, the different classes so much bound up in each other, that the shock of revolution would produce miseries greater than were or could be contemplated. Surely, this was an additional motive for acting; the very distress which such an event would entail upon those who brought it about was surely a motive which should not be without its effect upon the Legislature in urging them to take some steps of relief. Were they to wait until the incendiary began his work—until the manufactories were blazing, and woollen and cotton mills spreading abroad their flames upon the night? They themselves could not be safe unless they made an effort for the relief of the people. If they stood silent—if class legislators, introduced to the House by such means as he had alluded to, refused to give the people relief, he had at all events done his part. He had laid the distress before them; he had suggested means of relief. If that plan should be found wrong, let those who objected to it make some other suggestion; if they could not make a better, let them take up his. At all events, let them not close upon the people the door of despair. The ministry had given the people no hope—they had shown insensibility to suffering; but let them retrace their steps, and let not Parliament separate until some effort had been made to relieve the suffering millions of this country.

Subject, NEWFOUNDLAND; Date, JULY 30, 1842.

Mr. O'Connell rose to move that the Committee be postponed for three months, to enable a communication to be had from the parties interested. He contended that no case could be made out for the present Bill. What were the facts? In 1832 there was every reason to expect that the grant of a constitution to Newfoundland would be attended with beneficial effects; and, after inquiries had been instituted, a charter was

granted on the 27th July of that year, giving them a constitution, which consisted of two Houses of Parliament; one consisting of representatives elected by the people, and the other of a legislative council appointed by the Crown, a governor having the power of assenting to or withholding his consent from the measures the two bodies agreed to. That constitution had been suspended, in consequence of some irregularities which it was pretended justified such a proceeding. But what was the state of the colony now? Upon this point he would refer to a despatch from Sir John Harvey, the governor, dated October 6, 1841, which said:—

“1. The inhabitants of Newfoundland appear to be unfeignedly loyal and firmly attached to British connection. No material degree of political excitement appears at present anywhere to exist, but, on the contrary, an apparent approximation towards a general disposition to bury past occurrences in oblivion. The trade of the colony is flourishing; its revenues ample and increasing; the fisheries of the present year, both of seals and cod-fish, have been highly successful. 2. The apparent suspension of their representative constitution, so recently conferred upon them, upon the ground of their gross abuse of the elective franchise, has evidently created much apprehension in the public mind, and has, I am willing to believe, produced such a moral effect as would exert a salutary influence in repressing any undue violence in future elections, in the event of her Majesty's Government deciding on authorising me to convene another assembly. . . . To some of the causes to which these discordant proceedings may be imputed I may hereafter advert; at present I will merely observe, that all parties are, I hope and believe, convinced that moderation in their measures and proceedings will best accord with their true interests; and all and every individual of every creed, party and denomination who has approached me, and with whom I have held communication, has expressed an anxious desire that its constitution should be restored to the island, with certain modifications.”

The people were loyal and attached to this country, and, how were they about to reward them? By trampling on them and taking away their constitution. Let them not trust too much to their power to crush the people of Newfoundland. Let them remember that the French had a strong interest in the island. What were the reasons for seeking to oppress the inhabitants of Newfoundland? He regretted that he should have

to state what those reasons were, but the truth must be told. They were persecuting the people of that island, because the majority of them were Roman Catholics. Mark the words used by the noble lord opposite in his despatch, in answer to that from Sir John Harvey, from which he had just quoted. The noble lord the Secretary for the Colonies said—

“So far as my attention has yet been called to the difficulties connected with the administration of the affairs of Newfoundland, they appear to me to arise mainly from three causes:—1st. The interference of the Roman Catholic priesthood with election matters, which has led to feelings of religious animosity, previously unknown in the colony, and to scenes of a scandalous character, shocking to religious and well-disposed Roman Catholics.”

The grievance that he particularly complained of was, that this Bill was not founded on an investigation in which both parties had been heard. All he required was, that the Bill should be postponed till such an investigation was completed. In connection with this part of the subject, he would read an extract of a letter written to himself by the Bishop of Newfoundland, and dated the 25th of June, 1842:—

“MY DEAR LORD MAYOR—Your lordship retains in recollection the committee of last year; you remember that upon the occasion of that mock inquiry the people of Newfoundland were taken by surprise, and had no opportunity of being heard either by evidence or by counsel before that body, and that the several witnesses examined—almost all, indeed I believe all, with the exception of Captain Geary—were persons who professedly had not been in that island for several years, Sir Thomas Cochrane since 1834; Mr. Brooking since 1835; Dr. Shea since 1836; and none of them present during the general election, which took place in the latter part of that year, and the occurrences and the returns at which were made the principal subjects of complaint; but the people of Newfoundland were studiously kept in the dark upon the subject of the intended inquiry, although the Legislature was sitting at the time, until accident developed it on the very last day of Session.

“Notwithstanding the House of Assembly had only a few hours of existence before them, however, they appointed four gentlemen of their body to repair to London and assist at the investigation in the expectation that they would have been examined, and that the country would have the benefit of their evidence; but upon their arrival in London the Committee was up, the Parliament shortly after prorogued, dissolved, and the ministry changed.

“ Under these circumstances the delegates of the Assembly, appointed by their unanimous vote, were received by Lord John Russell, and invited by his lordship to put themselves in communication with the Government in writing ; and in compliance with this invitation three or four important communications were made by them ; and then, finding that there was no likelihood that the affairs of Newfoundland would, during that year, be brought under the consideration of Parliament, they departed from London, and returned to Newfoundland, but not before they had procured from Lord John Russell, through Mr. R. Vernon Smith, a reply, that no measure should be mooted with respect to Newfoundland without a fair and sufficient notification being previously made to the people of that colony, to enable them to adopt the necessary means of defending their constitution ; a distinct pledge bearing date 30th of August, 1841, and signed by R. Vernon Smith, that if the House of Commons shall determine on reviving the committee on the affairs of Newfoundland, the Secretary of State will give you (the delegates) due intimation of it ; and a similar pledge was subsequently verbally given by Lord Stanley to Mr. Brown, after the departure of the delegates ; and by Lord Stanley, Mr. Brown was distinctly authorised to communicate that pledge to his colleagues.”

He had a right to say that faith had been kept with the parties who opposed the Bill. There was an absence of all evidence on which to proceed to the destruction of the constitution ; on the contrary, the greatest blessings resulted to the people from their having obtained a constitution. A small and insignificant party was interested in the destruction of the constitution, because it would advance their own monopolising interests ; but the popular party—the party benefited by the constitution—the party interested in the internal improvement of the colony, desired the preservation of the constitution, and that was the position of the inhabitants whose interest it was now sought to crush.

But let them see what were the alterations which the noble lord proposed to make in the constitution. The first was to destroy the two Houses of the Legislature, and amalgamate them into one. Why thus mock them with the appearance without the reality of a constitution ? Let the old system be revived. Let despotism be established. Let the people be punished formally for making improvements in the colony, for

building houses, for cultivating the land. Let there be a despotism which would be responsible, but let them not receive a mockery of a constitution. Let not their legislature be converted into a divan. The second alteration proposed was an increase in the qualifications of the members of the Assembly. Sir J. Harvey recommended the increase in the qualification, and he was not adverse to it. The colonists themselves were willing to increase the qualification; but this Bill proposed to take the matter out of their hands. He protested against thus taking the legislation upon this subject from the inhabitants of the colony. He objected also to the change proposed to be made in the qualification of voters, which was to be raised to a £5 franchise for the town districts, and a 40s. freeholder with an occupation of two years. He contended that such an alteration would disfranchise a very large proportion of the inhabitants, and whom Sir J. Harvey considered as the most valuable part of the community. Sir J. Harvey said in a despatch, dated January 10, 1842:—

“I am of opinion that to require any rent qualification whatever, or any property—one, beyond, perhaps, the lowest value of a log hut (say 40.), and that, in fact, can scarcely be regarded as the property of the squatter, from being erected on ground to which he can have acquired no other title than such as an unauthorised occupancy may be considered conferring upon him—would operate a very extensive disfranchisement in the country districts, without at all improving, or, indeed, materially changing the description of voters; and, with regard to the towns, the qualification being already restricted by an Act of the Local Legislature to one person in each house, namely, him by whom the rent is paid, no further provision would appear to be required upon this subject.”

Sir J. Harvey solicited the opinions of five “highly respectable individuals in the colony,” and they all agreed that the effect of raising the franchise would be the disfranchisement of many voters. One of these gentlemen said:—

“After giving the subject all the consideration in my power, I beg respectfully to say, first, with regard to voters, that it may be laid down as a general proposition, that a household franchise is most suitable to the pecu-

liar circumstances of the inhabitants of this colony. Under this circumstance, it is my opinion, that a rent or property qualification, to supersede the present unlimited system of household suffrage, would, in effect, disfranchise a large portion of the inhabitants. I hope it may not be considered presumptuous in me to state, in conclusion, my humble opinion that, if the present constitution, so generously and liberally granted by his late Majesty, has not been found to answer the expectation formed at the commencement, the fault does not lie in the constitution."

The second gentleman said :—

"I consider, in the present state of Newfoundland, a property qualification impracticable and unjust; it would have the effect to disfranchise the greatest and best part of the population. In a moral and political point of view, I consider household suffrage the best that has yet been discovered. A householder is, for the most part, a husband and a father, having a fixed locality; the peace of his community and the prosperity of his country must be dear to him."

The third expressed his opinion as follows :—

"I do not think that a rent or property qualification would be productive of much, if any, practical advantage. Household suffrage, guarded by an efficient system of registry, together with simultaneous voting under a new division of the electoral districts, such as I recommended in my communication to the right hon. her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord John Russell, in July last, would, in my humble opinion, go far to render any other qualification unnecessary. In nearly all the other settlements, the inhabitants occupy premises which have descended to them from their ancestors, or land which they have themselves redeemed from the wilderness, for which they pay no rent to the Crown, and on which they have built for the convenience of their families and the purposes of the fishery. I would further remark, that such property is, in a great degree, valuable only so long as it be thus occupied, and that the annual rent of an ordinary house in St. John's would be almost equivalent to the full value of these freeholds, and, in many instances, much more."

The fourth gentleman admitted that the augmentation of the franchise would deprive of the right of voting a class of persons whom he was pleased to describe as "strangers and raw youngsters recently imported from England or Ireland." The fifth

gentleman who was applied to for information, expressed himself in a similar strain. He said:—

“The advantages which would result from such a regulation or law would be to disfranchise many adventurers arriving from the mother country or the colonies, having no property or stake in this colony, and who have hitherto been allowed to vote from the occupation of a hut of nominal value in the woods, or a room, as under-tenant, in town.”

It had been said, with respect to the subject of the finances, that the Crown ought to have the power of originating money-grants, as was done in this country. Why, according to the Charter, no money could be expended without the Governor's warrant. Some grants, certainly, could be made by the Assembly, but was that a ground for destroying the constitution? Everything that was wanted would be done. There was no necessity for thus trampling on the liberties of the people. The Catholic bishop of the colony, in the letter from which he had already quoted, stated that the Assembly had never refused any supply; that they had been always ready to adopt any proposition made by the Governor, notwithstanding the Council had thwarted them in every possible way. He would read the passage to the House:—

“I might go much further; but that I feel I have already fatigued you I might mention the extraordinary circumstance, that this much maligned House never refused whatever supplies were demanded by the Executive, however extravagant; and that, notwithstanding this, the Council were eternally thwarting them, by refusing the necessary votes for the necessary contingent expenses of the House. I might mention, that every measure that was ever recommended by the Secretary of State, or by the Governor, was ever sure, without one solitary exception, to be adopted by the Assembly, and reduced to a Bill, and passed; and I might have shown you, that Bill after Bill of these, notwithstanding such recommendation, was thrown out by the Council, many of them even without amendment, many without reaching to a committal, and some even without a second reading. But I think I have gone far enough, to inform you generally upon the main questions connected with this Bill; and even this would, probably, have been unnecessary, were it not that the official party here, who are leagued with the merchants, have just now entered upon a most furious crusade against the press, evidently to silence them while this measure is before the House.”

He denied that the noble lord had found the constitution suspended. The Session of the Assembly had ended in May, 1841, and it was impossible that a new election could have been held before November, because the whole adult population was absent, during the interval, at the fisheries. The deputation which had been over here on the subject had been assured, by Mr. V. Smith, that nothing should be done without due investigation. Now, he asked where that investigation had taken place? Every principle of honesty, of justice, and of fairness, was in favour of his proposition, and yet he knew that the majority of that House would support the Government in this attack upon the liberties of Newfoundland. If the Bill had been brought forward earlier in the Session, an expression on the subject might have been elicited from the people of England, who would have had generosity enough to ask for a fair trial. Why did not the noble lord call another Assembly, as had been recommended by Sir John Harvey, and see if that Assembly would not make every necessary alteration in the existing constitution? They had stated their willingness to raise the qualification of members, and to give the Government the initiation in the introduction of grants. Under the noble lord's plan, considerable delay must take place in calling together the Legislative Assembly. Under his plan, no such delay would take place. It had been objected that, among the members of the Assembly, there was one who could not read or write, and two who were in menial situations. Had those persons been elected by the popular party? No. They had been elected by the mercantile party to bring the Assembly into contempt. In 1836, the elections placed the anti-constitutional party in a minority, and the Government declared those writs void, because a little bit of wax had not been attached to them. At the new election, four mercantile men were elected; they refused to serve, and these persons were elected in their stead; so that the anti-constitutional party first elect improper persons, and then turn round and say, "Look at the improper persons who are elected under this constitution." Could anything be so gross or so in-

consistent as this? He had received a letter which gave a history of the transaction. The writer said:—

“It is a singular circumstance that all the persons who were complained of as being unfit members were returned by Protestant districts. I do not blame the Protestant constituency for this; it grew out of a combination among the Protestant merchants not to take a seat in the Assembly, even though they should be elected. In the year 1836, during the administration of Captain Prescott, there was a general election; it was hotly contested in almost every district in the island; the general result was a majority in favour of the Liberal party. Shortly after this election was declared void, owing, as it was said, to some informality in the writs. When the mercantile party could not acquire a majority, they changed their tactique, they seceded altogether—they not alone seceded, but they used their influence to return unfit persons. The person most complained of was a man named Moore; he was returned for Trinity by the influence of the house of Robinson, Brooking, and Garland, and then, after thus notoriously supporting the return, they charged the disgrace of it on the Catholic constituency. I will now give you the names of Conservatives who were returned in 1836, and who, on a new election, declined to offer themselves:—

“Robert Job, merchant, for the district of Bonavista; Thomas Bennett, ditto, Flago; William B. Row, lawyer, Fortune Bay; John Shea, editor of a paper, Burin. These would have a great influence on a House composed of fifteen members, with a council exclusively Protestant; but they would not again offer themselves. Our constitution is now suspended. It is rumoured, that Lord Stanley, fortified by *ex parte* evidence of the witnesses before the committee, is about introducing some Act into the Imperial Parliament. If we are punished, it is because we are Catholic. We have, however, some hope that the justice of our cause will protect us.”

The jealousy of the constitution was, in fact, jealousy of the Catholics of the colony. Up to the period of the granting the constitution, Catholics were excluded from every situation. He was perfectly ready to go into any investigation of the facts of the election, during which two outrages did occur, but the accounts of them had been grossly exaggerated. He contended that House ought not to legislate without hearing the other party. Would they give a triumph to one party alone? He had gone through this case; he had not gone into a discussion respecting rates and taxes, because other opportunities would

occur for doing that. But here was a constitution, with all the regular forms, already adopted. All the American colonies had had such constitutions conceded, and had derived advantage from them. He denied that the Roman Catholics had shown any exclusive spirit, or any wish to absorb all the funds of the colony to their own purposes. To prove this, he would read an extract from the petition of the inhabitants of St. John's, Newfoundland:—

“That in order to meet the charge of the subserviency of the Assembly to the Catholic priesthood, a glance at the records of that body will prove that in no single instance was a measure not only passed for the promotion of exclusively Catholic interests, but such a measure was never once introduced or thought of; nay, on the contrary, the only measure that ever passed the Assembly with reference to religion—with the exception of the marriage Act, legalizing the marriage of Catholics and Dissenters—was the granting of a sum of money to assist the Protestants of Harbor Grace in the rebuilding the Episcopal Church, which had been destroyed by fire, which grant was proposed and seconded by Catholics, and was carried by a Catholic majority.”

The Bill was brought forward at a time when it was utterly impossible to give it a fair discussion; all from whom he might expect a fair hearing, or from whom the inhabitants might expect redress, were absent; nor had he the slightest hope of convincing those who were listening to him. He put the question on the foundation of plain common sense. All he asked of the noble lord was to postpone the Bill till the next session, till the House could hear what the inhabitants of Newfoundland had to say. Their delegates would then be here, and anything that was just and reasonable, they would be ready to do. But he did implore the noble lord not to crush the colony with such a measure as this. He concluded by moving that this Bill be committed that day three months.

Subject, STATE OF IRELAND—ADJOURNED DEBATE ;
Date, JULY 23, 1844.

The Whig administration went out at the close of the year 1841. O'Connell had supported this administration vigorously, though he had described its men and measures as "base, bloody, and brutal." When the Tory ministry came in with Peel, O'Connell did less work in Parliament and more in Ireland. He had become an adept in evading the law by the formation of associations. The Precursor Society now merged into the world-famous Repeal Association, with which O'Connell occupied himself actively. He was also Lord Mayor of Dublin. In 1843 O'Connell made the great mistake of absenting himself from the English Parliament; nothing could be gained by such a course. Had it not been adopted for a time by one whose powers of mind outweighed those of his contemporaries, it might be called puerile. The object was to gain something from England, but it was by tongue and pen, effectively used in the place where speech would be heard, and where pen could not be refused type, that the real work had been effected hitherto. For Irish members to refuse to represent their country in the British Senate while they had no Parliament of their own was a suicidal policy. English members who might be, and who, to their credit be it said, were convinced by Irish eloquence to redress Irish wrongs, could not be expected to use exceptional means of informing themselves on such subjects.

The Tara meeting was held and caused great excitement in Ireland, but the echoes of its appeal died away faintly on the English shore.

The Clontarf meeting was planned and abandoned at the last moment. The crafty tactics which kept back the proclamation till the very eve of the day caused O'Connell agonies of fear lest there should be a breach of the peace in consequence, and a breach of the peace would have meant a deluge of blood, and an unsuccessful rebellion. His foreseeing mind grasped all the terrible possibilities, and perhaps his master mind succumbed even then to the first touch of the fell destroyer which was so soon to begin its fatal work on the overtaxed intellect. The meeting was prevented, but not without a victim. Father Tyrrell died from sickness consequent on the over-exertions he made to avert evil. The state trials were the next great event. They began on the 2nd November, 1843. We have not space to allude further to this subject. They ended early in February, and O'Connell proceeded to London, where a stormy debate was going on. He listened in silence for a while, and then he uttered one of his most remarkable speeches.

In the debate which followed when the verdict of "guilty" was known Lord John Russell said—

“Nominally, indeed, the two countries have the same laws. Trial by jury, for instance, exists in both countries; but is it administered alike in both? Sir, I remember on one occasion when an hon. gentleman, Mr. Brougham, on bringing forward a motion, in 1823, on the administration of the law in Ireland, made use of these words—‘The law of England estimated all men equal. It was sufficient to be born within the king’s allegiance to be entitled to all the rights the loftiest subject of the land enjoyed. None were disqualified; the only distinction was between natural-born subjects and aliens. Such, indeed, was the liberality of our system in the times which we called barbarous; but from which, in these enlightened days, it might be as well to take a hint, that if a man were even an alien born, he was not deprived of the protection of the law. In Ireland, however, the law held a directly opposite doctrine. The sect to which a man belonged, the cast of his religious opinions, the form in which he worshipped his Creator, were grounds on which the law separated him from his fellows, and bound him to the endurance of a system of the most cruel injustice.’ Such was the statement of Mr. Brougham, when he was the advocate of the oppressed. But, sir, let me ask, was what I have just now read the statement of a man who was ignorant of the country of which he spoke? No; the same language, to the same effect, was used by Sir M. O’Loghlen in his evidence before the House of Lords. That gentleman stated that he had been in the habit of going the Munster circuit for nineteen years, and on that circuit it was the general practice for the Crown, in criminal prosecutions, to set aside all Catholics and all Liberal Protestants; and he added, that he had been informed that on other circuits the practice was carried on in a more strict manner. Sir M. O’Loghlen also mentioned one case of this kind which took place in 1834, during the Lord Lieutenancy of the Marquis of Wellesley, and the Attorney-Generalship of Mr. Blackburne, the present Master of the Rolls, and in which, out of forty-three persons set aside (in a cause, too, which was not a political one), there were thirty-six Catholics and seven Protestants, and all of them respectable men. This practice is so well known and carried out so generally that men, known to be Liberals, whether Catholics or Protestants, have ceased to attend assizes, that they might not be exposed to these public insults. Now, I would ask, are these proofs of equal laws, or laws equally administered? Could the same or similar cases have happened in Yorkshire, or Sussex, or Kent? Are these the fulfilment of the promise made and engagements entered into at the Union?”

Mr. Macaulay said, in the same debate, February 19th, 1844 :—

“I do say that on this question it is of the greatest importance that the proceedings which the Government had taken should be beyond impeachment, and that they should have obtained a victory in such a way that that victory should not be to them a greater disaster than a defeat. Has that

been the result? First, is it denied that Mr. O'Connell has suffered wrong? Is it denied, if the law had been carried into effect without those irregularities and that negligence which has attended the Irish trials, Mr. O'Connell's chance of acquittal would have been better. No person denied that. The affidavit which has been produced, and which has not been contradicted, states that twenty-seven Catholics were excluded from the jury list. I know that all the technicalities of the law were on the side of the Crown, but my great charge against the Government is, that they have merely regarded this question in a technical point of view. We know what the principle of the law is in cases when prejudice is likely to arise against an alien, and who is to be tried *de meditate lingua*. Is he to be tried by twelve Englishmen? No. Our ancestors knew that that was not the way in which justice could be obtained—they knew that the only proper way was to have one-half of the jurymen of the country in which the crime was committed, and the other half of the country to which the prisoner belonged. If any alien had been in the situation of Mr. O'Connell, that law would have been observed. You are ready enough to call the Catholics of Ireland 'aliens' when it suits your purpose; you are ready enough to treat them as aliens, when it suits your purpose; but the first privilege, the only advantage of alienage, you practically deny them."

Mr. O'Connell spoke as follows: Sir, I hope that there is not an individual in this House who will suppose that I have risen to say anything about myself, or that there is an individual in this House who, after I have said what I intend to say, will have discovered—had he not known it by other means—that I have had any personal interest in the late trials. Sir, I arose for another purpose: I am here to make a protest; I am here to ask a question; I am here to protest in the name of my country, and on behalf of my countrymen, against the commission of one additional injustice to Ireland; and I am also here to ask the simple question of how is Ireland to be governed? I don't ask who is to govern it. I may have my preferences on that point—probably I have—but I ask, how is it to be governed? Sir, there is one fact which no man can deny; and that is—that there is no one country in the world which ever inflicted so much oppression, which ever committed so many crimes against another, as England has committed against Ireland. That, sir, is an undeniable truth. It did not require

the talents of the hon. and learned gentleman, the member for Edinburgh, to elicit that fact—every page of history teems with it—every page of history trumpets it forth to the world, that the greatest crimes that had ever been committed by one nation against another have been those of England against Ireland. But I do not mean to go through the history of Ireland to prove this point—I do not mean to go back further than the period of the Union. But for the misgovernment which has existed since the Union to the present day, this Parliament is clearly responsible. You ought to think of the situation of Ireland at the Union, and compare it with its present state. If Ireland was then in a condition of distress and destitution, and if it has since arisen to prosperity and comfort, then applaud your Government, talk of your wisdom as statesmen, and refer to the fact of the transition from want and misery to plenty and comfort as decisive evidence of the wisdom of our councils. But is it so? Is that the state in which the facts are before the world? No, sir; directly the reverse is the fact. At the period of the Union there was considerable prosperity in Ireland. For eighteen years before that time it had enjoyed the benefit of self-government, and it is a portion of history that no country in the world ever rose so fast in prosperity as did Ireland during those eighteen years. In the year 1800, when Mr. Pitt proposed the Act of Union, what were his arguments? He did not inform the House that Ireland was in a state of want and misery, and that, therefore, it would be advantageous for it to be connected with this great country, and to enjoy a participation in its commercial and manufacturing prosperity. No, sir; the case he made out, the case which it was his duty to make out, and which the facts only warranted him in making out, was, that Ireland had advanced most rapidly in prosperity for years previously—that she exported three millions' worth of manufactured goods, and imported one million's worth of manufactured goods—that her prosperity had thus accumulated when she was separate from England, and that it was clear that if she were connected with

a country so much richer than herself as England, that prosperity would be multiplied beyond calculation.

He admitted, of course—he admitted even against his own interests—that Ireland was in a state of prosperity; and the same thing was declared by the other side, by one of the most powerful statesmen in Ireland—Lord Clare. Both concurred in the material point; but not content with letting well alone, not content with allowing that prosperity to go on progressing, they thought they could accelerate its progress by joining Ireland with England. How few there were informed of the fact, that, at the time of the Union, Mr. Pitt thought that Ireland, prosperous as she then was, would multiply her prosperity in an incalculable degree by the carrying out of that measure. Sir, has the fact borne him out? Is he justified in his prophecy? Is Ireland in a state of prosperity? I am not here to talk of claims for political, and what, in some cases, may be fanciful rights. I am not speaking of the franchise—or of corporation rights—or of municipal rights—or of Parliamentary rights—but I am speaking of material and actual prosperity. Sir, what is the condition of Ireland? You talk of demagogues having power there. Oh! see the materials of their power in the poverty and distress of the country! I suppose many gentlemen have read the *Times* newspaper of yesterday. I assure the House that it was not through any influence of mine that it published the paragraph which I refer to. I did not procure it for it; but if I did, I could not get one better for my purpose. I mean the notice of a work upon Ireland. There is a German traveller, Kohl, who has visited all the countries of Europe, and who has published accounts of his travels. He is unconnected with Ireland, he has no sympathies with Repealers; on the contrary, he showed a distrust towards them. That man, in his book on Ireland, has declared, having travelled through all the countries of Europe, that in none of them did he find distress such as he saw in Ireland. There was no such thing known in other countries; and this, sir, forty-four years after the Union! But, I may refer to another witness; there is a gentleman of

the very euphonious name of Wiggins. He is agent to Lord Headley; he was examined before Mr. Spring Rice's committee, in 1830, to show that there then existed a good prospect for the prosperity of Ireland. He said, certainly the Union was not very useful as yet, but as we are coming to a period of tranquillity, by means of the adjustment of the Catholic claims, he conceived that there was every likelihood of future prosperity. He even quoted instances of this incipient prosperity. He has now published a book, fifteen years after his prophecy he has published a book; and, being a man familiar with Ireland, and with the condition of the people, he has declared that poverty has increased—is increasing—that everything is growing worse—that the sufferings of the people are hardly pronounceable. Those are the materials on which a popular man in Ireland grows powerful. But I have still further evidence. Look again at what the Poor Law Commissioners state. They enumerate 2,300,000 of the population as being in a state of destitution throughout a considerable portion of the year. Considerably more than one-third of the population were in a state of destitution throughout the year. It is not Kohl, or Wiggins, or any other particular individual alone, but everyone who has examined into it, that has found these facts. You have enumerated the population of Ireland—you did in 1821, again in 1831, and again in 1841. Captain Larcom, of the Artillery, superintended the enumeration in 1841. A Government report was made not only of the population, but of the state of the country too; and what facts do I find there? That out of the agricultural population, 70 per cent. are in a state of poverty, living in cabins having only one room; and that 30 per cent. of the town population are in a similar state, no family having more than one room; and in some cases several families in the same room. That is Captain Larcom's testimony. And there is another fact he gives, which will convince every one who reflects, how horrid the state of distress must be. Between 1821 and 1831, the population increased rapidly. Between 1831 and 1841, the ratio of increase was

70,000 per annum less than in the previous decennial periods. There was, consequently, 700,000 persons less in 1841 than ought to have been, and could have been found in Ireland, if the ratio had gone on from 1831 to 1841, as it had from 1821 to 1831. Can any man who hears these facts—can any one who goes across the Channel and looks for himself, deny them? And these are the effects of party—this is the situation into which we have been brought by your Government. I have shown that Ireland was prosperous before the Union. I have given you a faithful picture of her at present. Now, how do you mean to govern Ireland? You can, to be sure, take legal proceedings against some of her people; you have sent an army over. But will that remedy the evils under which she is suffering—will it mitigate them? Will it ease the deplorable poverty in which the mass of the population is sunk?

How little I should care for anything that occurred at these trials, if I could rouse this House, if I could rouse the people of this country to a due sense of the condition of Ireland, and, by inducing you to give up past contentions, I could lead you to ameliorate the state of the people. And for this end the discussion you have had on this motion is not wholly fruitless. I may be permitted to say, that I have felt the effect of it personally. With all my delinquencies on my head, the generous sympathy I have met in this country I shall never forget or conceal. I shall proclaim it from one end of Ireland to the other. This, then, is your time. Rally now for the elevation of the Irish people. Ah! but what little hope have we that this wise course will be taken? Is there any expectation of it? Is it prejudice to deny the probability of a better spirit actuating you? Has the Union been what it ought to be, the amalgamation of the two countries? It ought to have been an identification of the two islands. There should have been no rights or privileges with one that should not have been communicated to the other. The franchise should have been the same; all corporate rights the same; every civic privilege identical. Cork should have no more difference from Kent than

Yorkshire from Lancashire. That ought to have been the Union. That was Mr. Pitt's object. He distinctly obtained the sanction of the sovereign to the measure, on the ground of identifying the people, which could not be done if a dominant religion was to be maintained. Emancipation was, therefore, part of the Union. The moment it was carried, some ill-advisers of the Crown, some exceedingly conscientious men, who deemed their own religion the sole depository of religious truth, induced the King to withdraw his consent. The minister withdrew from office; but what folly, what absurdity it was not to complete a measure then ripe for adjustment! Is there any man living who will say the Union was completed? Is there any man on the other side of the House so besotted as not to admit that the Union was nominal and not real? See what an opportunity you then had of settling the differences which now beset you. There were eleven or fourteen of the bishops, I do not exactly remember which, who were willing to receive salaries from the State, and to give the Crown of Great Britain the power of nomination. You could have made your own arrangements; everything might have been settled according to your wish. But, unhappily, "the Church in danger" was the cry raised. The Union took place—an identification which was no other than that which Lord Byron speaks of as the shark identified with his prey, by swallowing it. And, what was the first Act of your Imperial Legislature? An Act for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act; the abolishing trial by jury. That was the first Act passed by the Imperial Legislature, and it was emblematic enough of the spirit in which it was intended that the Union was to be worked out. In 1805, Mr. Pitt was a party to the rejection of the Catholic petition. He lost his honour, but he reserved his place. Immediately after his death, the Whigs came into office, and carried one great measure. They abolished the slave-trade with the West Indies. They were able to do nothing for Ireland. They brought in a Bill, however, to the effect that the Crown should have the power of raising to high rank in the army and navy, those individuals

who were the proper objects of royal appointment. We were in the midst of a tremendous war, our opponent being the most powerful individual that had appeared on the globe for centuries. The Bill I have alluded to conferred nothing on the Catholics; it was a mere prerogative of the Crown. There was no compulsion on the part of the King to appoint a single additional officer. And here, sir, I cannot help putting it to the gallant officer on the other side (Sir H. Hardinge), how he should have felt, for the bravery which he displayed on the part of his country and the personal sacrifices which he cheerfully made, if he had had no other hope of reward, because his religion happened to be different from that of his Commander-in-chief. Never forget that there were gallant spirits in that army, whose chivalrous courage must have been depressed, because they were conscious they could never have reaped the reward of their valour on account of their religion. And what a paltry and short-sighted policy was yours not to use every inducement to inflame the public ardour, and to make the love of glory subservient to the interests of the empire. Yet what was the wise and sagacious policy of England? The No Popery cry was raised to an extent that seems now almost incredible. Some of the Whigs who had been representatives of counties and open towns for half a century before, lost their places. Was ever popular insanity carried to a height so absurd? You have now an opportunity of acting in the spirit which the Whigs manifested in 1805; neglect it and you will exhibit still greater absurdities than were exhibited in 1805 and 1806. Mr. Perceval then came into the ministry. He proclaimed perpetual hostility to the Catholics, and said that the spirit of the Union was to preserve the Protestants, and never to relieve the Catholics. Just as now, the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Shaw) and the noble lord (Lord Stanley) said that the Established Church is one of the Articles of the Union, and Catholic subserviency a necessary consequence. You have at last, however, outgrown the No Popery cry. Are you very sure that your Church cry is more likely to stand the test of time? Will this discussion—

will the sentiments announced by the noble member for Sunderland, a man of high rank and station, born, I may say, one of the leading statesmen of your country—will the sentiments of the Glasgow meeting, which echoed the opinion of the noble lord, tend to strengthen the position of your Church? When Mr. Perceval declared that concession could not go further, the Catholics were determined they would not take him at his word. They saw no chance for success but in their own exertions. Two prosecutions were instituted—one succeeded, the other failed. But the combination went on; the power of Napoleon increased, and its stimulating influence extended to Ireland. But through that war the Irish went with you. The Catholic priesthood, astounded by the infidelity of France, and seeing how the revolution was marked by the hideous progress of crime, which spread its lava over continental Europe, stood by you, gave good counsel to the people, prevented many and many a revolt, many and many an uprising, and demonstrated that over such a population France, with her principles, could never hope to rule.

Napoleon committed a great mistake; he was blind to the value of Ireland for his purposes. Let me rather say that a providential care preserved these countries from the frightful spread of revolutionary infidelity. As the career of Napoleon progressed and the English grew wiser, and the battles of Lutzen and Bantzen having been fought, his power was supposed to revive; the House of Commons declared that, in the next session, the claims of the Catholics should be considered. In the interval he fell, and his name became a by-word of contempt. The English nation was safe, and the House of Commons did not hesitate to slight its own pledge. The Catholics were again ill-treated. They rallied; a six years' struggle took place, and the Catholic Association was formed. We had monster meetings of various descriptions—provincial meetings, general meeting, simultaneous meetings of parishes—all these we had by our Catholic Association. You attempted a prosecution—there you failed; but you revenged yourselves by a

Coercion Bill. That was in 1825. Well, you neglected the opportunity you then had of conciliating Ireland. Recollect that all the leading agitators, the bishops, persons of every class influential amongst the Catholics, repaired to London. We threw ourselves upon our knees before you—we begged, as a beggar would ask, that you would take the state of Ireland into consideration. Did you want securities? Then you could have had them. Could you get them now? Do you expect the Thames to flow backwards? Emancipation would then have been received with gratitude. You would have been looked on as benefactors, organization would have ceased, and the elements of opposition would have dissolved in society. You had the opportunity, and I was sitting here and heard the right hon. baronet speak of the majority with which he carried the Coercion Bill, and but for the House of Lords it would have been carried. No one did more to conciliate Ireland by the hope of Emancipation than I did in 1825. You rejected it. We returned to Ireland. There was nothing left us but to say—

“ Hereditary bondsmen, know you not,
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow ?”

That was our motto: we assembled: the people were roused, indignant at this treatment: we made offers; and we should have been grateful had they been accepted: they were refused, and Emancipation was carried. You attempted to return a supporter to the Government in the county of Clare. The freeholders turned out, they returned me for that county in 1828, by a majority of 1,900. Emancipation necessarily followed. You granted it in an undignified way. That which you might have given to entreaty you yielded to necessity. That which would have been received as a favour was esteemed as a triumph. Perhaps I am wrong in saying we are rejoiced at it, for I am bound to say that not one atom of the insolence of triumph was shown by any of our countrymen. But our Union was full of mischief—a fraudulent—not compact—but it was a fraudulent surrender—terms of capitulation granted by superior force.

You had 175,000 bayonets in Ireland to carry it; you expended £275,000, in bribery and corruption, and yet you did it in a spirit of the sheerest dishonesty, taking away 200 representatives from Ireland, and leaving her but 100, when every calculation that was directed to that purpose demonstrated that she was entitled to at least 150. When you did grant Emancipation you did it at a sacrifice of the poorer classes of voters. You sacrificed the 40s. freeholders, and raised the suffrage to £10, and you indemnified yourselves by an act of the grossest injustice on the other side, all because the Church was in danger (*"hear" and conversation*). I understand that whisper. The noble lord is mistaken. I did not consent to give up the 40s. freeholders. The noble lord will find it in that book. I will open the book for him. I insisted that the 40s. freeholders of perpetual tenure should not be meddled with; but the 40s. freeholders for a single life or death, as it would be called in Ireland, who were made for an election, I consented to give up, and I wish I could have found the same spirit elsewhere; but, that could not exist on account of this unjust Protestant Church. It is the scapegoat of all your iniquity. You think it makes your Protestant Church sure, and the hon. gentleman opposite is ready to die for it, and has surrounded it with lines of circumvallation. Every oppression in Ireland, every iniquity perpetrated on the people of that country, every right you deprive them of—coporate reform—a limited Reform Bill—everything is placed outside as a buttress to defend and support that Church. And at the present moment what is it that prevents perfect justice to Ireland but the Established Church? Well, but Emancipation having been carried, the Reform Bill, I think, was its necessary consequence, and I take some credit to myself for having assisted in carrying it. But what did the Irish get by it? You added to the representation of the counties of England—you gave Scotland eight additional representatives—you gave five to Ireland; and yet Scotland has only a population of 5,000,000, whilst that of Ireland is 8,000,000. You gave to every one of your English counties, having a population of

150,000, on the score of population alone, an increased representation. When the population was above 100,000, you gave two additional members. To Anglesea you gave two, being an additional one. You gave to Cork, with a population of 700,000, not one member additional. I not only spoke in this House until hon. gentleman were weary of listening to me, but I relaxed from my studies by writing letters for newspapers demonstrating its iniquity. I put them in the shape of a pamphlet, and placed one in the hands of every member of this House. We remonstrated at the iniquity—we showed the injustice, and that, considering the species of franchise you were to give us, and the short representation we were to have, it was impossible Ireland should have justice done her; and if there were 150 members for Ireland in this House, do you think you would be able to get an exclusive scheme of Government in that country?

But the noble lord opposite was one of those who were too careful of the Church to do justice to Ireland. His piety exceeded his love for his neighbour; his principle of doing to his neighbour as he would be done by, did not exceed his attachment to the Established Church. Then we complain of the limited state of the franchise. I am not going into statistics at any length, but in the county of Mayo there are 380,000 population, with 900 voters. In Cork there are 750,000, an agricultural population, with 1,500 voters. Wales, with 800,000, very little more than Cork, has twenty-seven representatives in this House, and 36,000 voters. Does any man imagine that the Irish are so stupid that they would contentedly live under such a scheme of Government as that—that every preference should be made before them, every insulting restriction should be enacted against them? But this was not enough. We were in this limited state of franchise when, an effort being attempted with the then Government to increase that franchise, out came the noble lord upon us, and he brought in a Bill, the effect of which would have totally annihilated the franchise we had. Though in opposition, he carried that mea-

sure through two readings in this House, and many who voted with the ministry on every other question, voted with the noble lord against Irish rights. Under these circumstances we thought it right to bring the Repeal question before the House. It was debated by the House in 1832; there was a division: we had just one Englishman with us—forty-two Irish and one English; five hundred and odd voters against us. But there was, at least, this done, there was a solemn pléde given to this House, re-echoed by the House of Lords, and assented to by the King, declaring that, although they were determined to maintain the Union, they would, notwithstanding that, redress all the grievances of Ireland. I wish the House to recollect that, instantly, Repeal agitation was given up. We accepted that pléde in 1834. An attempt was made to realise it, but the members who attempted it were overruled, partly in this House, and partly in the House of Lords. You redressed no grievance. Will any man show me that one grievance was redressed? We lay by for four years, still no grievance was redressed. If we commenced agitation it would have been said, “We gave you a solemn pléde, to which the King, Lords, and Commons were parties, having the moral effect, though not the legal effect of an Act of Parliament, all branches of the Legislature being parties to the pléde. You would not believe it, you refused to credit it, and we therefore have not been able to redress your grievances?” We passed four years without agitation, in the hope that something would be done for Ireland; and something, it appears, was done, for the noble lord brought his Bill through two readings in this House. I do not wish to trouble the House by reading documents, but as one, which I hold in my hand, contains a good deal of what I should otherwise have to state in a less condensed form, I shall take the liberty of reading it; and I implore the House to observe from it what our conduct was with respect to this subject. Before we took any other step to procure a Repeal of the Union we formed what was called the Precursor Society; and I presented this petition from that society, and moved upon it

myself in this House. The hon. and learned gentleman then read the petition, as follows :—

“ The petition of the undersigned Natives and Inhabitants, Electors and Citizens of the City of Dublin,

“ HUMBLY SHOWETH,

“ WE, the undersigned, respectfully demand the attention of this honourable House to our claim for full and equal justice to Ireland.

“ Equal justice means a perfect identification of rights, privileges, and franchise for the people of Ireland, with those enjoyed by the people of England.

“ We respectfully, but most firmly, demand and insist upon that identification. The people of Ireland are entitled to, and must have, an equality of political and religious freedom with the people of England. They seek nothing more—they will not be content with anything less.

“ They are entitled to the identification and equality of rights.

“ First : As British subjects, contributing to the extent of their means equally with the British people to the revenues of the State.

“ Secondly : As the associates of the British people in all the perils, privations, and sufferings of naval and military life—contributing, as they do, more than their proportion to the ranks of the army and navy.

“ Thirdly : They are emphatically entitled to this equalization, by reason of the Act of the Legislative Union, which, to have any rational and equitable meaning, must be construed as intended to terminate all invidious distinctions and preferences between one portion of the British empire and the other.

“ They are also entitled to it by the determination expressed by both Houses of Parliament to perpetuate the Union between both countries.

“ Our present object is to render the Union complete and irreversible, by making it a real instead of a nominal Union, by changing it from an Union of parchment to an Union of interest and affection, by giving to the Irish people the benefit of the Union principle, and by abolishing the monstrous absurdity of considering both countries united only when the one is favoured and exalted, and the other oppressed and degraded.

“ That to render the Union complete, and in order to carry out the principles of that measure with practical effect, we respectfully demand the following measures :—

“ First : We demand a perfect equalization of the elective franchise in both countries, by extending the rights of voting of each country to the other; and we respectfully, also, submit that these rights ought to be enlarged in both.

“Secondly: We demand an immediate Corporate Reform, equal in every respect with that which England has obtained.

“Thirdly: We demand an adequate number of Representatives for Ireland in the United Parliament, deeming the injustice of the inferiority of Ireland to the other parts of the United Kingdom as one of the greatest grievances imposed by, and as the most unjust part of the Union Statute.

“Fourthly: We demand an equalization of religious freedom with England and Scotland. The people of England are not burdened with the Church of the minority; the people of Scotland are not burdened with the Church of the minority. In order to place the people of Ireland on a just equality with those of England and Scotland, they ought not to be burdened with the support of the Church of the minority; and our demand is, that they may be disembarassed of that burden, by the application to public purposes—especially to purposes of education and charity—of the temporalities of the Protestant Church in Ireland.

“Such is the extent of our demand—

“The equalization and extension of the Elective Franchise. The equalization of Municipal Reform. The equalization of Representation. The equalization of Religious Liberty. Equalization in every right and privilege—inferiority in none—superiority on our part being out of the question. The basis of our demand is identification. We are one nation, or we are not. If we be not, it is absurd and unjust to call the present political connection a nation. If we be one nation, then it is flagrantly iniquitous to treat us as aliens, either in blood, in language, or in religion.

“Should the just prayer of our petition be granted, we who have signed this petition are bound, by integrity and good faith, not to seek the Repeal of the Union Statute. We do not put the case in the alternative. We menace nothing. We threaten no ulterior measure; but we may venture to prophesy that, if the justice we require be refused us, the social elements of Ireland will never settle into tranquillity whilst the Union is a mere mockery and delusion, insulting and oppressive, by the inferiority which it inflicts upon the people of Ireland.

“We tell this honourable House that there are elements in the moral and physical energy of the Irish people, which will hereafter cause many to regret that they did not avail themselves of the present opportunity of consolidating the Union. We respectfully inform this honourable House that the Irish people will laugh to scorn the pretences under which justice is refused to them. Even if the Protestant Church in Ireland were in danger from the concession of the just right of the Irish people, that danger should be incurred.

“We believe that the real danger to that Church consists in its being obtruded, upon all occasions, as the motive for refusing to the people of

Ireland the rights and privileges which the people of England enjoy. We deem those persons false and foolish friends of the Protestant Church, who put forward Protestantism as the shield and protector of corporate iniquity and political oppression in Ireland; and as there is no other excuse for withholding the rights of the Irish people, save the alleged danger to the Protestant Church, from doing us justice, we do loudly and firmly, though respectfully, call upon this House, not to debase religion, by making it the cloak and accessory of crime, but to act now at length justly, and even generously, towards the people of Ireland, and to indemnify them for past oppression, by giving them full guarantee for future freedom.

"May it, therefore, please this honourable House to identify the Elective Franchise in England and Ireland—countries in which the tenures of land and houses are similar—and to give to Ireland as complete Municipal Reform as England has obtained, and to give also to Ireland her adequate proportion in the representation; and, finally, to place Ireland on a footing of equality in religious freedom with England, by allocating the temporalities of the Church of the minority in that country to purposes of charity, education, and public utility. And petitioners will pray."

I moved, sir, on that petition, for an increase of the Franchises in favour of Ireland; but what success had my motion? It was seconded, certainly; but that was all. It was opposed by the Government then in office—it was opposed by the Government now in office. It was opposed by both sides of the House alike. I will say that reasonable—that fair—offer ought to have been accepted; or if all the relief I demanded were not acceded, I submit that the House at least ought to have instituted an inquiry into the grievances of Ireland. Something ought to have been done. Nothing was done. We were scouted out of the House with contempt; and he knows little of the feelings of the Irish heart who thinks that we should not regard ourselves as degraded, if we acquiesced in silence in the injustice thus perpetrated against us, by those who sanctioned every grievance of the Union. Recollect that I should have been comparatively powerless if I had not a strong case of physical suffering in the country backing me. The poverty—the destitution of the people of Ireland, might be laughed to scorn in this House, but when you had declined affording us any remedy, was it not our duty to look for that

remedy from ourselves, and to endeavour, by our own acts, to mitigate the physical sufferings of the country? I have entered more at length than I intended to have done into the history of the crimes which England has perpetrated against Ireland since the Union. I have but little more to say, but I have, in the name of the people of Ireland, and I do it in their name only, to protest against your prosecutions. In the name of the people of Ireland I protest against the whole of that prosecution. Forty-one public meetings had been held, every one of which was admitted to be legal. Not one of those meetings has been impeached as being against law—each made in the calendar of crime a cypher, but by multiplying cyphers you come, by a species of witchcraft, to make a unit. This, that, and the other meeting were each legal, but the three together made one illegal meeting. Do you think that the people of Ireland understand that species of arguing? I tell you that they do not; and that though you may oppress them, you cannot laugh at them with impunity. Secondly, I protest in the name of the Irish people, against the striking out of all the Catholics from the jury panel. There is no doubt about the fact, that there were eleven Catholics on the panel, and that every one of them were struck off. The fact is certain; it is undisputed. There were excuses, to be sure, offered for it, but there are always excuses made for wrong committed. Oh, but the noble lord said he had a precedent, and he quoted a case in which I had acted in a similar manner. To be sure I did not hear him say the words, as I happened not to be present in the House at the time, but I perceived by those “ordinary channels” through which matters that take place in this House reach the public ear, that he charged me with having packed a Catholic jury. Perhaps he did not use the word “packed.” That is not so refined a word as the noble lord would employ, but it is equally significant. He said that I had “arranged” an exclusively Catholic jury to try a Protestant gentleman. I admit that to be a very serious charge indeed; for though I had no public responsibility vested in me on the occasion, I

had that responsibility which every gentleman at the bar feels to rest with him—namely, that of not outraging decency and justice by any act of his in the discharge of his professional duties. The case to which the noble lord alluded was that of General Bingham, a gentleman who, as a politician, was favourably disposed towards the popular party, and who was a very distinguished officer. He happened to enter into an altercation on the high road, and to drive against his opponent. The assault was not very serious, and yet that is the great case—that is the “State Trial” on which I am charged with having packed a Catholic jury. I am literally stating facts, but, perhaps, the hon. gentleman opposite has an objection to facts. The counsel with me in that case were John Bennett, a Protestant, and Feargus O'Connor, a Protestant, and it was by them that the proceedings connected with the formation of the jury were conducted. I am not shrinking from any responsibility, either direct or remote, that may be attached to my conduct; but the fact was, I happened to be engaged in another court until the moment when the last juror was in the act of being sworn. But, then, was it a packed jury? There were two Protestant gentlemen on that jury, and as all the jurors must be unanimous before the prisoner could be found guilty, it could not be regarded as a religiously packed jury. It happened, besides, that after I commenced my statement of the case, Mr. B. Travers, one of the Protestants upon the jury, was seized with sudden illness, and had to retire, and I then allowed Mr. O'Hea, a Protestant magistrate, to be sworn in his place.

I admit that, if I had the baseness of packing a jury of a different religion from the prisoner, to try one who had been a violent political partisan: if I had packed a jury of Catholics to try a man who had felt it to be his duty through life to take an active and vigorous part in sustaining what are called Protestant principles against the Catholics, there is no possible degradation that I should not think myself deserving of. But General Bingham was not opposed to the Catholics or popular

claims, and the jury before whom he was tried was not exclusively composed of Catholics; and I think I have, therefore, vindicated myself from the charge which the noble lord thought fit to bring against me. They have also sent me lists of two other juries along with that which I have just referred to. One of these was a jury of five Catholics and seven Protestants that, in the year 1838, tried a Catholic priest on a charge of conspiracy? And what was the verdict of the jury so composed? Was it an acquittal, or did the jury disagree? No; but found the prisoner guilty, without leaving the box. The other case has been sent to me from Midleton. It was a case of sedition that had been tried there. The prisoner was a Catholic, and the jury, which was composed of ten Catholics and two Protestants, found the prisoner guilty, also, without leaving the box. I mention these cases to the House, because they enable me to spurn with indignation the base insinuation, that ten or eleven Catholic jurors would perjure themselves in any case in which they would be empanelled. Protesting in the name of the people of Ireland against that accusation, and knowing it, as they do; to be utterly untrue, I leave it as a stigma with you for the mode in which you constituted the jury in the recent trial. They have, also, bid me complain of the diminution of the jury list, which, whatever insinuations may have been thrown out against the man M'Grath, has not been, I think, properly accounted for. A challenge was put into the array, not set forth generally, as in the Welsh case, but averring distinctly that the omission of the names was fraudulently done with intent to injure the traversers. I was not here when, as I have been informed, it was said by the very Attorney-General for England—than whom, I do not think any gentleman ever conducted a prosecution with more perfect accuracy and propriety than has been exhibited by him on every occasion in which he has been concerned—that there could not be, as he thought, a reply to that plea, because the names were not set forth. But, surely, he cannot forget, that a man may be tried for murder, where the name of the person murdered is unknown; and, if the law were otherwise,

would not the effect be, that crime would escape with impunity, if it could not be punished where—though the crime was witnessed—the injured party happened to be unknown? But, would it not, I ask, have been prudent and wise, when a fraud of such an intent was set forth as the ground of a challenge, for the Attorney-General for Ireland not to have shrunk from the proof, but to have met it boldly and openly? The Attorney-General did not act well according to his mode of proceeding, in declining to meet that proof, because he knew the case which he had to sustain, and he has claimed credit for having done so. I have but one observation more to make on the subject of that trial. It is one which I would make with some regret if it were not the fact, that I make it with some peril to myself. It is with reference to the charge of the Chief Justice; and I fearlessly assert that, since the time of Scroggs and Titus Oates, there never was delivered so one-sided a charge. These are the complaints that I have to make on the part of the people of Ireland; and I now turn from them and ask you, what is it you propose to do for the people of Ireland? You probably intend to keep an army of some 22,000 or 23,000 men there; but, can you continue to do so, consistent with the necessary demands upon you from the colonies? But there are some proposals of amelioration made, as I have learned through the same channels through which I discovered what the noble lord had said of me. The first of these is the enlargement of the grant. I do not know is it at Maynooth? (“*No, no!*”) Well, is it for education generally? and, I have to express my gratification at any aid given to education, as I think you cannot educate people too much; though you may educate them to a formidable purpose against yourselves. The next measure of conciliation is the introduction into Ireland of the English Catholic Charities Bill, known as Mr. Lamb’s Bill. I do not know any measure that would do a greater amount of mischief in Ireland than that would effect, though it had been introduced originally for England by myself. The hon. member for Oxford, however, took care to be most punctual in his attendance

whenever I had it in the list, and I had at length to complain to the then administration of my inability to carry it, and they got Mr. Lamb to introduce it in his own name. The Statute for Superstitious Uses, passed in the reign of King Edward VI., has never been extended to Ireland; and, even in England, it was a mere retrospective Act; though, singularly enough, Lord Eldon treated it as being also a declaratory Act. The old statutes of mortmain do not apply to the Catholic clergy in Ireland, as they are not recognised as corporations, and Catholic charities have accordingly been administered by the Equity Courts in Ireland, at all times, as efficiently as Protestant charities. What I would suggest would be, the introduction of a Bill making the Catholic bishop in each diocese a quasi-corporator, so as to enable him to take any quantity of land, the extent of which you might, if you wished, fix within certain limits, and give him power to leave it to his successor without the intervention of trustees, heirs at law, or executors. There is another point, that which relates to the fixity of tenure. Now, I say you are doing immense mischief by not acting expeditiously with reference to that matter, because you are unsettling the minds of all the actual occupiers. There is a feeling abroad, that all who have been ejected within the last six years will be restored. It is a melancholy fact which cannot be prevented—there is a difficulty in your Government getting credit for any useful measure, and the moment the people see a probability of a change, you unsettle their position. You must act rapidly. What I propose you should do is this: you must first make the law of landlord and tenant similar to the law as it stood at the time of the Union; you must strike out every statute you have passed from that day to this to benefit the landlord. That can be accomplished; you have the laws, and the landlords made them; and how can the landlords complain? They even preceded you in passing Acts for facilitating the making distresses in Ireland. The General Replevin Act was passed in Ireland before it was passed in England. In England it was passed in

the reign of George II., and in Ireland, in the reign of Anne. This is within your own limits.

You have much more to do, if you will only try with a spirit and disposition to act fairly for Ireland. You should inquire into the financial arrangements which were made at the Union. I will not trouble you by reading the documents which have been drawn up by the Repeal Association on the subject of the financial condition of Ireland; but if you will condescend to read them, they will show you that a greater injustice was never committed than that which has been committed since the Union, and in consequence of the Union, by the nature of the financial arrangements in Ireland. I say to you on that subject, do her financial justice. The only grievance that has been redressed is that of the corporations; but that is an insult and not a redress. It has thrown out one party from power, and given the shadow of power to the other party, and has dissatisfied them. Make a corporate reform for Ireland equal to that which you have made for England. We do not ask more. Give us that redress which you have given to others. Regulate the corporations in Ireland according to the proportion that the Protestant population bears to the Roman Catholic. I now come to another question—absenteeism; the cause of increasing poverty and destitution. Look upon absenteeism as a crime in Ireland. It ought to be punished as if it were a crime. It is said, how can you get at absentees to tax them? I say you have done it—you have done it by your income tax. The Irish landlord in England pays the income tax. You have the machinery; you can compel him to go back to his country and attend to his wretched serfs (*a cheer from an Irish member*). An Irish landlord cheers me. I am glad of it, for there is not a better landlord in Ireland; there is no necessity for a law to compel him to attend to his tenants; send back others, and let them follow his example. I am talking of an evil with which I am afraid you will not meddle; it wants a radical cure, for it is an evil too great to be borne. There is another boon I ask

for Ireland. Give us an adequate share in the representation. You have rotten boroughs which you can lop off; there is Harwick, with 175 voters, returning two members, and the county of Cork, with a population of 750,000, returning two members also. It has been admitted at the commencement of the present Parliament that there never were instances of greater profligacy than those which occurred at the last election. The hon. member for Bath made disclosures to you; you should act upon them, and give us a fair representation. I come now to the last obstacle of all, and the greatest—the Church. Can tranquillity ever exist in Ireland as long as there is a poor Church, totally unconnected with the State, perfect in all its parts, supported by the majority of the people, and, I am bound to say, insulted by the superiority of a wealthy Church supported by the minority? No one asks you to deprive any living man in this rich Church of his vested interest. Let not the revenues of the present incumbents be diminished; only apply the principle to the successor. You should look at Ireland with the eye of a master, and you will see that till there is religious equality there cannot be political peace. How will you give religious equality? You are told by some to pay the stipends of the Roman Catholic Bishops and clergy; they refuse it; it is impossible for them to accept the money of the State; they would lose caste if they did accept it. They are convinced that the connection between Church and State is injurious to the one and destructive to the other; that is their thorough conviction, and is also my thorough conscientious feeling. You have not a sufficient treasury to pay them; you could only dole out pitiful salaries, which would excite, but not satisfy them. At whatever point of view you look at it, it is impossible. As to talking of their sitting in Parliament, I would rather see them in any place that was not disreputable than in Parliament. Well, as to the other plan—does the Protestant religion require all the money it now enjoys? Would it fall if the clergy were not paid by the State? Is it necessary that religious truth should be backed by money? You tell me

the Protestant religion would fall if its ministers were not so paid. If that be the case, what a triumph it must be to me to belong to the Roman Catholic Church! The Catholics once had all the livings; they had been taken away, and that Church has only had some donations since the Reformation. You deprived the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland of all her revenues, and hunted her priests into the fastnesses. You set the same price on the head of a wolf as you did on that of a priest. And has the Catholic Church fallen for want of money? No; she never was in a more triumphant state than at the present moment. She has four archbishops, twenty-three bishops, fifty deans, sixty archdeacons, two thousand parish priests, with two or three curates each. She has an unbroken hierarchy, as regular, as orderly, and as perfect as it was the day before Henry VIII. ascended the throne. It is not money, then, that supports her; she is no disciple of money; in that respect she gives you a lesson. Have you not the same faith as we have? Are not the Scripture truths propagated by the power of argument, by the influence of education, and the talents of the clergy? Are they not sufficient for the defence and the protection of your religion? Why, then, is the country to be divided? I implore you, then, to look with the eyes of men and statesmen, and cure this anomaly of the Church of the few possessing temporalities, and the Church of the poor possessing nothing but their blessings. I will go back to my country, and carry back your answer. I am afraid it will not be satisfactory. I wish it were. Since the connection between the two countries, has there not been enough of ill-will? Is it not time to lay aside all enmity and malice? Has not the period come when, as Christians, as men, as brothers, we should put an end to the distinction—the odious distinction—between Irishmen and Englishmen, between Catholics and Protestants? Is it not time that all those distinctions, odious in all their relations, should be abolished and done away with, and that there should be a rivalry only in offices of charity and justice?

Subject, COLLEGES (IRELAND); Date, JUNE 16, 1845.

This was O'Connell's first parliamentary speech after his incarceration—when the malady, which ultimately killed him, had already begun its ravages.

Mr. O'Connell—I don't mean to agitate the question of Repeal on this occasion; and I will, therefore, only say that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is a very bad theologian—an exceedingly bad theologian—and being so very bad, it would be well worth his while to inquire a little into the facts before he makes statements on such subjects as that of which he has just been speaking. No Catholic bishop in Ireland could deprive a priest of his functions after a formal induction or a triennial possession. The hon. member for Montrose has spoken of the interference of the Catholic bishops, as if they wished to interfere with a system of education for Protestants, but they have done no such thing. I should be happy to hear of Protestant bishops interfering to secure the religious education of Protestant children—or of Presbyterian clergymen interfering to secure the religious education of Protestant children; and I claim the same right for the Catholics; namely, that the Catholic bishops shall be permitted to take care of the religious education of the Catholic children. I thank the right hon. baronet opposite (Sir R. Inglis) for the admirable description which he gave of this measure when he called it “a gigantic scheme of godless education;” and as regards the alleged success of the system on the continent, so far am I from assenting to that allegation, that I think nothing can be more unsuccessful than the efforts of those who seek to exclude from education religion, which should be the basis of it. I believe that religion ought to be the basis of education; and I came over from Ireland for no other purpose than humbly to represent the necessity of making religion the basis of education; to establish it, not only as a part, but as an essential part of it. I sincerely hope and desire that the discussion of this subject will be carried on with good temper and good feeling,

and that we shall not imitate the hon. member opposite (Mr. Colquhoun) in adopting such a tone, and making unfounded assertions of others who are absent. He boasted two or three times that he was a gentleman, and I think it would be far more consistent with the character of a gentleman if he had acted with more courtesy towards the Catholic bishops. He says that he is not in Conciliation Hall. He is not, it is true; and I should like to know what business he could have in Conciliation Hall, or any conciliation assembly. I must again express a hope that the discussion of this measure will be conducted with perfect courtesy and good humour, and I can pledge myself that such will be the case so far as I am concerned.

Subject, COLLEGES (IRELAND)—ADJOURNED DEBATE;

Date, JUNE 23, 1845.

Mr. O'Connell said—Sir, if this debate had not taken a desultory course, and had not avoided the great measure in dispute, I should have taken the liberty to have obtruded myself much earlier upon the attention of the House, and to have expressed my opinions then in as few sentences as I now mean to address to it. I cannot, however, go on without referring to Sir Philip Crampton, lest it should be supposed that I meant to say anything derogatory to that gentleman, or to insinuate anything that was unworthy of his reputation. I named an instance which I thought was the strongest that I could have adduced, because the mistake into which that gentleman fell was a mistake deduced from Protestant writers. He himself was utterly unconscious that what he was stating was not the literal fact. The Rev. Dr. Miley convinced him that it was not so, and he at once gave evidence of his high character, and the regard which he had for the truth, by retracting the expressions which he had used against the Court of Rome. I have half a mind to detain the House for a few minutes on the subject of Galileo. The right hon. baronet himself introduced it. The general idea is that Galileo was imprisoned for supporting

the Copernican system, and that he was for a length of time in the Inquisition. In point of fact, he was in the Inquisition three days only. Three days constituted the entire length of time which Galileo spent in the Inquisition; and so far from his being sent to gaol for promulgating the Copernican system, the Pope who was the contemporary of the philosopher was the very man who enabled Copernicus to publish his discoveries. Galileo was imprisoned for quite a different thing. He asserted that the centralization of the sun and the movements of the planets could be proved out of Scripture. He was forbidden to publish that doctrine. He broke the prohibition, and was sent to gaol for three days for a breach of the injunction; and that was the history of his imprisonment. I regret that the Government has expressed its determination to persevere with this Bill in its present form, and based upon its present principles. I am not disposed to give any heed at all to the array of motives charged upon the Government for bringing it forward. Almost all our actions proceed from mixed motives. I believe that the predominant motives which actuated the ministers in this matter was to bring forward a measure conciliatory to Ireland. I am quite free to confess, that I believe that such was the leading object of the Bill. I should like to know from the hon. member for Winchester, who paid me a high compliment, attributing to me much power, what were the other measures relative to Ireland brought in by the Government which I could support? The condition of Ireland is now such that no delay can be afforded in the application of a remedy. Ireland is in a frightful state. You have the most decided evidence of that fact in the Reports of Committees and of Land Commissions.

In 1830, Mr. Spring Rice spoke of the great distress which then existed, but was full of hope that relief would be speedily afforded. In 1834, the Poor Law Inquiry Commissioners said that there were 2,300,000 persons in a state of destitution in Ireland. You have now a Land Commission, and what does it tell you? Why it announces to you the startling fact, that

4,500,000—that is to say, more than one-half of the population of Ireland—are in the melancholy condition thus described. They are badly fed, badly clothed, badly housed, and badly paid; their food potatoes—their drink water—a bed and blanket luxuries to them almost unknown; in fact, they are suffering more than any other peasantry in Europe. That is the condition of Ireland, and is it not a condition full of horror? Forty-five years after the Union that is the condition of Ireland! Mr. Spring Rice, in 1830, promised amelioration. Mr. Wiggins, at the same period, expected the approach of relief; but in 1844 he writes a letter, declaring that he was convinced that he was totally mistaken, and that the destitution of the people of Ireland had increased. Of what other people can such a description be given as that which can, unfortunately, be drawn of the people of Ireland? This description is given by Lord Devon's Commission, and there cannot be the least doubt of its accuracy. If it is inaccurate, it is because its colouring is not sufficiently high, and not the least hope of amelioration is held out without the most complete change of measures. Recollect, also, that the agrarian disturbances in Ireland are accumulating year after year. You hear of more and more murders year after year. You hear with horror, and you should hear with repentance, of the increasing number of those hideous assassinations committed by the friends of ejected tenantry upon those who are instrumental in their ejection. The evil is proceeding north. The disturbances are spreading which now pervade the centre of the county of Roscommon, the entire of the county of Leitrim, and part of the county of Cavan; and a meeting of magistrates was held the other day in Fermanagh, where no less than two murders have been perpetrated under the present system within a short space of time. Are the gentlemen of England—are gentlemen in the House of Commons aware that this is the situation of Ireland? They cannot, if they give themselves leave to think, doubt that it is so. The evidence is of the most cogent character, and no doubt can be entertained of the fact which it but too strongly proves. And

yet you are talking here of your mighty boon. What is that boon? The people are starving. Feed them before you educate them. Don't think of such a Bill as I understand has got into the other House of Parliament. Don't mock us with your paltry unfencing of lands. You are calling upon the tenantry of Ireland—that tenantry of whom I have just given you a description—out of the little capital they have saved, to improve their lands, and if they happen to die within thirty years afterwards, their heirs will get some portion of the value of the improvements. When I addressed this House at the period between my conviction and sentence, I asked the Government what they were going to do for Ireland? It was no matter what became of me, my desire was that they should do something for Ireland. Though they did nothing for Ireland, they had on hand a scheme of their own which was to suppress in Ireland the expression of its sense of grievance and wrong. I got no response to my question as to what you were going to do. Let me, then, ask what you now will do for Ireland? I call upon the hon. member for Winchester—and I feel exceedingly flattered by his attentions towards me—I call upon him to say what can the Government do for Ireland; what will the Government help me to do for Ireland? Have the manliness to meet the Irish landlord. One way in which to do good is to make such a change in the present landed system as to afford the people a chance. Do I owe an apology for adverting to this subject? I think not; for it is highly important as regards the question before us. If you want to do anything else for us from which we can expect any good at your hands, you must shape this measure in such a way as that it can be received, and come into action. It will not do for you to make admirable and eloquent speeches like the one to which I listened with pleasure but a few minutes ago; they may sound exceedingly well, but they do no good at all. Your triumphant majorities; your exclaiming, “hear hear;” your declaiming against those who differ from you in opinion, are valueless themselves. Turn your majorities to good account; make them really useful to

Ireland. The present Government is the strongest Government which has been known for a century, and you have everything in your power. Give us then, at least, this measure in such a shape as will enable the people of Ireland to receive it as a boon. You accuse yourselves for not having consulted the ecclesiastical authorities of every description in Ireland before you brought in this Bill. I do not know what harm it would have done you to have so consulted them. You might have told them that you were not to be bound by the opinions received from them, but it would have assisted yourselves in coming to a right determination to have consulted them. The people of England will not sanction this scheme of godless education, and you must introduce religion into your system, or it will not be received by the people of Ireland. The Irish are essentially a religious people. Infidelity is unknown in Ireland. Act manfully, therefore; make religion the basis of your proceedings, and fear not. By so doing you will have a better prospect before you—you will have the protection of a higher Power if you adopt proper principles as the foundation of your scheme; but do not flatter yourselves with the idea that you are doing anything conciliatory to Ireland if, in a matter of this kind, you exclude religion from your consideration. Let there be Presbyterianism for the Presbyterian, Protestantism for the Protestant, and Catholicism for the Catholic. I want nothing for the Catholic which I am not ready to assert for others. Let there be fair play and justice to all.

One would think that, if you introduced religious instruction into the Colleges, you were afraid that you were introducing for the first time the elements of strife and dissension. By Heaven! are not these elements in existence at present? Are men in Ireland not Catholics, Protestants, or Presbyterians, whether you give the instruction or not? By showing fair play to all, by giving the opportunity of a more constant and attentive observance of religious duties, and by giving more religious instruction, you will give a better chance to the development of that which is the predominant quality

in the Christian religion—charity towards each other; and by thus showing fair play and justice to all, you would have a better prospect, at least, of effecting that reconciliation between creeds which is so desirable. If you fail in your present scheme, wou't you be the laughing-stock and the ridicule of the world? If you fail in the scheme of giving religious education, you would have the consolation of knowing that you had failed in a mighty and a majestic attempt—an attempt worthy of statesmen, and worthy in every way of Christian exertions. Do now make an effort in the right direction, and fear not the result. Let me now remind you that the Catholic bishops of Ireland have met on this subject; that they have enunciated their opinions, and pronounced your Bill dangerous both to faith and morals. That is the judgment which they have pronounced upon it. You may scorn their decision, and treat with levity their declaration; but I warn you to recollect that six millions and upwards of the people of Ireland treat their decision with profound respect. Recollect, too, that that decision has gone abroad among the mass of the Irish people. Conciliate the Protestants, and educate the Protestants; conciliate the Presbyterians, and educate the Presbyterians; but, recollect, when you come to talk of educating the Catholics, that you must necessarily pay attention to that to which they pay attention—the decision of their bishops. Already have their bishops told them that your plan of education is dangerous both to faith and morals. When they want, by way of guarantee to them that a number of the professors should be Catholics, it is not meant that a man calling himself a Catholic should be preferred to a Protestant, nor is it meant that a Protestant should be educated by a Catholic professor. Have you not, even in Belfast, two Professors of Divinity? Have you not there a double set of professors? And if you want for the protection of Protestants and Presbyterians a double set of professors, are not the Catholic bishops, whose duty is to superintend the religious instruction of the people, justified in requiring the means of protecting the Catholics? You tell me

that you will protect the Catholics. You say, that if a professor preaches infidelity, you will dismiss him. I am not satisfied with that. I mean you no disrespect, but I will not take your word for it. The bishops insist on having a power lodged in them for finding out the infidelity, and of having some voice, at least, in the dismissal of the professors who might inculcate it. I do not say that in every instance a professor of one persuasion will insinuate doctrines inimical to another. But they say we will not run the risk—that it is too awful a risk to be run. They want not to interfere with your interests—all they want is to be able to watch over their own; and they insist upon having the means of ascertaining whether that interest is not sacrificed.

These are the grounds on which we stand. It is not that the bishops say that Protestantism will mislead the Catholics; all that they insist upon is, that Protestantism is capable of misleading the Catholics. This has already been exhibited in Belfast. The professors of Unitarian persuasions are accused of introducing into their lectures Unitarian matter. The fact there is already proved; and really, if it was not so proved, it is in human nature that it should be so, and that the danger apprehended should exist. The hon. member for Newcastle-under-Lyne (Mr. Colquhoun) stated distinctly that the professors there broached infidel opinions in giving their lectures. I think direct allusion was made to the chair of Moral Philosophy. (*Mr. Colquhoun* : “*To the Professor of Greek.*”) To the Professor of Greek! Now, speaking of the matter, independently of the fact that it really is so, what excellent speeches might be made in this House, what cheers might be elicited, by its being asked, “Do you suspect the Professor of Greek? What has he to do with religion? He is only teaching a language; teaching his pupils to conjugate *ῥύρω* and the like.” To say that there was any danger from him, would make us only be laughed at. And yet, this very Professor of Greek is caught in the fact of inculcating infidelity upon his scholars. What do the bishops insist upon? Simply that there shall be no possibility of this

in future taking place. As to your amendments of this Bill, what in reality have you done? You have taken more power to yourselves. We want protection against you, against the ministry of the day, whatever and whoever they may be. The Catholics require that they shall not be subject to the caprices or mistakes of the ministry. The ministry have not time to examine Professors of Anatomy and Science—they must take their information from others; and, in nine instances out of ten, so long as I have been a member of this House, we should have known the political tenets of these professors from those who appointed them. I really believe that future ministers would take as much care of their friends, and be as sure not to promote their enemies as any ministry has ever been. The fact is, to conciliate the people of Ireland, you must conciliate the Catholic prelates. To prepare a measure which will be acceptable to the people you must consult the Catholic prelates. The bishops are now assembled, and you are aware of what they would consider a sufficient protection to their religion. At present they have proclaimed the Bill dangerous to faith and morals. That is their present proclamation; and there is no sincere Catholic in Ireland who does not know that, as far as religious instruction is concerned, he is bound by the decision of his bishop. Scientific instruction is another thing. But, as far as religious instruction is concerned, or rather when a scheme is presented to that people, from which religious instruction is excluded, they cannot consent to receive education based upon such a principle. You may think the clamour gone which was raised in England. The clamour against the Maynooth Bill was the most senseless and atrocious display of calumny, hatred, bigotry, and bad feeling, which ever disgraced any country. That had now exhausted itself. You do not perceive a symptom of it remaining. It has gone by, and so has the snow of last winter. You have nothing now to fear from it. You carried your Bill manfully. You did it, and it did you great credit. I come not here with overweening expressions of gratitude; but I am grateful for that measure. I am here to declare that

there never was a measure brought in with more complete fair play and justice, and with a more honest intention of carrying it out fairly for the people for whom it was intended. That measure was perfect in its kind; equal to any which ever passed through Parliament; and you are entitled to great credit for having carried it against the senseless and unjust clamour which bigotry, for the time, succeeded in raising against it. Take one step more, and consider whether this Bill may not be made to accord with the feelings of the Catholic ecclesiastics of Ireland. I ought not to detain you. I am not speaking here in any spirit of hostility. I should be most happy to give every assistance in my humble power to make this Bill work well. I have the most anxious wish to have the Bill work well, because I am desirous of seeing education promoted in Ireland; but even education may be a misapplied power. I admit that at one time I thought the plan of a mixed education proper; and I still think that, in literature and science, a system of mixed education would be proper; but with regard to religious education, I think that each denomination of Christians should be educated by their respective religious instructors. Let the students be put down upon terms of perfect equality in respect to religion, and then you will have a basis laid for an equality of education in literary and scientific pursuits which would gain the cordial assent of all parties in Ireland. Certainly, the Bill as it now stands may seem to confer very formidable powers on the minister of the day in the nomination of the professors, and the degree of control which they will be enabled to exercise over these colleges; and, more especially, they may appear so to a thorough Radical like myself; but I am not afraid of these powers. The smuggler meets his check in the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and so, in as far as the powers conferred by this Bill are concerned, where the ministers may acquire the means of making one man, perhaps, grateful, they, in all probability, will incur the hatred of fifty. Again, I repeat, I am most anxious for the success of this Bill; but I fairly tell you it cannot succeed without the Catholic bishops. They have the

faith of six millions of people in their hands. There may have been harsh expressions in the public papers, but depend upon it great anxiety exists in Ireland to have such a measure, if you will but make it effective; and if you choose to make it effective you have the power. For myself, I am not indisposed to vote with the noble lord, but that is without prejudice to any better mode being considered when we come into committee. But let me here express a hope that there will be no persevering with the committee this night. A few days' delay may have a most important effect. I am so strongly impressed with that opinion that I do hope that the right hon. baronet will not proceed with the Bill in committee to-night. However, which way soever you may decide in that respect, I trust the House will believe that what has fallen from me has been uttered in the fairest spirit of good faith. My political power elsewhere may be deemed a jest, but here it is a reality. I am ready to join in any measure that may be useful to the people of Ireland, and that may tend to do away with the spirit of disaffection existing in that country. It is not a political disaffection; it is not a religious disaffection; but it is a physical disaffection. You, gentlemen of England, have no notion of its extent or of its intensity; and though it may not display itself at this moment, sufficient to alarm you or arouse you, still the time may come, after some of us shall have gone to our graves, when that physical disaffection may have the most frightful consequences.

Subject, COLLEGES—IRELAND; Date, JUNE 30, 1845.

Mr. O'Connell said he should not consider that he discharged his duty if he allowed the Bill to go into committee without offering a few remarks to the House upon it. The right hon. baronet was perfectly just in thinking that the House ought not to submit to the dictation of any parties, however respectable or venerable; but they should not forget, at the

same time, that their object in legislating ought to be successful. What would their waste of money or their appointment of professors signify, if they afterwards failed in the object which they had in view? His opinion was that they would not succeed if they continued to proceed with the Bill, in opposition to the opinions and advice of the Catholic bishops. The right hon. baronet had stated that the Bill had been much altered since the Catholic prelates had expressed their opinion upon it; but he (Mr. O'Connell) believed he had authentic evidence that these alterations had made no change whatever in their views regarding the Bill. The following was a letter which he had received within the last few days on the subject:—

“Maynooth College, June 26, 1845.

“MY DEAR MR. O'CONNELL—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your kind and respected communication. Though my reply has been somewhat tardy, it is most consolatory to me to be able to convey to you, that the sentiments of the bishops relative to the dangers to faith and morals with which the Collegiate Education Bill is fraught, remain unaltered. It has been reprobated in such terms as became the divinely constituted guardians of the faith and morality of their respective flocks to apply to it. However, though some of the prelates were of opinion that a petition to Parliament, framed on the model of the memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, would aid much in averting the threatened calamity, others thought it not right to encounter once more contemptuous disregard of the just requisitions of the Catholic prelates of Ireland.

“You can, however, with a confidence, fearless of contradiction, state that the resolutions of the bishops regarding this bad scheme of academic education remain in full force, and that no ministry can ever hope to render tolerable to the Catholic people of Ireland so penal and revolting an enactment.

“You have full liberty to make any use you may think proper of this communication. Wishing you and your faithful adherents all your wanted energy and success in combating this anti-Catholic measure, I remain, my dear Mr. O'Connell, your very respectful and devoted,

“✠ JOHN MACHALE.

“Daniel O'Connell, Esq., M.P., London.”

That was the opinion, regarding the measure, of the Archbishop of Tuam. It showed that he still considered the Bill to

be one which would hold out temptations to youth to neglect the duty which they owed to the principles of their religion; and though describing it as a "penal and revolting enactment," might be considered in that House as too strong a condemnation of the measure, it was in itself evidence of the feelings which were entertained in Ireland respecting it. The object of the Government in introducing the Bill was to be successful; but they could not expect success if they met with the decided opposition of the clergy of two-thirds of the Irish people; of that portion, too, of the people who required additional facilities for education most, and to whom, if properly administered, it would prove most valuable. His objection to the Bill was, that it was an irreligious one; that it provided no means of instruction in religion; and in this point he did not think it had been improved by the alterations that had been made in it; since in its first introduction originally it left religion out of the question altogether. The principal object of human life was in it totally disregarded. They now came forward with a Bill in which they condescended to tolerate religion. They were kind enough to permit religion to be taught, but that was all. Now, he did not really think that to be any great concession. If the Catholic people of Ireland thought fit to erect a hall in a town in which one of these colleges was situated, the Government would allow of its existence. But what law was now in force that could prevent the Catholics from founding such an establishment? They did not open any law or confer any benefit not already enjoyed by this Bill; but they made—to use the words of the Archbishop of Tuam—a penal enactment. They gave dictatorial powers to their Visitors over these halls, while they did nothing towards the founding of them. In a recent case heard before Lord Chancellor Sugden, it was decided that there is no law in existence limiting the power of establishing convents and places of education for the Catholic people of Ireland. The Legislature, therefore, in passing this measure, did nothing affirmatively, but they did something negatively. They would, thus, by their proceeding, which he has no doubt was well-

intentioned, excite jealousies and religious animosities amongst all classes in Ireland. They had already the animating distinction in existence in that country. They had that "darkness," to use the term employed by the right hon. baronet, in which error and bad feeling might be most easily propagated; but they refused to remove it by giving the genuine light of religious education to the people, religious education to Protestants—religious education to Catholics—religious education to Presbyterians. They would promote the charity and the common Christianity of all by giving such religious education; whereas, by turning religion out of their colleges, or making its existence in them merely persuasive, they held back from the children the advantages of Christian truth, leaving matters in their original darkness, and instead of advancing their own views, they, on the contrary, defeated them. Then, again, it should be recollected that the Protestants of Ireland were the most wealthy class; and if the Bill merely gave permission to build halls, was it not probable that three, four, or five Protestant halls would be erected for one Catholic hall? If they wished, instead of allowing wealth to triumph over religious poverty, they should take the subject of providing for religious instruction into their own hands, and thus place all religious persuasions on a footing of perfect equality. It was not his intention, however, to divide the house at that stage of the Bill. He would find it to be his duty to press for a division on one of the early clauses, and having done so, he would consider that he had performed his duty against it. He would do so, not with any hope of success, but in order to protest against its provisions; to protest against it for giving merely a kind of left-handed permission, but no real assistance whatever to the best and most important branch of education—the religious education of the Irish people.

Subject, FAMINE AND DISEASE IN IRELAND ;

Date, FEBRUARY 17, 1846.

This scourge, long to be remembered in Ireland, was already threatening our unhappy land. Hitherto O'Connell had been sternly demanding moral, religious, and political freedom for his people; but now he cried for bread. The whole subject has been so ably treated in a recent work* that, even had we space for details, they would not be necessary.

It can now be said that the English Government were fully forewarned of the impending famine. O'Connell prepared a plan to meet the evil, worthy of his best days. The matter was brought before the Lord Lieutenant by an influential deputation, but it was received with indifference, and O'Connell treated with contempt; he was not necessary to the Tory Government then in power. If O'Connell's plan had been carried out, and it was perfectly possible, the lives of thousands would have been saved. He only wished to have the people employed in works of national utility, to have the ports closed against the export of corn, which was exceptionally abundant, and to forbid the use of grain in distillation.

The deputation was bowed out, and the usual number of fictitious committees, impracticable plans, and inane suggestions, were offered instead of common sense and prompt action. The Irish people were talked to death. Corn Laws for England and Coercion Laws for Ireland were the stones offered where bread meant life.

Mr. O'Connell rose to call the attention of the House to the state of famine and disease in Ireland. His intention was to move—

“That this House will, on Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to take into consideration the state of Ireland, with a view to devise means to relieve the distress of the Irish people.”

And it was a motion to which he respectfully demanded the utmost attention of the House. The importance of the subject was of itself sufficient to demand attention; but he should have been spared the whole of his labour had it suited the purpose of the right hon. baronet, in the course of his speech

* “History of the Great Irish Famine of 1847,” by the Rev. J. O'Rourke, P. P., M. R. I. A. Dublin: M'Glashan and Gill.

on the previous night to state what were the intentions of the Government with regard to Ireland. That, he begged to remind hon. members, was no party question; he certainly introduced the subject without any party motive or party object. He was moved by no partisan feeling; nor did he expect that he should be met by any party opposition. He was sure that all parties would agree with him in feeling deep anxiety at the prospect of distress; and thus the House would come fairly to the consideration of the subject, without bias or prepossession. It was certain that there was a fearful prospect of a most calamitous season before the people of Ireland. The extent of that calamity had been disputed, and there had been a time when there was a prospect of some portion of it being possibly averted; but he believed that hope had now quite vanished. The calamity was pressing and imminent—more pressing, more imminent, and more fearful than that House was aware of. In order to understand it, it was right that the House should be made aware of the state of Ireland before the calamity had impended. That calamity, they should observe, was not one brought on by any fault of the Irish people. It was not a consequence of the sterility of the Irish soil. The country had enjoyed an abundant harvest. That calamity was a dispensation of Providence, and they should bow to the will of an all-dispensing Power, whilst they fulfilled the duties of charitable Christians, and endeavoured to mitigate the evils that might arise. But to enable them to relieve the distress, it would be necessary for the House to understand the previous state of Ireland; and he was sorry to have to state in the commencement, that, from the public documents, it appeared for several years past, the population of Ireland, instead of increasing, according to the rules of nature, and as in other countries had been falling and wasting away. But the condition of the people, especially of the agricultural population, he described as ground down by famine and distress. He agreed in describing them as in a state of actual starvation, but he did not propose to call upon the House

to believe any mere assertions of his. He had no intention of asking them to believe anything he did not prove by documents. He meant to show from documents of the most unquestionable character, the increasing misery of the Irish nation. The first document would be an abstract of the Population Returns for 1821, 1831, and 1841, by which the following facts were placed beyond a doubt.

Between 1821 and 1831, the population of Ireland increased nearly a million, viz., 965,570 souls; but between 1831 and 1841, the increase had only been about one-half that number, or 437,980 souls. Attempts had been made to account for this decrease by the increase of emigration; but the argument was unsatisfactory. Those who used it, gave no returns of emigration between 1821 and 1831, but confined themselves to the emigration between 1831 and 1841; there was no reason at all to imagine that the emigration was less between 1821 and 1831 than it had been between 1831 and 1841. This fact, therefore, stared him full in the face, that in ten years the population went back half-a-million; there was an increase of half-a-million fewer human beings in Ireland between 1831 and 1841 than there had been between 1821 and 1831. One of the topics in connection with the state of slavery in the West Indies, which made the strongest impression from the lips of Sir Fowell Buxton, was the circumstance that the black population had decreased; but his case was not so striking as that of Ireland. The next public document to which he begged leave to refer, was the Report of the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry in 1835; they had been appointed by the House to investigate the state of destitution in Ireland, and they distinctly stated that 2,300,000 of the agricultural population were in a constant state of destitution approaching to starvation. For several weeks in the year they lived on the charity of their neighbours. The last Population Returns of 1841 showed that, out of the whole rural population of Ireland, 46 per cent. lived in a single room; the entire human family and the pigs occupied the same apartment together. The fact was, that

of the civil population—that is, of the inhabitants of towns—36 per cent. lived in a single room, and that two or three families sometimes occupied the same room. Perhaps the most important document of all was the Report of Lord Devon's Commission; it had been directed to that noble lord and four others, and perhaps a better Commission was never formed by the hands of any Government. It was impossible to believe that they were deceived themselves, or that they meant to deceive others, and the following were the terms they used, warranted by the evidence they had taken, and their own observations:—

“That the agricultural labourers of Ireland suffer the greatest privations and hardships; that they depend upon precarious and casual employment for subsistence; that they are badly housed, badly fed, badly clothed, and badly paid for their labour; that it would be impossible to describe adequately the sufferings and privations which the cottiers and labourers and their families in most parts of the country endure; that in many districts their only food is the potato, their only beverage water; that their cabins are seldom protection against the weather; that a bed or blanket is a rare luxury; and that nearly in all, their pigs and their manure heap constitute their only property; that a large proportion of the entire population comes within the designation of agricultural labourers, and endure sufferings greater than the people of any other country in Europe have to sustain.”

Hon. members would recollect that these were not the assertions of demagogues, or even of persons interested in reporting exaggerated scenes of misery; they were the distinct and emphatic statements of men above all suspicion, and beyond belief that they could have been imposed upon. The rural population in the last census was calculated at seven millions, and five millions of these were in the condition described in the Report of the Earl of Devon's Commission. It was a Report made forty-five years after the Union with England—after the Union with the richest and most industrious country on the face of the earth; and what did the Commissioners say but that the agricultural population of Ireland was badly fed, badly clothed, and badly housed—that their food was potatoes, their drink

water, and that they endured greater privations than the peasantry of any other country of Europe. He would appeal to hon. gentlemen who listened to him, whether this was not a frightful state of society. They must remember that the Irish did not govern themselves, that there was no Irish Parliament, and that after a government by England of forty-five years' duration, this was the result. He would not enter into all the topics this part of the question presented: he would only put it distinctly to those who heard him, that they were responsible for the present condition of Ireland. If England could not govern her, she ought to abdicate; but if she continued to attempt it, she was bound to rescue the people of Ireland from their present misery. This Report, too, was not made in a year of calamity, a year of famine, but in 1844, when the harvest was abundant, and comparatively little distress was known in Ireland; it was made at a period of comparative comfort, if he might use the expression, of comparative freedom from calamity. It might be said that it was the fault of the Irish people; but Lord Devon's Report did not say so. The Commissioners had reported two points: the first was, that "the patient endurance which the labourers exhibit is deserving of high commendation of Government and Parliament." The Irish people were, therefore, not to blame for their misery, and the Commissioners called upon the Government and the Parliament to give their best attention to their condition, with some confidence that the call would be responded to. Another matter of commendation on the part of the Commissioners, was the habits of temperance of the Irish peasantry.

"Up to this period (they said) any improvement that may have taken place is attributable almost entirely to the habits of temperance in which they have so generally persevered, and not, we grieve to say, to any increased demand for their labour."

In addressing himself, therefore, to the present distressed state of the inhabitants, he carried with him the hope that he had impressed upon the House the real claims of the sufferers.

What had they to fall back upon at this moment? Potatoes were their only food—their only drink, water; and they had neither bed nor blanket to cover them from the cold. It was singular enough that they were threatened now with this calamity; it was not to be attributed to the population—to any refusal to labour and cultivate the soil. He had two Parliamentary documents before him to show how unfounded was any charge of that kind. The first was this:—

“An account of the quantities of wheat, barley, oats, flour, and oatmeal imported into Great Britain, from Ireland, in the years 1842, 1843, 1844, and 1845, distinguishing the quantities in each year.

CORN OF IRISH GROWTH,
Imported into Great Britain from Ireland.

Years.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Wheatmeal, or Flour.	Oatmeal.
	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.	Cwts.	Cwts.
1842	112,195	50,287	1,274,326	314,311	1,551,172
1843	192,477	110,449	1,561,997	773,463	1,706,682
1844	200,276	90,656	1,509,870	839,567	1,150,976
1845	372,719	93,095	1,679,958	1,422,379	1,059,185

That Return gave this result; that 2,145,772 quarters of grain were imported from Ireland into England, and 2,481,564 cwts. of flour meal; showing that there was an abundant crop in Ireland last year; that while her people were starving she produced a larger quantity of grain and meal for the consumption of England. The second Parliamentary document he had to refer to, was—

“An account of all cattle, sheep, and swine, imported into Great Britain from Ireland, from the 10th day of October, 1845, to the 5th day of January, 1846. Oxen, bulls, and cows, 32,883; calves, 583; sheep and lambs, 82,576; swine, 104,141.”

These two documents proved an anomalous state of society to exist in Ireland; for while the country produced such abundance the inhabitants were starving. So blessed was she by

Providence; so cursed by man! Others might account for it as they could; but the fact was indisputable, that the best state of society there was the worst in other parts of the globe. Having shown what Ireland was, even in the best times, he would now advert to the extent and formidable nature of the calamity by which she was now visited. The documents he should first employ for this purpose were such as had been furnished by Government; and with some of them hon. gentlemen must be familiar; to them the reading might seem tedious; but it was his duty to lay the case of Ireland, in the fullest manner, before the House; and on this account he trusted he should be excused if he offered a few known details. The subsequent passage was contained in the Report of Messrs. Lindley and Playfair, dated November 15, 1845:—

“During our stay in Ireland, we carefully examined such Official Papers as were transmitted to us from the Castle; we consulted persons acquainted with the facts of the disease; we visited the district lying between Dublin and Drogheda, and inspected various potato fields and stores in the counties of Dublin, Louth, Meath, Westmeath, and part of Kildare. Judging from the evidence thus collected, and from what we have seen of the progress of the disease in England, we can come to no other conclusion than that one-half of the potato-crop of Ireland is either destroyed or remains unfit for the food of man. We, moreover, feel it our duty to apprise you, that we fear this to be a low estimate.”

The next extract he would read was from the Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry at Dublin Castle; and the House would observe that it was a remarkable paragraph:—

“It appears from undoubted authority, that of thirty-two counties in Ireland, not one has escaped failure in the potato crop; of 130 Poor Law Unions, not one is exempt; of 2,058 electoral divisions, above 1,400 are certainly reported as having suffered; and we have no certainty, until the receipt of the more minute returns, now in the progress of completion, that the remaining 600 have altogether escaped.”

That Commission had corresponded with nearly all the local authorities in Ireland; and the following was the con-

clusion at which it had arrived, after having written 362 letters to obtain correct information :—

PROPORTION OF POTATO CROP LAST YEAR.

Provinces.	All.	Nine-tenths.	Four-eighths.	Five-fourths.	Two-thirds.	Halves.	One-thirds.	One-fourths.	One-fifths.	One-sevenths.	One-eighths.	One-tenths.	Total.
Ulster, ...	6	1	3	15	37	133	32	6	6	...	239
Munster,	1	9	13	88	16	4	1	...	1	...	133
Leinster,	4	1	28	41	97	9	2	1	1	184
Connaught,	1	8	12	49	6	4	1	...	81

A more authentic document could not be produced ; and the accuracy of its details might, therefore, be fully relied upon. Sir Lucius O'Brien, at first, had been difficult to be persuaded of the extent of the disease in the potatoes ; but he had subsequently waited on the Lord Lieutenant, and had admitted that he had been mistaken, and that it prevailed to the excess that had been stated. He need not remind the House of the documents read by the right hon. baronet in his speech last night. Hon. members would be convinced how fully, deeply, and entirely they corroborated the representation he had given upon the subject, without any point of mitigation ; misery, poverty, famine, and disease were the features belonging to the present wretched state of Ireland. A committee, called the Mansion House Committee, had been appointed in Dublin, and the utmost care had been taken to collect accurate information. Between the 10th December and 26th January, they issued 923 letters, and had received 523 answers ; viz., from Leinster, 141 letters ; from Ulster, 163 letters ; from Munster, 152 letters ; from Connaught, 67 letters, Of these there were—from ministers of the

Established Church, 216 letters; from Roman Catholic clergy, 195 letters; from Presbyterian ministers, 40 letters; from lieutenants and deputy ditto, 47 letters; from poor law boards, 25 letters. The following was the degree in which they represented that the potato crop had suffered, and was unfit for human food:—Under one-third, 110; one-third, 111; one-half, 148; over half, 84. Such was the synopsis of the letters and answers. At one period, when the potatoes were stored, and the calamity not immediately before the eyes of the people, they had hoped that it had passed the crisis: that appeared to be a mistake; but whether it were true or false that there was at one time a lull in the disease, it was now quite certain that it was making frightful progress again. He had now to trespass on the patience of the House while he brought under its view other documents, collected from various parts of Ireland, describing the state of the disease in different localities. Unless the occasion were grave and pressing, he should not have felt justified in taking this course; but some of the leading journals within the last ten days had asserted positively that the disease had ceased, and that there was no danger of a want of provision. He did not accuse the writers of party motives, but of having been easily deluded, and willing to delude others. The conviction that the disease was most destructive was not merely local; it was not confined to a particular district, but from one end of the country to the other the cry was echoed of coming famine. Upon this part of his case he would trouble the House with the subsequent extract of a letter from Tralee, dated the 2nd instant:—

“Potatoes, I regret to say, from the progress of the rot, advanced a third; and this, as I stated a few days past, at a period when the rate of remuneration for agricultural labourers is $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day, and diet a few wet lumpers. This is low enough, but the tradesmen in this town are not earning that same. The inevitable consequence of this is already manifesting itself. Fever is on the increase both here and in Killarney, and unless the most vigorous efforts are made to facilitate public works, and employ those able and willing to exchange their labour for the means of purchasing commodities of human consumption, the pestilence of 1871, also the result of scarcity, will bear no

proportion to what is likely to ensue shortly. In that year disease did not appear until the approach of summer; then the poor creatures lay in dozens in the market-house of Killarney, and in other dilapidated ruins with which that neglected town abounds for a long time past."

The Londonderry Agricultural Report for January contained the following statement:—

"The wheat plants have made great progress during the month, and have a very healthy appearance, and the grass fields are as forward in their look as we often observe in March. We are sorry to observe so many of the potatoes, which were confidently relied upon for seed, giving way before the disease. Now, after having been subjected to pitting and housing, great quantities of them are found to be rotten; nor are those still in the ground much better, for although apparently sound, a few days after being dry they assume a very different aspect. We still fear the consequences at seed time. Many were disposed to try autumn or winter planting; but the weather has been very untoward for that purpose, and those who tried it report unfavourably of it, the excessive moisture having destroyed the seed."

A respectable farmer in the county of Wexford wrote thus:—

"I said in my last that the apple potatoes that were not rotted might be used for food. Our apples were as dry as possible when we pitted them, and we kept them dry by our manner of covering them. We thought we might have some for summer, but we find they are scarcely fit for cattle now, and more than half of them are completely in pulp. We cannot use any apple potatoes this year, and this is a general complaint here. The cups are not very much lost, but there are ten times more of them rotten than when I wrote last."

The Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, of Castletownroche, county Cork, on the part of a meeting held there, addressed circulars to all the landlords possessing property in the district, containing a minute description of the state of the population. The result was:—

"More than half the potato crop is unfit for human food, and the disease is progressing. More than half the labourers are unemployed, and are likely to continue so for the next three months, and during the months of July and August, as the farmers will not have money or food to give them."

He would now advert to the centre of the country and to

the state of the disease there. The first quotation he would make was from a letter from Nenagh, dated February 4:—

“We continue to receive the most distressing accounts of the fearful progress of the disease from various quarters. In the King’s County the complaints are universal. In this county the disease has gone on with amazing celerity within the last three weeks; many persons, on examining their pits, found their potatoes in some instances altogether useless—not even fit for pigs or cattle. In several districts the poor are pining in the utmost misery, but with unequalled fortitude and patience, hoping, even where there is nothing but religion to assuage their wretchedness. The heavy and constant rains of the last few weeks—raining almost without intermission—have done great injury; and the softness of the weather otherwise tends, in a great measure, to produce the fermentation of the potato which causes its destruction as an article of food. Landed proprietors should endeavour to aid themselves and the people at this tremendous crisis.”

The subsequent letter, from John F. Hodges, M.D., dated Downpatrick, 2nd February, referred to the condition of the counties of Down, Armagh, Antrim, and Monaghan:—

“During the month of January I had occasion to visit several districts in the counties of Down, Armagh, Antrim, and Monaghan, and I carefully inquired into the state of the potato crop. I found that, though there was considerable difference in the amount of loss in the districts examined, yet that everywhere, with a few trifling exceptions in some moory soils in the county Monaghan, the disease continued its destructive ravages, unchecked by any of the methods recommended to stop its progress; that in every description of pit—in the moist field and the dry loft—the potatoes were either, as the farmers expressed it, ‘melting away,’ or ‘shrivelling up with a dry rot.’ In some districts in Armagh, I was informed that the destruction was progressing with such terrible rapidity that, of potatoes raised, thrice picked, and stored up in pits as free from all taint, not more than one-third was found fit for use some days ago. In the neighbourhood of the city of Armagh the extent of the loss was represented as very great. In the neighbourhood of Marketbill and Portadown the loss has also been very great, and will, I fear, be severely felt by the small farmers in that part of the country. In Monaghan I made particular inquiries from several farmers, among whom I may mention the name of Mr. Gowdy, one of the most intelligent agriculturists in the district in which he resides, and I found it to be the general persuasion, that fully two-thirds of the crop, at that time (6th of January), had been rendered unfit for food. Along the north-east coast again, in the neigh-

bourhood of Larne, the destruction has also been great; and several Antrim farmers, whose names if required, can be supplied, have last week assured me that the stock of potatoes which they have at present on hand is not so large as they were in former years accustomed to have in the month of May."

The next document he had to offer presented a peculiar feature, well deserving notice. It was an extract of a letter from Tullamore:—

"A great many robberies are daily committed about the suburbs of Tullamore, from the great distress and poverty arising from want of employment, together with the scarcity of potatoes and the high price of provisions, the unfortunate people having no other remedy to keep them from starvation. Fever and sickness are on the increase, both in the town and country parts."

From the parish of Killard, in the county of Kildare, they wrote in these terms:—

"It contains sixty-six families, comprising three hundred and seventy-four individuals, having, out of their crop of ten hundred and ninety barrels of potatoes, but one hundred and six barrels fit for human food. That, in the townland of Doonbeg (same parish), there are forty-five families, comprising two hundred and seventy individuals, with but eighty-five barrels of good potatoes, out of a pit containing six hundred and sixty-six barrels. That, in the townland of Kilfiera (same parish), there are eighty-eight families, whose total produce of potatoes was fourteen hundred and fifty barrels, of which one hundred and eighty-seven barrels only were fit for human food. That, in the townlands of Dunmore and Doonbeg (same parish), there are twenty-nine families, or one hundred and twenty-seven individuals, whose total produce was three hundred and seventy-two barrels, of which there were but fifty-eight barrels fit for human use. That in the townland of Donoughboy at least three-fourths of the crop are lost."

On the want of food in the county of Galway they wrote as follows:—

"The question of famine is no longer one of surmise. Its certainty, in a few months at furthest, is even acknowledged by the Government; and the reports which come in every day from the rural districts but too sadly confirm the conclusion which has been arrived at from the most carefully collected facts. Potatoes bear even now a famine price in the market. White potatoes go at 4½*d.* per stone, and cup potatoes 5*d.* We believe 10*d.* per stone, in times of the greatest famine, was the highest price for potatoes ever

known in Galway; and when we take into consideration that the potatoes now brought for sale to market are not only diseased to a great extent, but one-third of them completely waste to the purchaser in two or three days, the 4½*d.* per stone rises in real value to 9*d.* or 10*d.* When this is the case at present, what will it not be in a few weeks hence when the crop is more exhausted? At the price which potatoes are even only now, a labourer employed the whole week at 10*d.* per day (the usual price of labour in this district is often lower) has to lay out the entire of his week's wages on them alone, if he is even so fortunate as to be able to purchase with it a sufficient quantity of this lowest of human food. There is nothing for any other accompanying article of diet; nothing, unless the belly is stinted of this worst kind of food—nothing for fuel, rent, or clothing; nothing for milk or fish; meat is out of the question. If this is the case at present with the labourer in full employment, how must it fare with the unfortunate creatures who have it only occasionally, or fare with both when food becomes dearer, and is placed totally out of their reach? A troop of the 13th Light Dragoons, from Gort, arrived here on Tuesday, under the command of Captain Hamilton, for the purpose, it is said, of repressing any outbreak among the people which may arise owing to the exportation of corn from this port. Two companies of the 30th are likewise expected—one from Loughrea; the other from Oughterard—to aid the force in garrison, if necessary. The dragoons and additional military are expected to be stationed here for some time. This increase of troops is said to have been caused by the posting of a threatening notice last week, to the effect that the merchants' stores would be broken up by the people if any further exportation of corn was attempted. Her Majesty's steamer, the *Stromboli*, arrived at the port of Galway on Monday evening, and anchored at the roadstead."

It was not less remarkable than creditable, that not a single instance of riot or disturbance of the public peace, owing to the want of food, had yet occurred in any part of Ireland. To the preceding documents he might be allowed to add the following report from the board of guardians at Nenagh:—

"At the weekly meeting of the Nenagh board of guardians, on Thursday, 29th January, Sir T. B. Dancer said:—"I am sorry to say, at least of my own potatoes, that the disease is progressing; out of eight or nine acres of potatoes which were dug last week, I had four cartloads of them affected with the disease; and, within the last fortnight, nearly all my cups are failing, the one-third of them, at least. In this month and next, which are generally soft months, I am of opinion, that the great portion of the potatoes,

now apparently sound, will become rotten or diseased. I have also inquired amongst my workmen and tenants, and they all bore the same testimony; and to show you as a proof of what I have stated, that when I lately found the disease so prevalent among my tenants' potatoes, I offered them 10 per cent. allowance.'

"Mr. Michael Meagher—'I am bound to tell you this, that for the last three days I had been in Borrisoleigh; it is strange to say, that it is not the black potatoes are going but the white and sound ones, which were heretofore not diseased or affected with the regular rot.'

"Mr. John Kennedy—'It is a general complaint, that it is the sound potatoes that are failing under the malady, and not the black ones.'

"Sir Thomas Dancer—'What do you call "black ones?"' 'The previously diseased potatoes?'

"Mr. Hayes—'There is no doubt but the disease is every day becoming more prevalent.'

"Chairman—'I am afraid that the opinions of the guardians are unanimous on that subject, but, as far as I am concerned myself, I can say to the contrary.'"

At Tralee poor-law union, a meeting had been held on the 3rd instant, to present a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, and the following was a report of what passed on that occasion:—

"Mr. Trant, introducing his motion, that a committee be appointed to draw up a memorial to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, on the subject of the expected famine, regretted to say that there was even then more reason for the board carrying out his motion than when he had given notice of it, for he could assure them that the disease was rapidly extending in his district.

"Mr. Foran, the poor-rate collector for the barony of Corkaguinny, said he was sorry to be obliged to acquaint them that in some parishes in his barony, one-half of the crop was lost. Potatoes were unusually high in price, too, at one side of Dingle; the minions were 12s. a peck (32 stone). The disease was, in his opinion, decidedly on the increase.

"Mr. Quinlan thought that out of two farms of his he would not have a sound potato on May day. The spread of the disease was frightful.

"Mr. Rae was sorry to be obliged to corroborate what had been said about the spread of the epidemic; and, to make the matter still worse, the late high tides had washed away a quantity of the potatoes of the poor people in his neighbourhood, the parish of Keel.

"Captain Chute, Mr. Gorham, and other guardians, bore testimony to the spread of the disease.

“Colonel Stokes could state from personal knowledge, that labourers in the vicinity of the Spa were now purchasing potatoes in the market, not having any of their own. Lumper potatoes were selling at 24s. per peck. At the rate potatoes were selling on Saturday last, potatoes sufficient to support the family of a labouring man for a week, would cost 6s. 2d. more than the entire week's wages of most labourers in employment. He might, in the present season, safely say that two-thirds of the labourers were unemployed. He had paid 12s. a peck for diseased potatoes to feed cattle, in the market, last week, and good lumpers were 24s., and minions 32s. a peck. In conclusion, he urged on the board the necessity of representing to Government that they were willing that a tax should be levied on the properties of gentlemen, both resident and absentee, to provide food for the poorer classes, in the event of a famine.

“Mr. Trant's motion was seconded by Colonel Stokes, and passed, and a committee was appointed.”

At Youghal, a public meeting had been held on the 11th instant, and what passed was contained in the following report of the proceedings:—

“The Rev. Mr. Smiddy said—‘Mr. Chairman, as I am in possession of certain documents connected with the state of distress, I shall occupy your attention while making a few observations on the subject. A short time since, by order of the Poor Law Commissioners, in Dublin, inquiries were made in several parts of the union as to the state of the potato crop, the result of which was forwarded to the Poor Law Commissioners. This was set on foot here, and inquiries were very accurately and minutely instituted, and the result of that is to convince every person that something must be done, in order to provide for the approaching season of want and scarcity. By this arrangement, we had parties appointed in several districts of the country, to inquire what supply of potatoes remained on hand, and what amount of labour or employment was available for the people; the result is that, in the country parts of this parish, the farmers have only a supply sufficient for their own consumption, with the exception of two or three farmers, one of whom would be able to send twenty barrels to market in case the present supply remains free from disease, and that farmer is from the neighbourhood of Windgap. We have procured accurate information in reference to those persons who are objects of destitution. With regard to the labouring population, many of them are already obliged to live on the diseased potatoes, and the large body have only a supply which they expect will not last longer than two-months (*sensation*). That is the state of the potato crop in the country, and the amount of employment is very small indeed. Some of them, it has been

ascertained, have only employment for nine months of the year, while others are only employed for five or six months during that period. The state of things in the towns is even still worse. We all know that a general calamity has befallen the country with respect to the potato crop, and this misfortune must be more generally felt in large towns, as there is no supply of food there as in the country, to relieve or alleviate the lamentable visitation. Inquiries have been made in several lanes in this town, and I am confident this meeting will be appalled and astonished at the result of the investigation.' The Rev. Mr. Smiddy here read an abstract of the condition of the inhabitants of lanes in Youghal who lived by manual labour, showing the number of families and individuals, and the portion of the year, up to six months, to which the employment of more than a moiety is limited. From this return it appeared—

	Families.	Persons.
That there are living in lanes,	908	4,579
Living on charity,	88	356
Employed only three months, and less,	56	235
Ditto four months,	72	253
Ditto five months,	95	453
Ditto six months,	228	1,245
	539	2,542

So that 539 families out of the 908, and 2,542 individuals out of the 4,579, are limited in employment, all to six months; many of them to three and four months of the year, and the wages in many instances so low as scarcely to give them subsistence, even for the time they are employed. This (continued the rev. gentleman) is a problem for the political economist, and a subject of serious reflection for all who are interested, not alone in the welfare, but in the actual existence of their fellow-creatures. "And such being the state of the distress, such being the amount of destitution, it is evident that something must be done, and done immediately, to remedy the awful circumstances of the people.

"Mr. Lomaseny, though a resident in the town for thirty-six years, had no idea of the destitution which he saw in Donovan's-lane; in that place there were six individuals living upon a floor ten feet square; there was not as much straw for them to lie upon as would be allowed a favourite dog; the covering at night consisted of the remnant of one blanket, with clothes which they wore during the day! In other places similar sights were to be seen; similar, and perhaps if possible, more frightful poverty was to be witnessed."

There was no distinct specification of the sufferings of the poor in towns and cities; but, according to the Report of Lord

Devon, they were most afflicting. He would trouble the House with one more letter; it was from Lord Cloncurry, and was in the following form, addressed to the editor of the *Dublin Evening Post* :—

“February 9th, 1846.

“MY DEAR SIR,—I think it right to mention to you that I planted some potatoes last November in lazy beds, the soil rich, maiden, and dry; the seeds of the best kinds, mostly cut, but some whole; the kinds, purple kidneys and pinkeyes. On examining them last week, I find one-third decayed, after making shoots. This is bad news; but it is better to give timely information. It was for this purpose I gave my time to the Mansion House Committee, the members of which appeared to me to have no other object in view but the service of their fellow-creatures. I believe the statement contained in several hundred letters directed to me, contained more true and early information than all the costly Reports and Commissions of the Government. I believe if some of the measures we recommended were adopted, they would have afforded a cheaper and more effectual relief than any suggested by salaried advisers. There is in the country at this moment corn more than enough to feed our entire population; by establishing stores or granaries for the poorhouses and other places, into which the farmers could send their corn, receiving in return a note as to the quantity, it would prevent the great loss which takes place every year by want of proper corn-stands or barns through the country; it would be at hand if wanted, and if not, it could be sold in May or June at probably an advanced price, which would pay all expense. I have advocated the establishment of public granaries for many years, from a knowledge of their great utility in many parts of the continent; and in no country would they be so beneficial as in Ireland, where almost all the farming classes are unprovided with the necessary corn-stands and stores. It would have been much more becoming of the Government to listen to the advice of the Mansion House Committee, and to profit by the information they could have given gratis, than to desire their understrappers and officials to deny the existence of the danger, and to insist upon it that our accounts were exaggerated, and more political than patriotic.—Dear sir, your humble servant,

“CLONCURREY.”

Reluctant as he (Mr. O'Connell) was to continue the dulness necessarily produced by the perusal of a succession of documents, he felt that this was a matter of too much importance not to require the fullest information. He wished the House to understand that scarcity in Ireland had always been attended

with typhus fever: no matter what change of air might be procured, the disease did not seem affected by the atmosphere: but it always ceased when food became abundant. Thus cause, effect, and cure were obvious. The cause was want of due nourishment; the effect, typhus fever; and the cure, a supply of the necessaries of life. He would furnish four or five instances of famine in Ireland, showing that fever ceased when the period of harvest arrived:—

“1734—Summer wet, autumn variable, winter mild; harvest bad, much straw and little grain.

“1735—Summer again cold and wet, autumn wet, winter open; fruits and grains very backward.

“1736—One of the hottest summers remembered, autumn fair, winter open. Pestilential fever appeared in winter of 1734, continued through 1735, became very frequent and fatal through summer of 1736—and disappeared in autumn of the same year, which brought a most abundant harvest.

“1740—Spring dry and cold, summer dry, autumn unusually frosty, winter frosty. Great dearth of provisions this autumn (1740) which proceeded almost to a famine in winter, the potatoes having failed, while other provisions bore double or treble their usual price. Fever appeared in summer of 1740, increased in autumn, and rose to a terrible degree of violence in spring and summer of 1741. 80,000 persons died of fever and dysentery in this epidemic. The fever which had begun last autumn returned in spring, and raged through the summer of 1741. It was computed that one-fifth of the inhabitants died, though probably with exaggeration.

“1741—Spring dry, summer dry, autumn variable, winter frosty. Plenty of good corn in autumn of 1741, fruits of the year duly matured, winter concluded healthy, and the bills of mortality sunk conspicuously.

“1742—Spring dry, summer hot, autumn variable, winter stormy and frosty. Provisions most plentiful; bread sold at twenty-one pounds six ounces for a shilling.

“1743—The summer and autumn were remarkable for health, as well as for fertility and plenty in large crops of corn of all sorts; and we had scarce any disease then or in winter, except cold and sore throat from which we are seldom exempted.”

The next period to which he would refer was the year 1798. The hon. and learned gentleman then read as follows:—

“In 1798 summer and autumn wet, crops scanty, fuel scarce. Gentry flying out of the country, poor out of employment, tillage neglected, conse-

quent starvation. Fever prevalent in the spring of 1798, spread in the end of summer to a frightful extent. In 1799 summer wet and cold; general deficiency in crops. Fever now assumed a most malignant type. In 1800, summer unusually hot, and dry, but followed, like the previous wet summer, with deficient wet crops; the crops, moreover, of very bad quality; the people in a state of starvation. Malignant fever continued from 1799. In 1801 most abundant harvest; fever began to decline, and disappeared in the summer of 1802."

He now came to 1817; the following were the characteristics of the period:—

"In 1817, crops of the preceding year very deficient, did not arrive at maturity; corn was uncut in November; much of it lost; corn saved was green in the husk or matted; potatoes scanty, wet, unripe; no straw even for the beds of the poor; turf also deficient. This deficiency of food, fuel, and bedding, was felt most seriously in winter and spring of 1816-17, when fever appeared, which became very prevalent in summer of 1817. Spring and summer wet, cold and unproductive as the preceding year. In 1818, spring moist, summer unusually hot, crops good, provisions in abundance. The epidemic which had arisen in spring of 1817, continued to increase at a rapid rate through summer, winter, spring, and summer again, until the autumn of 1818, which brought with it a most abundant supply of food, fuel, and straw for bedding. Fever at the very same time began to decline, and soon after disappeared. One million and a half of the population suffered from fever in this epidemic. In 1826, potato crop of the preceding year (1825) very deficient. The weavers in Dublin were, by a sudden reverse of trade, thrown out of employment to the number of 20,000. Fever appeared rising rapidly in the spring of 1826, reached a terrific height in the autumn and winter following, declined in summer of 1827, and disappeared in autumn. The autumn of 1827 produced an almost unparalleled abundance of crops."

There was one other calamity connected with scarcity which had been observed and commented upon by a medical gentleman in Dublin—one of the very first in his profession—he meant Dr. Corrigan. The following were his remarks:—

"I cannot conclude without noting a warning circumstance that has had some influence with me in bringing out these observations at the present time. It has been remarked by all the observers of epidemic fevers in Ireland—by Rogers, O'Connell, Beatty, Barker, and Cheyne—that smallpox and bad fevers, which ravaged England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

have been observed by medical writers. Sydenham has gone so far as to say that, from their intimate connection, he doubts that the plague and smallpox may not be of the same nature, only with different forms of development. It seems as if the human constitution, under influences which have acted injuriously on vegetable organization or have predisposed to epidemic fever, had lost so much of its energy as to render it less able to resist infection. Smallpox has been of late very prevalent in Ireland. I subjoin a table of the admissions and deaths from it in the Hardwicke Hospital for the last four years:—

		Total Number of Admissions.	Number of Smallpox Cases.		
			Admitted.	Cured.	Died.
1842	..	1,553	22	17	5
1843	..	1,551	18	14	4
1844	..	1,769	5	5	0
1845	..	2,413	86	71	15

“This visitation should put us on our guard. It may have come to us as a warning. With our previous experience we should not neglect it. We know the danger that threatens us. We may combat it, should it come, but we can do more: we can prevent its attack. If there be no famines there will be no fever; and if active and timely exertion be made to afford sufficient employment and wages to our people I believe there will be neither famine nor fever.”

The hon. and learned gentleman continued—I have shown you our distress. I have shown that there are no agricultural labourers, no peasantry in Europe so badly off, suffering such privation, as the great body of the Irish people. In no part of Europe, I repeat, is there such suffering as in Ireland. There there are five millions of people always on the verge of starvation. I have shown you from Government documents—from an enormous load of documents, taken from, and referring to, all parts of Ireland, that its people are threatened—that they are in the utmost danger of a fearful famine, with all its concomitant horrors. I may be asked what I propose? I answer, that I call upon all the members of this House to join in the most energetic measures to stop the impending calamity. You cannot be too speedy; you cannot be too extensive in your remedies. It may be said that I am here to ask money to succour Ireland in her distress. No such thing. I scorn the thought.

I am here to say Ireland has resources of her own. You have a revenue from the woods and forests of Ireland. You spent £74,000 within the last few years on Trafalgar-square. Let that revenue represent a capital of a million or a million and a-half. Why, then, borrow on the credit of that fund. You may borrow a million and have a sinking fund. You may do more—you may borrow money on the rents of the Irish landlords. Borrow money, I say, and bring in an income tax, charging the absentee landlords twenty per cent. and the resident landlords ten per cent. The object is to protect the labouring population from an impending calamity. They are even now surrounded by disease and death in their most horrid forms. And it is fitting that we should make the landlords contribute in such a way as shall be effectual. You may tell me of the Poor Laws. My opinion is that Poor Laws may mitigate distress in ordinary seasons, but will not meet a famine. The workhouses would make very good hospitals for the sick. That fever prevails in Cork, Tralee, and Killarney I have proved to you; it has raged to a frightful extent in Limerick; the number of patients in the infirmaries has increased; the lanes of Dublin are full of fever. You are not to be guided in such a case as this by ordinary rules. It is a case beyond every rule. The people are not to blame. It has pleased Providence to inflict this calamity upon them; it is your business to mitigate that calamity as much as possible. There are the railroads, for example. Why do you not take strong measures with railroads? I should be happy to see the Government authorised to act in reference to these. I should wish to see this House and the other support the Government in that course. I will dispense with the rules and regulations that fancy railway schemes brought before Parliament. Famine is coming on—fever is coming on. This House ought to place in the Queen's Government powers adequate to such an exigency, so that it may have the means of giving the most extensive employment. As to contending lines, I do not know but the Government would decide better; for I don't know a worse tribunal than this

House. I found myself yesterday voting on a railway question without exactly knowing what I was doing; I cannot, therefore, blame others. But wherever £100,000 has been subscribed for a railway, the Government ought to have power to give another £100,000, by way of loan, so as to afford every facility for proceeding with the works, and to leave private individuals at liberty to apply the funds thus left for a time in their hands in such a manner as to give further employment. Lend the money to the railways at one per cent. or two per cent. I know how many objections may be started to such a plan; but I speak of a case which is superior in every objection. Great evils require great remedies; the remedy ought to be commensurate with the evil; and I am speaking from the depth of my conviction when I declare that in my conscience I believe the result of neglect on the part of this House in the present instance will be deaths to an enormous amount. On the grounds which I have stated, I request the appointment of a committee of the whole House, if for no other effect, at least for the purpose of convincing the Irish people that the calamities are not disregarded. I don't blame the Government for what they have done, and for what they propose to do. They have had my humble support. I have not been peddling for objections to their measures. I am prepared to give an honest support to any plans which the Government may bring forward for the purpose of mitigating the effects of the scarcity. Yet those which have been propounded are miserable trifles; they would do for ordinary times and for an ordinary scarcity; but they will not answer when death is abroad. The details into which I felt it my duty to enter have made my statement necessarily a dry one; and, for the extreme patience with which I have been heard, I beg to express to the House my own thanks and the thanks of the Irish people. The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by proposing his motion.

Subject, ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL;

Date, MARCH 11, 1846.

Even now, when O'Connell's gigantic strength had begun to fail, he was at his post and as ready to defend his faith as he had ever been to plead for his country. His son, Mr. John O'Connell, rose afterwards and briefly stated that he had been educated at Clongowes College by the Jesuits, "and that he had never heard a word or sentiment from them that was unworthy of a Christian, an enlightened gentleman, and a loyal subject." But it was little use to protest or explain to men who were predetermined to uphold a certain thing with an utter and illogical disregard of any foundation for it. Mr. Newdegate followed, and made the very intelligent observation that "in order to form a correct estimate of the principles of the Jesuits, the House ought to know something of their specific acts, of their members, and where they existed." It might be supposed that gentlemen who had been educated by the Jesuits would be most capable of giving such information, but as the only information they could give was favourable, and as that kind of information did not agree with the hon. gentleman's private theory, he could not accept it. If ignorance is preferred, and it seems to be only on such subjects that it is preferred, there is nothing more to be said.

Mr O'Connell—The noble lord seemed to have an impression on his mind unfavourable to the Jesuits. This was because he had not had the opportunity or inducement to consult or consider the history of that most illustrious order. He (Mr. O'Connell) had well considered it; and he was satisfied that there never existed a body of men who were greater benefactors to science and literature as well as to religion. That order had experienced injurious treatment even from some Catholics. He believed that their virtues were made crimes, and that the strict discipline which they enforced operated against them. He would challenge any man to give him time and date, and state any circumstance disgraceful to the character of the Jesuits, which he was not able to refute. No man could be admitted a Jesuit until after twelve years of religious exercise and study, and devoting five years to the instruction of youth. Then at the expiration he might or might not be admitted into the order. It could not be disputed that many of

the most distinguished men of science and literature belonged to this order, notwithstanding all that had been said against them. The authority of Pascal, although an elegant writer, was not of any great weight on this subject. This would be apparent to any one who would look into the facts of the case. His book turned merely on a crotchet. There was another person, however, who had recently made some atrocious attacks upon them. Michelet was not an author to be quoted as an authority either here or elsewhere: He was a writer of romances of the most atrocious nature against the Jesuits. How he succeeded in France was by drawing on his imagination instead of upon authorities. There was not one assertion of crime which he had alleged on the part of the Jesuits, which was not without foundation. The Jesuits were subject to the civil law, like other men; and if they were guilty of crimes, they could be punished. The truth was, that they had drawn persecution upon themselves in consequence of the purity of their lives. From which countries had they first been expelled and had suffered persecution? They had first been expelled from Portugal. He was sure that no one would say that that was a most pure and enlightened country. They had then been expelled from Spain. He was sure no one would rise and say that that was a pure and enlightened country. But, thank God! they had revived again, and had diffused themselves over the face of the earth. They had sent, within a very short time, not less than fifty missionaries to Corea, Cochinchina, Siam, and other places; and he had no doubt but that they would double the number next year. This was the first time that he had said anything in that House in favour of the Jesuits; but he had done so now because he regarded them as the greatest benefactors of science and literature.

Subject, PROTECTION OF LIFE—IRELAND; Date, APRIL 3, 1846.

This may be called O'Connell's last speech. The one which follows was but a cry for help for his afflicted country—a cry which was the death-wail of Ireland's noblest son.

On the 23rd of February, 1846, while famine was staring the whole nation in the face, a Bill was brought in for "the protection of life in Ireland." A foreigner reading the announcement would exclaim that the English nation were indeed pre-eminent for humanity, antecedents in Ireland and India notwithstanding. But this Bill was not to preserve the lives of the poor famine-stricken people, it was simply a Coercion Bill. A few murders had been committed in Ireland by the despairing people, who, seeing little hope of legal justice, took matters into their own hands, and were by so doing guilty of deadly crime. Such crimes were few indeed compared with the black mass of seething guilt in England; but Irish sins, however trivial, are visited with the severest retribution.

The Bill was passed with alacrity through the House of Lords; it came down to the Commons; but England's danger was Ireland's opportunity once more. The Corn Law question was of more importance, embracing as it did the fate of a cabinet. Ireland could be coerced any time; but it was not coerced just then. O'Connell defeated the measure, Peel went out, and Lord John Russell came in.

Mr. Disraeli has noted this as O'Connell's last speech, probably having overlooked his last speech, as it was short, and merely referred to the famine; possibly because he may have considered this as virtually O'Connell's last parliamentary declamation. But Mr. Disraeli has singularly misrepresented O'Connell. He says that this "remarkable address was an abnegation of the whole policy of O'Connell's cause;" and he gives this curious reason for his conclusion: It was because he "*proved* [the italics are our own] by a mass of authentic evidence, ranging over a long term of years, that Irish outrage was the consequence of physical misery, and that the social evils of that country could not be successfully encountered by political remedies."*

The process of induction in Mr. Disraeli's mind is vicious. The speech being here in evidence, it needs only a glance to see that the whole argument was to prove precisely the reverse. Irish "outrage" was indeed caused by social physical misery, but no man ever proved with such incontrovertible eloquence, that this physical misery was the direct result of the most grievous and inexcusable political misgovernment.

* "Life of Lord George Bentinck."

Mr. O'Connell said—In rising to propose an amendment to the motion of the right hon. baronet, I promise the House to be as brief as I possibly can; and if I should trespass upon its patience longer than my own inclination would dictate, I trust that the importance of the question will plead my excuse. The case on behalf of the promoters of the Bill, has been stated by the right hon. baronet in a manner which it is impossible should give dissatisfaction to any quarter. I will not say one word against that manner. I never heard a harsh measure more moderately proposed; and there is, I may say, for us, danger, even in moderation. The only attempts of the right hon. baronet at anything like the colouring of oratory was, when he attributed the crimes to causes out of which they have not arisen. I do not think he has shown in the slightest degree—he scarcely attempted to show—that the evils, such as they are, would be remedied by this measure; in fact, he only alluded to the Bill just to vindicate the severity of its provisions, by comparing it with former enactments. He did not show, or attempt to show, that this Bill would remedy the existing evils, or prevent the crimes with which we are unhappily menaced in Ireland. There were, however—shall I call them admissible?—statements made by the right hon. baronet that are highly consolatory. It is consolatory to know, on the authority of Government, that there is nothing political in the crimes charged against Ireland; above all, that there is nothing religious, or belonging to any sect of religion, in the crimes themselves; that they are really perpetrated against persons of every species of politics, against persons of each religion; that the Roman Catholic religion is no protection to Roman Catholics, and Protestantism no incentive against Protestants. It is confessed by her Majesty's Government, and it is an undoubted fact, that there is nothing in these outrages which partakes either of sectarianism or political bias. I will now proceed to notice other statements made by the right hon. baronet. He said distinctly that, out of thirty-two counties in Ireland, twenty-two are free from disturbance; there are five in which it is partial, and five

more where it prevails to a greater extent. Thus, no less than two-thirds of the entire country are perfectly free from any taint of the guilt belonging to others. Then, the right hon. baronet has clearly told us that, even in the counties actually disturbed, the great majority of the inhabitants have not participated in the disturbances. They are confined to a comparatively small minority, which is engaged more or less in outrages. Therefore, a Coercion Bill is utterly unnecessary, according to the confession of ministers, for the great body of the population of Ireland. There are, it seems, five counties requiring, as the right hon. baronet contends, harsh measures; only five counties, and in those the great majority of the inhabitants are free from guilt. Before I proceed farther, again let me remind the House—and I do it, I may say, in the presence of the press of England—that however they may assume that the disturbances have a political basis and a sectarian origin, the Government has declared and decided the contrary. I will now notice one or two of the particular cases alluded to by the right hon. baronet:—First, as to the case of the wife and husband in the county of Tyrone, I did not think it could have been mentioned as a proof that crime calling for this Bill existed in Ireland. The county of Tyrone is as quiet as any county in England, or as any district on the face of the globe. Crime, such as it was, was diminishing, and the horrible outrage referred to was one of those acts of delinquency which are sometimes committed in the best regulated and most civilised communities. It ought never to have been made one of the features justifying this measure. I am borne out most completely by evidence, when I speak of the tranquillity of Tyrone. Next, I will allude for a moment to the letter the right hon. baronet received from Mr. P. B. Ryan, “my faithful friend.” Of Mr. Ryan we shall hear more; but, I must at present read one passage from a local paper, which will serve to show the degree of veracity to be attributed to this worthy gentleman:—

“MR. P. B. RYAN.—We regret being under the unavoidable necessity of postponing the able and masterly reply of P. Fogarty, Esq., of Cabra Castle,

to an extraordinary letter which has recently been published, with the name of the above gentleman signed to it. Mr. Fogarty says, that 'the Thurles bench of magistrates should be appealed to in relation to Mr. P. B. Ryan's wonderful letter.' "

So we shall certainly have full information as to that gentleman's veracity. Before I enter into the subject more at large, I wish to recall the House to the fact of the unhappy assassination of Mr. Pierce Carrick. Now, I think it would be well that the House should distinctly understand that case—not as reflecting upon the character of the unhappy murdered man—not for the purpose of palliating in the slightest degree his murder. It is a crime that no man not fit to be a participator in the murder would attempt to justify, or even to palliate. I feel almost unwilling to go into the question of the causes of that murder, lest it should have the appearance—it could not have the reality—of palliating it; but it is necessary that the facts should be known by the House. We are appealing to you—we are appealing to the House; for the notice I give is a notice of appeal to the House to eradicate the causes of crime—and to enable you to do so, you must distinctly understand why it is that those wretches are tempted to commit—if they cannot be justified in committing—crimes of this description. Now, I have the local newspaper, which contains a paragraph relative to the conduct of Mr. Carrick. It states this—but it will be less tedious to the House that I should make this statement with reference to Mr. Carrick. Unhappily he was the agent of a young gentleman under age. He got the tenants to pay their rents by a promise that, as soon as the young gentleman came of age, 25 per cent. should be taken off their rents. The young gentleman came of age. Mr. Carrick did not call upon him to perform his promise; he sent out a valuer to value the lands; the tenants thought that a reduction of rent would follow the valuation; but the valuation was higher than the existing rent, and they were obliged to pay that high rent. And when they came to expostulate with the valuator, what did he say? He said he did not value

the lands at all; that he got a cut-and-dry valuation—that was the phrase he used—from Mr. Carrick, and he only made a return of that which was dictated to him. Mr. Carrick told the tenants they must take out leases; and when they came with their rent, the first thing he did was to stop £10 from each tenant for the expense of a lease. They paid £10 each. They were obliged to go home to collect money to make up the deficiency in the rent; but from that day to the day of his death they never got a single lease. If he had lived one week longer, he would have got an *habere*, and turned out thirty-one families. And here, again, let me solemnly protest—I am sure I need not—that I do not consider any of these acts as an excuse, or a reason, or even as the slightest palliation of his murder. No, they are not; it was a horrible murder—it was an atrocious murder—it was a crime that is deserving of the severest punishment that man can inflict, and which causes the red arm of God's vengeance to be suspended over the murderer. I want the House to prevent the recurrence of such murders.

You are going to enact a Coercion Bill against them also, when they attempt to commit those abuses of property. They have a legal right; but I say those abuses of property are really the stimulants to the worst of crimes. Now, the amendment I mean to propose is this:—

“That while this House deplores the existence of outrage in Ireland, and is sincerely anxious for its repression, it is of opinion that such outrage will be aggravated, not removed, by the arbitrary, unjust, and unconstitutional enactments of this Bill; and that it is the duty of Parliament to adopt such measures as will tend to eradicate the causes which produce those crimes instead of resorting to laws which will harass and oppress the innocent without restraining the guilty, and which being restrictive of public liberty cannot fail to augment national discontent.”

Sir, my motion, the House perceives, is directed to remedy the evil complained of. It does not controvert the fact of the existence of crime which the Government has stated. There is

no doubt that atrocious murders have been committed—there is no doubt that the number of those murders is not diminishing.

The question is, what is the proper method of preventing the recurrence of these crimes? If I thought that would be effected by this Bill, there is not a man in this House that would vote for it more readily than I would. But I solemnly declare that my opposition to it is founded upon this—that I am convinced the words of this resolution are true; and that this Bill, instead of leading to the amelioration of crime, will augment it, and increase the number of the victims. Now, look just at the Bill for one moment, and you will find that it is calculated, take it at the best, to inflict a penalty of a most grievous nature upon many innocent persons, with the chance of reaching a few guilty. It certainly will inflict a penalty upon many innocent persons, in the expectation of reaching a few of the guilty; and even that is an expectation which is not likely to be realised by this process. Now, I shall call the attention of the House to the clauses of this Bill itself. You should understand distinctly what it is the Bill contains, and how little applicable it is to the suppression of crime. The right hon. baronet did not distinctly state the clauses of the Bill in proposing it. He merely alleged former Bills of this kind, and, amongst other things, he attempted to show that I had formerly assented to this penal clause, for which purpose he quoted Hansard. Now, sir, I am as ready as any man to have any clause introduced, which, without violating constitutional principle, will have the slightest tendency to repress crime of any kind. The first provision of this Bill is to give to the Lord Lieutenant arbitrary power. It gives him the power at his will and pleasure, without assigning a reason, without the necessity of proof of any form, to proclaim any part of Ireland he pleases. The allegation that the proclamation is necessary may be unfounded in fact, and, therefore, the proclamation equally unfounded—utterly unfounded in fact; but no contradiction of the allega-

tion can be received, for there is a clause in the Bill by which the proclamation itself is declared to be conclusive evidence of the fact; so that the *sic volo sic jubeo* of the Lord Lieutenant is quite enough to authorise the issuing of the proclamation, though the Bill, to be sure, says that he must have some pretext for so doing—that there shall be some disturbance in the district. The Lord Lieutenant can also add an adjacent district to a district so proclaimed; for instance, if the county of Monaghan were proclaimed, the county of Tyrone, or any part of that county, can be proclaimed by reason of the disturbances in the county of Monaghan, and the *habeas corpus* will no longer be of any value in any such proclaimed district.

The most unlimited powers are then given to the Lord Lieutenant to charge any of those districts with any sum of money he pleases. There is no limit to it but the possibility of its being paid. He can give any sum of money by way of recompense or compensation to any person that is injured. I do not so much complain of that—the grand jurors have something of a similar power—but what I do complain of is, that by this enactment the power given to the Lord Lieutenant is unlimited. There is no control over him, as in the case of the grand juries, whose presentments may be traversed, and who, having themselves to pay part of the money, would be cautious not to give too much to any suffering person. But the Lord Lieutenant has no limit to his power; he can give any sum he pleases, and there is no traversing his presentment or controlling it. In the next place, he can give a reward to any person he pleases. In short, he has the most unlimited power to reward that it is possible to give. He has next the power of appointing as many stipendiary magistrates as he pleases. He has the power of appointing inspectors of police, and chiefs of police, and sub-constables, and officers, and privates of police, as he thinks fit. Uncontrolled, unchecked, without any legal possibility of preventing it, he has those powers. He has the power of compensation to any extent—he has the power of giving rewards to any extent, and of appointing policemen and

officers of every description to any extent he chooses. The effect of that may not be easily understood in this country, but it is well known in Ireland. I am not accusing any Government; it is an accusation against human nature. Persons who are at all likely to get into the police have been known more than once to fabricate outrages, and represent the country to be in a state of disturbance to effect their own purposes. Now, let me tell the House how this money is to be levied. It is to be assessed by a person to be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. No magistrate, no grand juror, no country gentlemen, or lawyer, or judge, has power to control it. The Lord Lieutenant appoints a person to levy the tax. He is limited only according to the poor rate, but is not limited by the poor rate. Any person having a holding under £4 yearly pays no poor rate, but he must pay the tax under this Bill. No person is so poor as to escape taxation under this Bill; but if a man be rich, he is secure from it, for the lessor is not to be liable at all. The lessor is quite free, the owner is free, the country gentleman is free for his domain; he will pay nothing for his domain; the wretched cottager, or the day labourer, when he gets a day's labour, must pay the tax, but the squire in the large mansion-house pays nothing. The justification of the right hon. baronet was, that the grand jury have the power of charging their counties by previous acts. Why, they have; but what is the precaution taken? No additional force of police could be sent into a county without a demand from the magistrates. The magistrates who were to assess for it were to make the demand; one-half of the money was paid by the Government, and the other half by the county; and it was levied through the grand jury, who were to present for it. They had an opportunity of investigating the account, and their personal and individual interests induce them to make it as little as they could. But by this Bill, no grand jury or magistrate can interfere: the whole is done at the will of the Lord Lieutenant, who appoints his taxmaster-general to go about and levy contributions. That tax falls upon the poor: and the rich man escapes, and

yet this is called a Bill to make life and property secure in Ireland. How is it to do that? The wretched man scarcely able to exist at present—poor as poor can be—scarcely able to pay his rent—will have, in addition, that enormous tax to pay. If he refuse to pay it, you can get a stipendiary to call out the army or the police to go and distrain and sell the goods by force, if necessary; you give an irresistible force for the levy being made with certainty; but what becomes of the man against whom the levy is made? Have you conciliated him—have you rendered him less liable to commit offences? Will it make him better disposed towards the noblemen and gentlemen who pay nothing? Nay, in what situation do you place him and his landlord? One of the greatest grievances of Ireland is the clearance system. See what an adjunct this measure will be to the clearance system. The landlord has additional powers to levy his rent—he has already too much; but in addition to that, the poor man is obliged to guard the rich man by the payment of taxation. He must give up possession of his holding whenever the remnant of his property is sold, and when he has no property, but is a starveling in the land. What security can you have against the wild madness of a wretch of that description? It is likewise an additional stimulant to clear the land; because a man must necessarily be a bad tenant when this additional burden is put upon him. When the landlord enters into possession, he has not this additional tax to pay, so that he derives an advantage from clearing it. In addition to other stimulants to clear it, he has the reward in anticipation of not having this tax to pay when he has cleared the land of his tenantry. The next thing I quarrel with is the power given by this Bill to arrest any person found in houses (not being inmates thereof or travellers) within the proclaimed district. It enacts that any person or persons found in any proclaimed district in any house of public resort, licensed or unlicensed, in which malt liquors or spirituous liquors are sold or consumed, or in any house, shop, or other place of public resort wherein tea, coffee, provisions, liquors, or refreshments of any sort are

sold or consumed, whether kept or retailed therein, or procured elsewhere (not being there for travellers), after one hour after sunset and before sunrise, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour. I shall be glad to know what houses will escape? Why, even the consumption of water in a house will authorise them to break into such house, and into every room of that house. If the person authorised to enter a house be delayed an unreasonable time (he is to judge himself of what is an unreasonable time), he has power to break into the house. The rich man is safe, and liquors, and coffee, and tea may be consumed in his house; but no poor man's house will be, or can be, possibly secure one moment from being broken into. Is this, I ask, the way to make the people respect the law? Is this the way for them to look to the law for protection? This is an Education Bill—this is a new plan of coercion; but are they likely to be taught any great reverence for the law of the land, when they find armed policemen breaking into the rooms where their wives and daughters are lying, under the pretence of searching for some person not a regular inmate of it?

Now, let me remind the House that it stands admitted that, even in the disturbed counties, the majority of the people are free from taint, but they are not to be free from the tax. The entire majority must pay the tax in order to get at the guilty minority. We tax the poorest of the people in the hope of what? In the hope of educating them to detect persons who commit crime. Do you think you can ever succeed in that? What motive could they have? You want to intimidate them into exerting themselves to preserve the peace. On what principle are they to do that? It has been urged in support of this measure that there was an old Saxon law which rendered the vicinage liable for every person in it; but let it be recollected that at the time the owners were the principal men in the district; they were armed; they had the magistrates, the law, the sheriff, the power of the county with them; they had the legal authority to arrest every person; but what legal authority has the Irish peasant, what *posse comitatus* can he command?

The thing is unfounded in principle, and must be most mischievous in practice. I declare most solemnly I think it will be almost impossible to prevent an insurrection if this act be carried into effect. You may have a sanguinary warfare that can only end in ruin and destruction. The Irish people are unarm'd, and in your power; they are weak, and you are strong. I would here observe that, on looking over the returns from the two glorious battles fought in India, I find a great number of names in the list exactly resembling the names of the cottagers who were dispossessed by Mrs. Gerrard. But to return to this Bill. I ask, do you hope to succeed in it? Oh, no, you can never hope to succeed in anything so unjust. Do not seek it, but make it the interest of the Irish people—their real interest—to keep the peace. They will let others live when they have the means of living. By this Act of Parliament every offence is made a misdemeanour, only though, in some instances, punishable by transportation. That is done designedly, of course. It is made a misdemeanour, and why? because there is no peremptory challenge allowed to a prisoner in cases of misdemeanour. If he were indicted for a felony, he is entitled to twenty challenges; but, though you punish him as a felon, you take away from him the privilege he would have if you indicted him as a felon. It is a curious fact in the history of the law, that in the reign, I believe, of Edward II., it was enacted, that no person prosecuting for the Crown should challenge a juror, except for cause, but the judges have allowed the Crown to set aside jurors; so that the Crown has, in fact, unlimited power of challenge in defiance of the Act of Parliament, of common sense, and of common justice. The next clause to which I will call the attention of the House, is that which makes being out of a dwelling-house at forbidden hours a transportable offence, unless the party proves himself to be innocent. It is said I assented to a similar clause that will be found in the Statute of 1835. I admit at once that I did assent to the Statute of 1835, and now let us see if it be a similar Statute. The present Statute is put in force at the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant, and the Statute of 1835

could not be put in force except by the presentment of a grand jury, finding the district to be disturbed, and which could be traversed, as all such presentments can be. By the Statute of 1835, the accusers were bound to prove the guilt of the accused; by this Statute, the accused is bound to prove his innocence. By the Statute of 1835, the punishment was fine and imprisonment; by this Statute, the punishment is transportation. It is quite fair in parliamentary warfare for the right hon. baronet to quote "Hansard," as the right hon. gentleman has had it so often quoted against himself; but "Hansard" ought to be quoted correctly, and it cannot be quoted against me in the triumphant manner it has been quoted against the right hon. baronet. To those who do not know me well—for to those who do it is quite unnecessary—I may be permitted to say that I have done more to prevent the perpetration of crime in Ireland than any man. When I was at the bar, and was called upon to act as counsel in defence of Whiteboys, I never on any occasion made use of one single expression in mitigation of such crime, nor did I ever entertain the idea of doing so. I can produce incontestable proof of this from the testimony of the Crown Solicitor who went the same circuit. I do not deny the existence of those crimes, but I do propose the proper means to put them down. It is curious enough that by the ninth clause for the punishment of those found out of their houses at night, it is enacted that they shall be guilty of misdemeanour, and this clause is much relied on; but is not crime committed by day as well as by night? Are not murders committed in the open day? And yet you propose to leave the day for the commission of crime, and to apply the Coercion Bill only to the night. Nothing afflicts me more than the title of the Bill: "An Act for the better protection of life, and to facilitate the apprehension and detection of persons guilty of certain offences in Ireland." Now, how will it protect life? No protection is afforded by it by day, but by increasing the constabulary force, which can be effected by the existing law. The Bill does nothing to meet the case; but will make

the people more discontented; its only effect will be to create a feeling of exasperation, and make them more intent on the commission of crime. What I call upon the House to do is to insist upon a strict investigation into the causes of these crimes, and then to eradicate them by the removal of those causes. It may be said that the Bill is in safe hands, and that abuses of its power will not be allowed. But let me give the House a few instances of cases of abuse under the powers of former Acts, by which a district was proclaimed, and of which the same assertion was made. I may observe, that as for attacks by night by gangs of armed men, the punishment of the law for such offences is very severe at present. If any man is found out armed at night in a disturbed district, he is adjudged to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and punished by fine, imprisonment, and whipping. This is not light punishment, for I have known instances under this Act where men have been nearly flogged to death. On former occasions I referred to the operation of similar Acts of Parliament to that now proposed. I will now refer to evidence on this subject. The following evidence will show that this is no idle apprehension. In the Lords' Report, 1842, page 259, William F. Tighe, Esq., county Kilkenny, says:—

“ I spoke to several of the magistrates, requesting that they would omit, in their application for the Insurrection Act, the barony of Ida and the barony of Gowran, south of Thomastown.

“ You were not aware of any disturbances at that time in the barony of Ida or the southern part of the barony of Gowran? I was not.”

“ Do you know on what grounds the magistrates recommended the proclamation of either? Several of the magistrates told me that if they did not proclaim it the disaffected would take refuge there. The answer I made to them was, ‘ When they did so, and when it is disturbed, then, and not till then, apply to have it proclaimed.’ . . . I have since received a letter from my agent, in which he states that he has seen a notice posted in the town of Innistogue, by order of the magistrates, prohibiting all persons from being out after sunset, and particularly the fishermen. He further states that it is his intention to appear at the petty sessions of magistrates to request them to exempt the fishermen from that order; as, if they were prevented

from fishing at night, the principal means of support of their families would be taken away. He informs me that during the summer they can only fish at night on that part of the river (Nore)."

John Dunn, Esq., Queen's County, page 423, says :—

"I am particularly acquainted with that part of Kilkenny now under proclamation, adjoining the Queen's County,

"Had there been any disturbance in it at the time the Act was put into execution? Not in the barony of Innisfadden, adjoining the Queen's County. I am aware of none.

"Can you state on what ground it was the Insurrection Act was applied for as far as respects that barony, and the circumstances attending it? I understand that some few trees, some two or three, had been felled in the demesne of Lady Ormond, and I am not aware of any other transaction at all that could justify the application of such a measure."

Report of Committee of the House of Commons, 1825.
Major-General R. Bourke, J.P., Limerick County, asked,
p. 331 :—

"Do you recollect the introduction of the police in the county of Limerick under the Peace Preservation Bill? I do. There had been a county meeting held, at which it was resolved that the state of the county did not then require the introduction of the police; and shortly after that county meeting, at the spring assizes following, the grand jury applied to the Lord Lieutenant to place the county under the Peace Preservation Bill.

"And on that application, notwithstanding the decision of the county at large, the police were introduced? They were introduced.

"What description of persons were appointed to that police? Generally speaking, they were very unfit persons.

"Was the Insurrection Act enforced in those baronies which continued in a state of tranquillity? It was. There was a memorial sent up from the baronies of Clanwilliam, Ownebeg, and Croonagh, signed by nearly all the resident magistrates, by most of the proprietors, and by clergymen of both persuasions, stating the good order and tranquillity that had prevailed and was prevailing in the baronies, and how hard it would be to expose the occupiers of the land to a very heavy tax under the Peace Preservation Bill; but the answer received was, that it was in contemplation to send police to the whole county, and that the Lord Lieutenant saw no reason for excepting those baronies."

He begged the attention of the House (the hon. member

continued) to the fact that by Lord Stanley's Act the county of Kilkenny was proclaimed; and it was thought convenient to introduce that Act into the city of Kilkenny, where no disturbances or crimes contemplated by this Act had been committed. On an explanation of this, the answer was that it was for the convenience of the police that the Act should extend to the city of Kilkenny. So, then, for the sake of the police, the city of Kilkenny was proclaimed, and its inhabitants were exposed to all the severe enactments of this law, and this without any ground whatever. He wanted the House not to place such discretionary powers in the hands of any Government, for the bad use that had been made of them might be made again. It might be said that, in consequence of the commission of some horrid murders, this was an experiment which should be tried. If no Coercion Act had ever existed before he might listen to this suggestion; if the experiment had been tried on once and failed, he might be induced to try it again; even if it had failed a second and a third time there might be some reason in asking to try it once more; but they had had Coercion Acts seventeen times since the Union, and they had uniformly failed. Such are some of the blessings of the Union. Sometimes the Coercion Bill was divided into two parts; but the list which he was about to read gave an accurate statement on the subject. The hon. and learned gentleman read the following document:—

“1801, two Coercion Acts; 1802, July, two Acts; 1803, December, two Acts; 1805, February, one Act; 1807, August, two Acts; 1814, July, one Act; 1817, June, one Act; 1822, February, two Acts; 1823, March, one Act; 1831, October, one Act; 1833, April, one Act; August, one Act; total, seventeen different Acts. Observe, that the first of these Acts in 1801 was intitled, ‘An Act for the protection of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland.’ The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended from the Union until 1805, when the Whigs allowed it to revive. Suspended again from 1807 to 1810; again from 1814 to 1818; again from 1822 to 1828; again from 1829 to 1831; again from 1833 to 1835.”

By several of these Acts trial by jury was abolished; regarding insurrectionary crimes, a bench of magistrates, with a

King's counsel, were authorised to transport for any such offence. This was not a dead letter. Now, were all these instances to be regarded as experiments? Under these acts all the social guarantees were trampled under foot, trial by jury was suspended, and the powers of the magistracy were increased to a most alarming extent. But did this put a stop to crime? A lull might be created for a short time, but after it passed there was always an increase of crime. It appeared, then, that this was a process which they were called on to go on with.

The right hon. baronet (Sir James Graham) said that Lord Stanley's Bill had been carried into effect, and succeeded. Was this so? Lord Stanley's Bill was not acted upon. It originated in the disturbances respecting the collection of tithes. The Government had taken up the tithe campaign, and had filled the barrack-yards with the crops of the tenantry which had been distrained for tithes. The Bill passed, but what did the Government do? The first thing was to put an end to the tithe campaign. The distraints for tithes ceased, and the claims of the clergy were bought off, and thus the people were relieved from the payment of tithes. The Government agreed to advance £1,000,000 to pay off the arrears of tithes; and when it was proposed in that House, the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel) called it a vulgar expedient to settle the question. In addition to this, more than £18,000 costs, which had been incurred were forgiven or paid off. Then the Bill for changing the direct payment of tithes into a rent-charge passed, and the people were conciliated to a considerable extent by it. If it did not go so far as it ought, it at any rate showed a conciliatory disposition on the part of the Government. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. baronet would not again impute the change that took place to Lord Stanley's Bill on the maxim *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. He was not disposed to speak harshly of the right hon. gentleman; on the contrary, his wish was to avoid anything of the kind. The first thing, however, the present Government did when they came into office was to adopt a change of system, and the right hon.

baronet declared that concession to Ireland had reached its limits. He did not now reproach the right hon. baronet for the use of the expression, for it had been withdrawn with great manliness. He did not blame him for inconsistency in changing his opinion. When such a change took place in opinion as happened with the right hon. baronet, it only showed that he was a wiser man to-day than he was yesterday. He would do justice to the right hon. gentleman, and say, You did not shrink from any change of opinion, however it might affect you, when you thought it your duty; you performed a great duty to England: in the name of Heaven why not do so to Ireland? Why not try other means with that country than coercion? He did not wish to dwell on the injustice of England to Ireland, but still it should not be forgotten that no country had suffered so much from another; but he would say, let all this be buried in oblivion, and put the people of both countries on an equality, and deal with Ireland as they dealt with England. He would say, Protection to all, injustice to none; and give equal rights and franchises to the people of Ireland with those which you yourselves enjoy. The various Acts you have passed to tranquillize Ireland have been insufficient; your coercive laws have failed; the argument, therefore, was inviting to a conciliatory process. They must have observed what was done in the way of conciliation by the Whigs, and the effect it produced; but there had been a recoil since gentlemen opposite came into power: crime had diminished during their day, but crime had increased since. God forbid that he should accuse the right hon. gentlemen of this! but he charged them with not looking sufficiently to the state of Ireland and the crimes thereof. One of them opposite, with a halo around his name, afforded an instance of this, and showed that he was a sadly bad politician. He had read a conversation which had occurred in some other place, and it had appeared in the newspapers, and he saw an illustrious name of one of the parties, to whom sentiments were attributed which must be regarded as being most calamitous, that he

should talk of the prosperity of Ireland, and that the trade of that country was on the increase, and that its imports and exports were on the increase. Since then there had been an increase of exports without a corresponding increase of imports. Where could he have been all this time, and not look to the evidence around him? He could have taken no notice of the reports of the Committee on the state of that country, and of the evidence which had been collected. If these books were consulted, it would be seen that no people in Europe were in so necessitous a state as the people of Ireland. It appeared that 7,000,000 out of the 8,200,000 of the population were engaged in agriculture, and most of them were in a state of distress. He would not proceed. What was the state of the population of that country, from the evidence of Alexander Nimmo, Esq., Civil Engineer. The hon. gentleman read the following extract from the Report of the Lords' Committee of 1824, to inquire into the state of Ireland, page 226:—

“Your professional intercourse with Ireland has given you the means of general accurate information on the state of the peasantry of that country?”

“I have seen a great deal of the peasantry. I have sometimes slept in their cabins, and had frequent intercourse with them, especially in the south and west of Ireland.

“I conceive the peasantry in Ireland to be, in general, in almost the lowest possible state of existence; their cabins are in the most miserable condition, and their food is potatoes with water—very often without anything else—frequently without salt, and I have frequently had occasion to meet persons who begged of me, on their knees, for the love of God, to give them some promise of employment, that from the credit of that, they might get the means of supporting themselves for a few months, until I could employ them.”

The following was the evidence of W. H. W. Newenham, Esq., before the Commons' Committee, 1824, p. 300:—

“Is the condition of the people very bad in respect to the means of subsistence, and houses, and dress? Excepting where a gentleman's own residence is, particularly so. I have seen several countries, and I never saw any peasantry so badly off.”

John O'Driscoll, Esq., barrister (same Report, 1824, p. 380), gave this evidence:—

“ Will you describe to the Committee, generally, the condition of the people, and their habits of living? In the part of the country (county Cork) that I am best acquainted with, the condition of the people is the very worst that can possibly be. Nothing can be worse than the condition of the lower classes of the labourers, and the farmers are not much better (381); they have nothing whatever, I think, but potatoes and water; they seldom have salt.”

Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Commons' Report, 1825, p. 205:—

“ What is the state of the lower orders in your diocese? I can safely state to the Committee that the extent and intensity of their distress is greater than any language can describe; and that I think the lives of many hundreds of them are very often shortened by this great distress.”

Hon. gentlemen talked of murders, but were not those murders of the worst description? The witness proceeded:—

“ It also enervates their minds, paralyses their energies, and leaves them incapable of almost any useful exertion.”

Page 206, describing the state in which some of the peasantry exist:—

“ Thus, he drags out an existence that it were better it were terminated in any way than to be continued in the manner it is.”

R. De la Cour, Esq., county Cork, page 548:—

“ What is the condition of the peasantry? Wretched in the extreme.”

Page 549:—

“ Are the inhabitants of that country exceedingly miserable? Miserable with very few exceptions.”

The Report of the Select Committee of 1830, states, p. 4:—

“ That a very considerable proportion of the population (variously estimated at a fourth or fifth of the whole) is considered to be out of employment; that this, combined with the consequences of an altered system of managing land, is stated to produce misery and suffering which no language can possibly describe, and which it is necessary to witness in order fully to estimate.”

He begged the particular attention of the House to this, page 8:—

“The situation of the ejected tenantry, or of those who are obliged to give up their small holdings in order to promote the consolidation of farms, is necessarily most deplorable. It would be impossible for language to convey an idea of the state of distress to which the ejected tenantry have been reduced, or of the disease, misery, or even vice which they have propagated in the towns where they have settled; so that not only they who have been ejected have been rendered miserable, but they have carried with them and propagated that misery. They have increased the stock of labour; they have rendered the inhabitants of those places which have received them more crowded; they have given occasion to the dissemination of disease; they have been obliged to resort to theft, and all manner of vice and iniquity, to procure subsistence; but what is, perhaps, the most painful of all, a vast number of them have perished of want.”

Such was the effect of the ejection of tenantry in Ireland. He would not quote individual instances of misery arising from this course, but should refer to general evidence as to the misery of the people, and as to those absolutely dying from want. This was the evidence of Dr. Doyle and other creditable witnesses. He would now refer to Lord Devon's Report, a document from which the Government could not shrink, he was sure, and no one would charge that noble lord and his colleagues with exaggeration. In that Report it was stated:—

“That the agricultural labourers of Ireland suffer the greatest privations and hardships; that they depend upon precarious and casual employment for subsistence; that they are badly housed, badly fed, badly clothed, and badly paid for their labour; that it would be impossible to describe adequately the sufferings and privations which the cottiers and labourers and their families in most parts of the country endure; that in many districts their only food is the potato, their only beverage water; that their cabins are seldom a protection against the weather; that a bed or a blanket is a rare luxury; and that nearly in all, their pig and their manure heap constitute their only property; that a large proportion of the entire population comes within the designation of agricultural labourers, and undure sufferings greater than the people of any other country in Europe have to sustain.”

He would remind the right hon. baronet (Sir J. Graham)

that he had stated that the number and atrocity of the murders in Ireland was a blot upon Christianity. Was not such a state of things as he had just described a blot upon Christianity? This, be it recollected, was forty-five years after the Union, during which time Ireland had been under the Government of this country, which had reduced its population to a worse condition than that of any other country in Europe. That was the work of the British Parliament. They had governed Ireland; but what was the testimony borne with regard to the character of the Irish people? There was once an Englishman, Attorney-General of Ireland, who said that the Irish people were the fondest of submitting to impartial justice of any people upon earth; that they looked not to any advantage to themselves in going to law, so much as to the strict justice of the case. But he would proceed to more recent times; he would give the House some specimens of the modern character of the Irish people, from the evidence published with the Reports laid before Parliament on this subject. He need not appeal to the right hon. baronet, who had himself admitted the patient endurance of the Irish people. The Devon Commission also spoke of the same fact, and said that the patience and the endurance of the people deserved the attention of Parliament. But the mere admission of that patience and endurance would not do; they should have deeds and not words. They had a strong case, and if they desired to serve the people they should recollect that it would require a powerful hand, and a manly tone and temper, he would say a tone and temper dignifying to human nature, to stand over such an amount of human misery, and, as it were by a touch of the wand, to turn that want into comfort and happiness.

But to enable them to ascertain how they should proceed, he would read some extracts for them in order that they might understand the people whom they had to deal with. They were told that the urgency of the case alone justified the sweeping inroad upon the constitution. The Irish people were dealt with as a nation of assassins whom the ordinary

laws of civilized nations could not restrain. Was that their true character? Let the evidence on the records of Parliament testify. Major Warburton, upon his examination before the Select Committee of the Commons, 1824 (Report, page 154), is asked—

“Are any circumstances in your knowledge concerning the anxiety of the population to be employed? I have known at that period (the time of distress) that any person, in fact, that could afford to give the people one meal a day could get their labour for it.

“One meal of what? One meal of food of any kind. I believe there were instances of it.”

W. W. Beecher, Esq. (same Report, 1824, page 195):—

“I think it (submissiveness towards persons in a higher station) is carried beyond proper respect, and that it is more than is justified. I think they have been unused to fair dealing from the upper orders; and that, if they get it, they are astonished and gratified beyond measure.

“Is there not, at the same time, a strong attachment on the part of the tenantry towards their landlords in cases where they conceive they have been well used? Very strong.”

R. Griffith, Esq., Civil Engineer (same Report, page 231):—

“Do you conceive that if an English gentleman were to engage in the investment of capital in any commercial or manufacturing speculation in the centre of that very district, or the most disturbed part of it, that he would be in any hazard, personal or otherwise? I think neither himself nor the property would be in any hazard, provided he treated the people justly, and paid them fairly.”

John Dunne, Esq., Queen's County (same Report, page 284):—

“Generally speaking, is their disposition orderly and quiet? Generally speaking, it is so; and to the want of employment I attribute, in a great measure, much of our unhappy state.

“Is there a great anxiety on the part of the people to be employed? The greatest possible; the anxiety of the creatures to be employed for any kind of remuneration is wonderfully great.

“Are they industrious? Very industrious, indeed, if they can only get employment.”

Rev. John Collins, P.P., Skibbereen, county Cork (same Report, 1824, page 337):—

“The people feel they exist more by sufferance than by law; but whenever they are treated kindly they are grateful, because they think the kindness extraordinary, and the result of natural benevolence rather than of the law.”

James Lawler, Esq., J. P., county Kerry (same Report, page 439):—

“There is no person more amenable to the law than the Irish peasantry, if they are left alone.

“When they find the intention is to deal justly and reasonably with them? They are the easiest in the world to manage, although they are very wretched.

“Are they industrious—do they work hard? They are the most industrious people in the world.

“Are they kind and charitable towards each other? Their charity is unbounded towards each other; they always give something, more or less, according to their means.”

Archbishop of Cashel (Lords' Committee, 1825; Report, page 278):—

“Does not your grace think, from the experience you have had of the common people of Ireland, that they are very grateful for any benefit conferred upon them, and disposed to submit to the authority of their superiors, when treated with justice? Certainly, their gratitude is great; they are accustomed to act from immediate feeling and impulse, and very much disposed to receive every favour with a respectful gratitude almost bordering on excess.”

Colonel W. J. Curry, Agent to Duke of Devonshire (Commons' Committee, 1825, Report, page 300):—

“Do you find the lower orders of the Irish, with whom you deal, in general, a grateful class of persons? They appear extremely grateful at the moment, and I have no reason to suppose they feel ungrateful at any time. I think they are, in general, a very grateful people.

"In general, do you find them easy to be governed? Certainly, very easy to be governed."

Earl Kingston (Lords' Report, 1825, page 431):—

"Is there a desire to seek employment where it can be found? A vast desire; they will work for anything, whatever they can get. I have had some offered to me for threepence a day, stout, able men, and glad to get it."

J. S. Rochfort, Esq., county Carlow, (same Report, page 543):—

"No man in Ireland, be he ever so poor, refuses anything to the travelling beggar.

"Have you observed among the lower classes of Ireland a great feeling of charity and kindness? I believe if they had but one dinner they would share it with a travelling beggar.

"You conceive that benevolence is a strong ingredient in the Irish peasant? A very strong ingredient."

That was the evidence of a gentleman of very strong political feelings, which, if anything would have influenced him in giving his evidence but truth and justice, would have inclined him to speak against, and not in favour, of the popular side. The evidence went on to say:—

"Do you attribute it (*viz.*, any misconduct or lawlessness) to any defect of national character, or to political circumstances acting strongly on his feelings? Certainly not to his natural character, but to the political circumstances in which he is placed."

James Cropper, Esq., of Liverpool, merchant (same Report, page 688):—

What was the object of your visit to Ireland? To see the state of the country, with a view to ascertain what was the best means of relieving the distress."

Page 691:—

"Did you observe in Ireland whether there was any anxiety on the subject of education on the part of the people? Yes; in all my inquiries

I received the same answer, that the anxiety for education was very great.

“Which do you consider the English or the Irish peasantry to be more desirous of education? I should think the Irish peasantry.”

John Wiggins, Esq. (an English gentleman), land agent (Select Committee, Commons, 1830):—

“3993. Do you think there is, on the part of the Irish peasantry, a spirit of industry and an anxiety to improve that can be relied upon as a means of eventually bettering their condition? I certainly do. I think they are energetic and industrious whenever they see any prospect of their industry tending to their own comfort.

“3994. The efforts I have witnessed are really extraordinary; people bringing manure from the sea on their backs, up extraordinary cliffs, such as an Englishman would not fancy to be accessible, and I give them credit for infinite perseverance in these ways. I have seen pieces of land cultivated that it would be thought scarcely possible to get at here (in England).

“4060. Do you recollect the failure of the crop in 1821? I do.

“4061. Was there not a very great pressure upon different parts of Kerry at that time from that failure? Very considerable. I think out of a population of 230,000 in Kerry, 170,000 were reported to have been destitute of the means of subsistence for the moment; and it ought to be remarked, to the credit of the people, that not a single depredation on property took place.”

In his second Report upon Poor Laws, Mr. Nicholls states (paragraph 31) that in Donegal—

“There was no employment for the young people, nor relief for the aged, nor means nor opportunity for removing their surplus numbers to some more eligible spot; they could only, therefore, live on hoping, as they said, that times may mend, and their landlords would sooner or later do something for them. Yet, with all this suffering, no disturbance or act of violence has occurred in Donegal. During the severe privations of last summer, when numbers were actually in want of sustenance, there was no dishonesty, no plundering. The people starved, but they would not steal; and although their little stock of cattle and movables has been notoriously lessening these last four years, and especially in the last year, which seems to have swallowed up nearly all their visible means, they have yet paid their rents. The occupier's share of the produce has been insufficient for his support, yet the landlord's share has generally been paid in full.”

He would cite again the Devon Commissioners (Devon Report, page 12):—

“Our personal experience and observations during our inquiry have afforded us a melancholy confirmation of these statements. And we cannot forbear expressing our strong sense of the patient endurance which the labouring classes have generally exhibited under sufferings greater, we believe, than the people of any other country in Europe have to sustain.”

And at page 36, already quoted:—

“Up to this period any improvement that may have taken place is attributable almost entirely to the habits of temperance in which they have so generally persevered, and not, we grieve to say, to any increased demand for their labour.”

Such were the people that the House had to deal with—such were the people they had to legislate for. If they treated them with justice, the House might be sure of their gratitude and hearty co-operation; but he would say, let them not, when they asked for bread, be given a stone or a serpent. He regretted exceedingly that he felt it to be his duty to delay the House so long; but he felt it necessary, in the next place, to refer to evidence in support of the causes of the disturbances existing in Ireland. Francis Blackburne, Esq., K.C., at present Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, appointed to administer the Insurrection Act (Lords' Committee, 1824, Report, p. 4), said:—

“On the property of Lord Stradbroke, in the county of Limerick, there were forty or fifty families; the whole of that numerous body, consisting of persons of all ages and both sexes, was dispossessed, and their houses prostrated; they were, generally speaking, destitute of the means of support, and, unless relieved by people from charitable motives, I do not know what was to become of them. But that circumstance created a good deal of irritation in the country, and we were apprehensive of its effects in endangering the public peace. This is not a singular case; the same thing, to a greater or less degree, is generally prevalent in the whole of the country.”

Page 7:—

“Will you state what, in your opinion, is the ultimate source of discontent in Ireland? The extreme misery and wretchedness of the population; the great mass of the population is in a state of poverty, destitute of employment, and, generally speaking, destitute of what, in this country, would be consi-

dered the comforts and necessaries of life. It is a subject on which an Englishman can scarcely be said to have the materials even for belief."

The state of Ireland was so bad that the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench declares it is a subject on which an Englishman can scarcely be said to have the materials of belief. In all this the House would observe that he was not at all alluding to the recent calamity that had befallen the country in the potato disease. All this evidence had been given long before that misfortune had been thought of or known. But he would proceed. Major Thomas Powell, Inspector of Constabulary, Leinster district, said (p. 165) :—

"In the Queen's County, where the collieries are in full work, there is no instance of any outrage committed in that part of the country. Generally, are there more disturbances where there is most poverty and misery? Certainly; for instance, in the barony of Galmoy there is not a resident in the whole barony, and that is one of the most disturbed."

Major-General Richard Bourke, J. P., county Limerick (Commons' Committee, 1825, p. 313) :—

"In the event of re-entry (on termination of leases) are you aware what becomes of the surplus population? I hardly know; there are instances where they have been sent off the land, and have huddled themselves upon bogs and other uncultivated places; and some of them go wandering about the country.

"Have you any doubt that the system of diminishing the number of tenants is generally acted upon, on the termination of all the leases in that part of Ireland? I should say it is universally acted upon.

"Does not that produce a great deal of misery? Yes; a great deal of misery. It has led to murders, burning of houses, and several other outrages."

Matthew Barrington, Esq., Crown Solicitor (same Report, p. 574) :—

"What do you consider to have been the immediate cause of the outrages which have taken place in Munster? I think the attachment to land and change of possession has been one cause, the collection of tithes by proctors, and an unemployed population."

Robert Smith, Esq., Clerk of the Peace, County Monaghan (Commons' Committee, 1830, Q. 2,930):—

“What becomes of those tenants (evicted on consolidation of farms)? I cannot inform the Committee what becomes of them; but in one of the cases to which I now allude, I was informed that upwards of twenty families were turned out, and in the other case more than thirty. The consequence was, that the persons so dispossessed did not submit quietly, and in revenge cut the tails off the cattle of the proprietors of the estates, and committed various outrages. In the other case, the people who were turned out mustered a strong armed force, and at night attacked the persons who had been put into possession, whereby some lives were lost. I should here observe, that previous to these occurrences, the county in which this has happened had been peaceable.

“2931. I think this mischief arises from sending the people upon the world without means of procuring shelter or opportunity of earning money.”

Now that was the case in the county of Monaghan, which was in the north of Ireland, and where the House would perceive the same causes led to exactly the same description of outrages as in the south. John Wiggins, Esq., land agent (same Report) in answer to Q. 4027:—

“I found in general that three-fourths of the produce are paid often in rent in Ireland; but certainly, even upon a tillage farm, half the produce is frequently paid in rent—about double the proportion that is paid in England.

“4030. I conceive the relation between landlord and tenant has given rise to that political commotion which we call ‘Whiteboyism.’”

Matthew Barrington, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Munster Circuit (Commons' Committee, 1842):—

“They (the Whiteboy associations, &c.) have always had objects connected more or less with land.

“5. Be good enough to explain what appears to you to be the cause of those several outrages? Since I have been Crown Solicitor, I have endeavoured to get at the root of the system by tracing each outrage to its immediate cause. . . . I have traced the origin of almost every case I prosecuted, and find that they generally arise from the attachment, to the dispossession of, and the change in the possession of land. . . . I have never known a case of direct hostility to the Government, as a government, although hos-

tility to the law leads to hostility to the Government; but as to direct opposition to the Government, I never knew an instance of that being the object.

"14. I knew one instance (of ejection without provision) which led to a desperate murder on Lord Stradbroke's estate at Bilboa. The farm was out of lease, and during the lease a great number of people had been allowed to reside on it. Mr. Blood, the gentleman who was murdered in Clare last year, took possession of the farm, as agent to Lord Stradbroke, dispossessed the tenants, levelled their houses, and they were all thrown out on the road. The succeeding tenant was immediately afterwards murdered."

That was the evidence of a gentleman who had been for more than thirty years Crown Solicitor to the Munster circuit.

This was the evidence of the Rev. Nicholas O'Connor, P. P., Maryborough (Commons' Committee, 1832):—

"3239. Are the Committee to understand that the Whitefeet are confined to those ejected from their grounds? It is not confined to them, but they have been the persons that first made it general, and others had an apprehension of a similar fate, and they have joined it from thinking it would be a protection to them to keep them in their land.

"3329. I am very sure there is nothing that they would not forgive sooner than the turning them out of their farms. Every string of their hearts is twined round every twig upon them. It is impossible to induce the people to forgive those turning them out of the place where their fathers and grand-fathers lived.

"3331. They abandon their clergy, and we can have no influence over them.

"3332. It gathers together all the desperate people? Yes, they care not if they are taken and hanged for their desperate acts, committed in a state of revenge. Death would be a relief to them—they care not for life."

Matthew Singleton, Esq., chief magistrate of police (same Report, 1832):—

"4101. There is scarcely an outrage committed relative to lands, but what the people assign a cause for, if I may use that expression. In some instances the unfortunate people do show one.

"4102. What are the Committee to understand by showing a cause? Oppression, high rents, low wages, and contracts broken."

Rev. J. Delany, P. P., Ballinakill, Queen's County (same Committee, 1832):—

"4373. Asked as to causes of disturbances. There have been a great

many causes. I will state one that occurred in my own parish. There were three families comprising twenty-three individuals. The heads of those families were accused of having cut scollops or switches, for the purpose of thatching their cabins, or, perhaps, for sale; there were some ash and oak. The parties so offending were summoned, and a fine of £5 recorded against them. The landlord gave them the option of going out instanter (it was in the depth of winter, in November), forgiving them the arrears due and the fine; or to pay the fine, and be served with notice to quit in six months. They chose the first alternative, and went out; their families were scattered over the parish. The next summer, 1830, was one of famine with us. We were obliged to introduce a sort of poor-rate to keep the people from starving and dying in the ditches. Two of these families were thrown upon the parish, and I had to support them myself. One of the poor men lost his cow some time after being turned out. A series of calamities befel him. He took ill, and after lingering a long time in a state of the utmost destitution and misery, died of a broken heart. The sons of this man, together with a son of the second family above mentioned, became leaders in this system of Ribbonism; and, I have reason to believe, were some of the most daring and ferocious among them. One of them, to this day, has held out against all my admonitions, and has not yet surrendered himself.

“Did any other cases of considerable hardship occur in your neighbourhood? There was a vast number of persons in the course of the last seven years ejected from the estate of the late Mr. Crosby; some of them came into my parish, and I found them exceedingly troublesome, and disposed to engage in those illegal associations.”

Rev. Michael Keogh, P.P., Abbeyleix, Queen's County (same Committee, 1832):—

“4336. To what do you attribute these outrages? The poverty of the people, and a great many having been ejected from their lands.

“4337. State the particulars of the ejectments. [Mentions 174 families on one property, 34 on another, and several others, principally at the expiration of their leases.]

“4654. The disturbance began subsequent to the ejectment of the people.

“4670. How do those people who are ejected maintain themselves afterwards? Very poorly indeed; they throw themselves into the towns, and live therein, strolling about and trying to get work.

“4676. There are some of the families ejected in the most wretched state—paupers, going from door to door.”

James Naper, Esq., Loughcrew, County Meath (Commons' Committee, 1832):—

"5606. Do you think that the lower orders have any reason to be discontented? I think very just reasons.

"5607. State what these reasons are. There are many reasons why Ireland should be in a discontented state; but one of the principal reasons is, the position of the landlords and the lower orders of the peasantry."

John Robinson Price, Esq., J.P., Queen's County (Commons' Committee, 1832):—

"6676. On the very borders of the barony of Ossory, on a noble lord's estate, an ejectment was brought against the middleman, an *habere* issued, possession taken, and the land was re-let to a Mr. Marum, not to the tenants in possession, which is the usual way, for the six months' equity of redemption. Mr. Marum deluded the tenants with the hope that he took the land for their benefit; but when the six months expired, he turned out those tenants, and, I am told, he sold the household effects for the six months' rent. The consequence was, his cattle were houghed, and driven from the county Kilkenny to the Queen's County for that purpose. For three years this system was kept up, and Mr. Marum was shot in the open day, afterwards, in the midst of a dense population.

"6677. Was this transaction accompanied by much general disturbance? It ignited the whole barony of Ossory; so much so that the barony was put under the Peace Preservation Act, with a resident stipendiary magistrate."

"6736. Is it your opinion that the clearing of estates and the consolidation of farms has been pushed to too great an extent? I think, under the circumstance, it has. There is no employment for the poor, and a conviction rests on their minds that a piece of land is necessary to existence. I certainly think that the disposition of the landlord, and the interest of the landlord, were sufficiently active and alive to carry on the work of depopulation gradually; and I do think he was aided, assisted, and enabled to carry on the system with greater velocity by certain Acts of the Legislature, such as the Civil Bill Ejectment Act, which gave a very summary process to the landlord; the distraining of standing corn; the Joint Tenancy Act; the Sub-Letting Act, which, though it did not turn anyone out, it kept them from getting in when out; and last, not least, the disfranchisement of the 40s. freeholders, which, I am certain, broke the last link of connection between the landlord and the pauper tenant."

John Cahill, Esq., surveyor and civil engineer (same Report):—

• "7251. Were there any other circumstances which contributed to that state of disturbance which has taken place? There were.

7252. What are they? There were a good many people evicted and turned out of their farms. About four years ago, there was one gentleman who evicted eighty-nine persons; another ninety-six; another ninety-five.

"7255. Were these cases where the land had fallen out of lease? They were.

"7257. Gentlemen have agreed to make the farms, in my opinion, as large as possible, and those people who remained on the lands were evicted and put off, as is the case, which I stated of those gentlemen who turned out the numbers I have stated.

"7258. Do you conceive that it has been these individuals who have been so turned out, from want of having proper means of supporting themselves, who have become wanderers and vagrants, and the source of the Whitefeet association that prevailed in that part of the country? I do very much consider so. There were 1,126 of these poor people who were evicted, with the idle colliers, going about, left idle on a part of two parishes, and all that within six miles of each other.

"7260. Do you know them by name? Yes, I have their names.

"7261. Are you able to trace what has become of them in the course of the last four years? Yes.

"7262. State generally what has become of them. Do they continue wandering about? I have known on one estate, which is near me, and which I regulated for a gentleman, there has been a great many of the old people turned off that became beggars, and a good many of them died of want."

W. Kemmis, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Leinster Circuit (Lords' Report, 1839):—

"6743. In answer to question, gives account of eleven murders in Tipperary, from 1816 to 1838, all arising from evictions.

"6744. What, in your opinion, has been the cause of the outrages in Tipperary, generally? Generally on account of land; the letting and the dispossession of land.

"6745. What proportion of outrages may be attributed to that cause? The greatest number decidedly.

"6746. Two-thirds? Three-fourths and more.

"7148. Do the Committee understand you rightly, that Tipperary is more disturbed than other counties? Yes, than other counties on my circuit.

"7149. And that the great majority of violent crimes are caused by turning tenants out? Yes."

Matthew Harrington, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Munster Circuit (same Report):—

"From your examination of witnesses, and from other circumstances that must have come to your knowledge occasionally, can you state to the Committee what, in your opinion, has been the cause of those outrages? I think the causes have been an anxiety to possess land; the dispossession of land, and the disputes about land.

"7347. That is, during the whole of that period? With respect to all the disturbances during the time I have been Crown Solicitor, I could almost trace every outrage to some dispute about land.

"7437. Have any outrages that you have inquired into appeared to arise from hostility to the Government? No; I never knew, in twenty-five years, an instance of any outrages directed against the Government, or that had any political object.

"7465. When the causes of outrages have been removed, have you observed that the disturbances have immediately subsided? I have, certainly."

Edward Tiernay, Esq., Crown Solicitor, North-west Circuit
(same Report):—

"7727. Will you have the goodness to state to the Committee your opinion of the cause of those agrarian outrages? I believe it is a great deal occasioned by the letting and dispossession of land, and dispossession of former tenants or occupiers."

E. C. Hickman, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Connaught Circuit
(same Report):—

"8446. Have you heard of any case of tenants being turned out because they gave a vote at elections contrary to the will of their landlord? Yes, I have heard of that.

"8477. What was the county in which you heard of it? My own county of Clare."

Piers Geale, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Home Circuit (same Report):—

"8605. Will you have the goodness to state to the Committee what, in your opinion, has been the more general and common class of outrage of every description on your circuit? I think it has always some connection with the taking of land."

J. Tabiteau, R. M., county Tipperary (same Report):—

"9628. The general groundwork of the outrages in that district you consider to be disputes relating to land? Yes; property—land, generally speaking.

"9720. Is ejection from land in the county Tipperary synonymous nearly with reduction to destitution and misery on the part of the cottier tenant? Indeed it is; and ejecting throws them altogether out of their grade of life, out of the rank of farmers into that of labourers.

"9746. What, in your opinion, has been, generally speaking, the cause of the great number of murders in the county of Tipperary? I believe the cause of actual murder is generally, ground—something about land."

J. Howley, Esq., Assistant-Barrister, county Tipperary (same Report):—

"9992. Are you able to form an opinion whether the ejections have been more numerous in the county of Tipperary, in proportion to the population, than in other counties? From conferring with different assistant-barristers, it would appear there are a greater number of ejections in the county of Tipperary than in other counties."

John Barnes, Esq., Stipendiary Magistrate, county Longford (same Report):—

"11,755. As far as you have been able to form an opinion, will you have the goodness to state what you conceive to have been the causes of these murders? From everything which has come to my knowledge, from the number of witnesses I have examined, I am inclined to think—nay, I am certain—these murders have occurred in consequence of persons having been turned out of their lands, and those lands having been granted to persons of an opposite religion and character.

"11,803. Is there any hostility exhibited towards the Government of the country? Not the slightest that I am aware of."

Tomkins Brew, Esq., S. M., Tuam (same Report):—

"12,765. What was the cause of the firing at Mr. Synge, and the murder of his servant? He had turned several of his tenants off his land that had refused to send their children to his school, and a conspiracy was formed on that account to murder him. He was fired at, and his servant shot."

In order that they might rightly estimate the working of the ejection system, he would state a few results. In the

county of Tipperary, where there were most ejectments, there were also most murders; and he would beg to call the particular attention of the House to this fact. It appeared by Appendix, Part IV., pages 293 to 302, Land Commission Report, that in the year 1843 there were issued from the Civil Bill Courts 5,244 ejectments, comprising 14,816 defendants; and from the superior Courts (allowing for the Queen's Bench the same average as 1841, the number for the latter years in that Court not being given), 1,784 ejectments, comprising 16,503 defendants; making a total of 7,028 ejectments, 31,319 defendants; or, within the period of five years—from 1839 to 1843—comprised in the return, upwards of 150,000 tenants had been subjected to ejectment process. Did he deny that disturbances existed in the country? He never did deny the existence of these disturbances. He never denied that dreadful murders were committed. He never had any notion of concealing these horrible facts. He was now placing the facts before the Government, and at the same time showing the causes that had led to these crimes, in order that they might be able to apply a remedy to these causes. He had shown by evidence what was the disposition of the people. He had shown that the causes of the outrages were attendant on ejectment from land; and he would next come to a few others of the grievances of which he complained. He complained of the administration of justice in Ireland; of their being no confidence existing on the part of the people in those intrusted with the administration of the law. He did not like to be bringing the names of individuals so often before the House; but he would appeal to the Government itself whether they had not uniformly appointed to the administration of the law every man who had been most violent in his political feelings, and who had taken the strongest part against the religion of the people of Ireland. He did not mean to disparage the judicial acts of these individuals. He knew of no serious disparagement of their conduct on the Bench; but it was not on him, but on the public, that these things would make an impression.

Had not the Government made Mr. Serjeant Lefroy a Judge? Had they not placed Mr. Serjeant Jackson also on the Bench? And had they not made Mr. Litton a Master in Chancery? Were these men favourable to the people or to the religion of the people of Ireland? Had they not also appointed Chief Justice Pennefather, who was no friend to the Irish people, and the present Lord Chief Justice, who, while Attorney-General, had deserted one Administration and gone over to another? He too was no friend to the Irish people.

He would not go further. He was sorry that he had repeated even so many names, and he would not continue the controversy further respecting them. He spoke not of their individual character, but of the impression which the appointment of such men was likely to produce in the public mind. And would the House regard as nothing this fact? Lord Chancellor Sugden was reported to have said the other day, that the people of Ireland must have the fullest reliance on the administration of justice. But who was to give them that confidence? Who, if not the magistracy of the country? And could they forget that seventy-four magistrates had been struck off the list for no other reason but that they had advocated the Repeal of the Union? The people knew that their doing so was no crime; that not one of them had been prosecuted for advocating Repeal; that, in point of fact, there could be no prosecution for such a charge. And, he would ask the Government, would they now enact this Coercion Bill, while the exclusion of these seventy-four gentlemen from the commission of the peace was continued? If they had committed a crime, if they had disgraced the bench, if they had dishonoured the administration of justice—well and good. In such case let them, by all means, be removed. But there was not the slightest allegation against them of anything of the kind. Then the State trials. He would not say a single word upon the proceedings of the Solicitor-General; but how were the parties tried who stood arraigned on that occasion? Was there the least doubt of there having been a one-sided charge? Was there the least doubt

that those privileges which should have been at once conceded to the accused were pertinaciously as well as fatally refused? He would only say, that these circumstances had made a bad impression upon the people, and that House was bound to make them a recompense. And what had he (Mr. O'Connell) to suggest by way of recompense? He had as yet suggested nothing; but he would not leave the Government and the House without the means of making it. Although there had been some murders committed in Ireland, that were not directly traceable to evictions from land, yet in sum and substance, the whole form and state of society showed it was from evictions of land, from the insecurity of land-holdings, from the difficulties arising through the want of land, that we must seek for the great and primary cause of all these crimes. There were some exceptions, he admitted, but he was sorry to say that those exceptions were becoming more numerous. The truth was so, and he did not shrink from stating the truth. The great fault, however, was the land question. The fact was, that that House had done too much for the landlord, and too little for the occupier. What had been the first measure for the benefit of the landlords? The first Statute passed after the Union in favour of the landlords was the Act 56 George III., c. 88, which gave them additional powers to work out ejectments. Up to that time they had not power to distrain. The Statutes of England were not enacted in Ireland towards landlords; but the Act 56 George III., c. 88, gave them powers which were no part of the bargain at the time of the Union. Many parties had taken leases, and made contracts without those new powers being in the hands of the landlords. The Statute gave them the power of distraining growing crops, keeping them till ripe, saving and selling them when ripe, charging upon the tenant the accumulation of expense.

All these powers were first introduced by this Statute and conferred upon the Irish landlord. He did not believe there had ever been a more fertile source of murder and outrage than these powers. Thus, the source of crime was directly traceable

to the legislation of that House; and it was the imperative duty of that House, and every member in it, immediately, or as speedily as possible, to repeal that Act. Then there came the Act, 58 George III., cap. 39, for civil bill ejectment. First the power was given to distrain upon the growing crop, enabling the landlord to ruin the tenant; and then there came the further power to the landlord of turning out the tenant from his holding. The Act 1 George IV., cap. 41, extended the power of civil bill ejectment; and the Act 1 George IV., cap. 87, enabled the landlords to get security for costs from defendants in ejectments. Then the Act 1 and 2 George IV., c. 31, gave the landlords the right of immediate execution in ejectment; and the Act 6 and 7 William IV., gave further facilities for civil bill ejectments. All these were additional powers to the landlord; and it was to these Statutes that the late Lord Chief Justice Pennefather referred, when he said their object was to forward the interests of the landlord. The repeal of these laws was one of the remedies which he (Mr. O'Connell) called for, but not the only one. He wanted the House to determine at once to do justice to Ireland, politically, as well as in relation to the law of landlord and tenant. He would now enumerate the remedies which would create political satisfaction, and which the people believed would be their best protection. First, they had not an adequate number of members to represent them in that House; next, an extension of the franchise; third, corporate reform; and last, a satisfactory arrangement of the temporalities of the Church. These four general remedies he demanded from that House as a mode of coercing the people of Ireland by their affections and their interests into a desire to continue the Union with England. Then, as to the remedies in relation to landlord and tenant. He asked the House to repeal the Statutes on this subject since the Union. He asked the House to give a limitation to the landlord's power where there was no lease. Do not allow the landlord to distrain unless where there was a twenty-one years' lease, nor to eject unless where there was a thirty-one years' lease. He respectfully called on that House

in the next place to give full compensation to tenants for their improvements. Labour was the property of the tenant; and if the tenant by his labour and skill improved the land, and made it more valuable, let him have the benefit of those improvements before the landlord turned him out of possession. See what a stimulant was here offered to activity and exertion! A man, who now laboured helplessly, would unquestionably labour with greater energy when he understood he was labouring for himself. This principle was embodied in Lord Devon's Report, though it was not worked out. The principle, too, had been introduced by Lord Stanley. It was, therefore, part of the administration of her Majesty's Government. Let it not be a mockery. Do not encumber it with clauses and provisions which the tenants were neither able to comply with nor to understand; but act upon it openly and manfully, giving the most practical security to the landlord for his rent, and to the tenant the value for his solid and substantial improvements, and the House would then see a stop put to outrage. The next remedy he called for was, an extension of the Ulster tenant-right. Let that right be extended all over Ireland. In Lord Devon's Report the superior tranquillity of Ulster was traced to the security afforded to the tenant by this right; for there no tenant could be put out of possession without receiving full and fair value. The evidence on this subject was of some length, but he would read a portion of it to the House.

Mr. Hancock, agent to Lord Lurgan, counties Armagh, Down, and Antrim (Land Commissioners' Report, p. 483):—

"37, 38. Much of our Ulster prosperity has been the result of this extraordinary matter (namely, tenant-right) in connection with tenure; and no measure would have a greater effect in improving the condition of the south and west than the introduction of tenant-right as it exists in Ulster. I consider tenant-right the claim of the tenant and his heirs to continue in undisturbed possession so long as the rent is paid; and in the event of ejection or change of occupancy, it is the sum the new occupier must pay the old for the peaceable enjoyment of his holding. I consider tenant-right beneficent to the community, because it establishes a security in the possession of land, and leads to the improvement of the estate, without any expenditure of capital

on the part of the landlord. It likewise affords the best security for his rent, as arrears are always allowed to be deducted from the amount the occupier receives for tenant-right. It is very conducive to the peace of the country, for almost every man has a stake in the community, and is, therefore, opposed to agrarian outrage, as well as riots. The laws are more respected; there are none of those reckless, daring men, who are ready for any deed; under the consciousness that their situations cannot be worse. The liberty of the subject is more respected, and imprisonment has greater terrors, from the fact that almost every tenant can procure bail for his future appearance in court or his future good behaviour. There is never any instance of forfeited recognizance. An arrest is, therefore, a much more serious matter in this than in any other part of Ireland, for, as there is less risk (from his stake) of the offender flying, so here the degradation is more keenly felt, and parties often subscribe and bring actions against magistrates for false arrests and imprisonment, whereas, where no tenant-right exists, the first step is to arrest to prevent escape; and, secondly, the consideration of the cause. Imprisonment and contamination with bad characters are thus more frequent. The magistrates cannot have the same respect for the liberty of the subject; and when acts of oppression occur, revenge is taken, not by an appeal to the civil court for damages, but by combination and an appeal to force, waylaying, and murder. The necessity of distress for rent—a fruitful source of riots and broken heads—is also obviated by the tenant-right, as there is no danger of loss for arrears.”

Then there was the following in another part of the Report. Robert Smith, Esq., Clerk of the Peace, county of Monaghan, gave this evidence:—

“80. Do they often sell the tenant-right where there is an old lease? Very frequently.

“81. Where the tenant is ejected for non-payment of rent, by his landlord, is he allowed to sell his tenant-right? I am not aware that any such right of sale is recognised by the landlord; but it is generally known throughout the country that an agrarian law exists, such as to intimidate any of the lower classes of farmers from taking land from which a tenant has been ejected for any cause, without the person coming in making compensation to the party turned out.”

“82. That applies to the tenant going out under all circumstances? I think so.

John Lindsay, Banbridge, county Down (Land Commissioners' Report, pp. 883, 584):—

“39. Is the tenant-right or sale of good-will prevalent in the district, and to whom is the purchase money paid? It prevails in the district; the

tenants who have held the land think they have a right to dispose of the land when they are going to leave it; they think they have always a right to do so, and very reasonably, I think.

"40. Is it generally recognised by the landlord? Some recognise it, and some do not; but where they do not recognise it, they set their faces against it; they are very generally defeated, and have been obliged to do it after risking life, in some instances, in my neighbourhood.

"41. Is it done behind their backs, without their knowledge? No; they have even ejected the tenantry. I have known some of them do it in the parish I live in. One of them put a man out of his farm, and there is no person will take it. He sent down a person to cultivate the farm, and he was sent home again. The people gathered that night, and desired him to go home, and not come there again; and the man got leave to sell his tenant-right afterwards.

"42. How long ago is that? About three years ago. Something similar happened to a man, about two or three miles from my place, last winter was a year.

"43. Is the value of the tenant-right increasing or diminishing, and how is it affected by the tenure? The value of the tenant-right is decreasing in consequence of a scarcity of money, and I suppose it would be regulated also by the price of land at the time the tenant-right would be sold. If it is at a high rent they will give less; and if at a low rent, they will not get more.

"44. What should you say was the value of tenant-right of land fairly set and held at will, comparing it with a year's rent, or by the acre? About four years ago, at a place I receive the rent of, it would have sold for £20 an acre, and now, though the rent is lowered 10 per cent., it would be difficult enough to get £10."

Mr. Handcock, Lord Lurgan's agent, Down, Antrim, and Armagh:—

"38. The landlords are compelled to recognise tenant-right, as, in several instances in this neighbourhood, where they have refused to allow tenant-right, the incoming tenant's house has been burned, his cattle houghed, or his crops trodden down by night. The disallowance of tenant-right, as far as I know, is always attended with outrage. A landlord cannot even resume possession to himself without paying it. In fact, it is one of the sacred rights of the country he touches with impunity; and if systematic efforts were made amongst the proprietors of Ulster to invade tenant-right, I do not believe there is a force at the disposal of the Horse Guards sufficient to keep the peace of the province; and, when we consider that all the improvements have been effected at the expense of the tenant, it is perfectly right that this tenant-

right should exist; his money has been laid out on the faith of compensation in that shape."

This, then, was the evidence of the north of Ireland, as to the value of this tenant-right. How often had he heard all the boast of the superior tranquillity of the north? It was because they were better treated by their landlords; and, generally speaking, there was a better feeling there towards the landlords, because the tenants were allowed to sell their tenant-rights. In the county of Tipperary there was an agrarian law, which was the law of ejectment; in the province of Ulster there was a general law giving the tenant valuable rights. He called upon the House to make their choice between the two. Now was the time for their choice. The country had arrived at a state in which it was necessary for something to be done. This miserable Coercion Bill would do nothing. It would do worse than nothing. There were many excellent landlords in Ireland, and there were numerous bad ones; numerous estates were in the hands of agents. The remedy which he asked for was, that the tenant-right of Ulster, which had been enjoyed in that province for 300 years, and which was available at this present moment, should be generally adopted throughout Ireland. He further required that a heavy tax should be levied upon absentees, and the election of county boards instead of the existing system of grand juries. He wanted the House to grant a strong, bold, manly, useful remedial measure. He would not weary the House by going into further details now; but, having pointed out the remedies, he called upon the British Parliament to grant them at once. Were they desirous of putting an end to these murders? Then it must be by removing the cause of murder. You could not destroy the effect without taking away the cause. He repeated, that the tranquillity of Ulster was owing to the enjoyment of tenant-right; where that right was taken away, the people were trodden under foot, and, in the words of Lord Clare, "ground to powder." The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by saying he had trespassed

upon the House at greater length than he intended, and he would close by moving the amendment which he had read.

Subject, STATE OF IRELAND; Date, APRIL 24, 1846.

Talk was still the order of the day. Presumably honourable members thought that talking would have some mysterious effect in alleviating suffering, that is, if they thought at all. This was O'Connell's last speech, but one, yet even then, with his failing faculties, he was a power in the state, a power to be feared and courted, an instrument to be used, if he could only be cajoled into permitting it. The *Times* which could always stoop to flatter when convenient, actually denominated O'Connell "the Liberator" in the course of this session, recommended the Government to seek his assistance, and owned to the sudden knowledge that "the power of the executive had been felt in acts of harshness, seldom of beneficial or parental interference." Fear is a wonderful quickener of intellectual perception.

It was, in fact, suddenly discovered that the Irish people would be "filled with such gratitude, affection, and joy as no people had hitherto shown to their rulers," if the Government would "employ itself in improving the material and social condition of the people." Such discoveries are made occasionally, and put forward with an air of kindness and candour, which would quite deceive any person who was not aware how frequently they had been made before; as if Ireland ever wanted anything from Government except to have her social and material condition improved. Of late years, certainly, some attempts have been made in this direction, but they have been made too tardily, too grudgingly, and too sparsely, to awaken any warm feelings of gratitude—acts which are only partial justice can scarcely be accepted as munificent gifts.

Mr. O'Connell—I am sure I have never been churlish in acknowledging the evident disposition of the Government to adopt measures to meet the present emergency. I should have been ashamed of myself had I been so; but I have now to complain, I have to join in the general complaint, of the inactivity of the persons employed by Government in Ireland to superintend the distribution of food; of their unnecessary diplomacy; their wearisome reference from one to the other; of the wanton delay in some localities; the tediousness everywhere.

Why can Government point to one single spot in which effectual relief has been administered? But while I say this, I must add that I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Stafford O'Brien) speak as he did in high praise of Lord Lincoln and his commission in Ireland, and I hope that Government will strengthen their hands. But, sir, I think that Government has fallen short—that more money—a great deal more money—will be necessary. I am not asking it as a favour. I am not here in mendicant form, appealing to you for alms for Ireland. Advance money. You have security for it—tax landed proprietors—take a discretionary power of taxation from the Coercion Bill, and employ it better. Send out persons to find out the situation and circumstances of each landlord, and tax him accordingly. Does the landlord, like the hon. member for Northamptonshire, do his duty—then tax him lightly; and has he neglected it—then tax him heavily. It may be said these are unconstitutional doctrines. Sir, the people are starving—they are dying; while you are here canvassing constitutional doctrines, they are perishing of hunger. Did you not hear the evidence given in the returns laid on the table of the House? Did you not hear how this family had but two, that family had but one day's supply—how another family, again, had been eight-and-forty hours without food—and how a further eight-and-forty hours' suffering would land them in their graves. Then, I say to Government, do not delay. Act firmly—act boldly. We have heard from every side declarations of benevolence to Ireland. Act, then. The House would not shrink from giving you an indemnity. But let there be no longer unnecessary delay. If you cannot meet my challenge to point out a single place where you have given effectual relief—if it be true that not a shilling has been advanced—then for Heaven's sake begin. Begin to-morrow morning; strengthen the hands of your officials in Dublin Castle. Let not a day, not an hour, be lost. I may be told that I am throwing out opinions contrary to those I have always entertained on the subject of outdoor

relief. I do not shrink from my old view of the subject. I shall think outdoor relief but another name for the confiscation of property; but in the present state of Ireland, I prefer confiscation to letting the people die of starvation. Make the experiment for one year—administer for this year outdoor relief; tax the landholder for this—you can relax next year—but this is the time for making the experiment. Don't bring your Coercion Bill against the poorer classes—coerce the landlords. Compel them to prevent the people dying of hunger; it is necessary to compel them. I do not disparage the landlords. There are abundance of good landlords; and abundance of bad landlords; of clearing landlords; of destroying (not angels, but) landlords in Ireland. I do not commit myself to the doctrine of outdoor relief. It will be seen that I have very strong objections to it, but none of them apply on this occasion—in this emergency. Sir, I was sorry to hear my hon. friend, the member for Limerick, so adverse to the total repeal of the Corn Laws. My conviction is that nothing can do good to Ireland but that repeal. The existence of the Corn Laws has done us no good. Can any man contradict that? They have been concomitant with increasing misery—concomitant with increasing destitution; and therefore if any man praise the Corn Laws to me, he must draw on his imagination, for as to Ireland the facts of the case are against him. Corn Law repeal would increase manufacturing enterprise; it would raise wages; agriculture cannot raise them, the Corn Law has not raised them. They say the Corn Bill was passed to keep up wages. Is there any country where wages are so low? Notoriously none. The only chance of raising them is in the repeal of the Corn Laws, and I wish to Heaven you would set about it at once.

Subject, DESTITUTE PERSONS (IRELAND) BILL;

Date, FEBRUARY 8, 1847.

This was O'Connell's last speech. It was but imperfectly heard in the House as the opening sentences show. His last words are a cry for help for Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell was understood to say, that, in the first of the Irish Bills which had been submitted to the House—namely, the Indemnity Bill—he heartily and entirely agreed. Much had been said against the Labour-rate Act, but, he thought, unjustly. That Act had been of immense advantage in many baronies in Ireland, especially in the west, and many of the works effected under it had been exceedingly useful. It had not been of so much use in other parts of Ireland, he believed, where such public works were less wanted; but where they were necessary it had been very useful. The next Bill was the one for affording temporary assistance to the labouring poor. He could not say he entirely approved of that measure, but he should vote for it nevertheless, as he was ready to support any Bill which would afford one additional means of relief in the present calamity. The next Bill was one for the relief of the destitute poor in Ireland. He was afraid the House was not sufficiently aware of the extent of the misery; he did not think the members were sufficiently impressed with the horrors of the situation of the people of Ireland; he did not think they understood the miseries—the accumulation of miseries—under which the people were at present suffering. It had been estimated that 5,000 adults and 10,000 children had already perished from famine, and that 25 per cent. of the whole population would perish unless the House should afford effective relief. They would perish of famine and disease unless the House did something speedy and efficacious—not doled out in small sums, not in private and individual subscriptions, but by some great act of national generosity, calculated upon a broad and liberal scale. If this course were not pursued, Parliament was responsible for the loss of 25

per cent. of the population of Ireland. He assured the House most solemnly that he was not exaggerating; he could establish all he said by many and many painful proofs, and the necessary result must be typhus fever, which, in fact, had broken out, and was desolating whole districts. It left alive only one in ten of those it attacked. This fearful disorder ere long would spread to the upper classes; the inhabitants of England would not escape its visitations, for it would be brought over by the miserable wretches who escaped from the other side of the channel. The calamity would be scattered over the whole empire, and no man would be safe from it. He repeated that two millions of human beings would be destroyed, if relief were not speedily and effectually afforded. It had been asked why the rich Irish did not relieve the poor? They had relieved them. It would be seen by the reports already before the House, that a large body of the Irish people were always on the verge of starvation. Another report, more recently made, had confirmed this statement, and established that in ordinary years great numbers were in destitution. But the destitution of the potato crop had occasioned a positive annihilation of food, and the people were starving in shoals, in hundreds—aye, in thousands and millions. Parliament was bound, then, to act not only liberally but generously, to find out the means of putting a stop to this terrible disaster. It was asserted that the Irish landlords did not do their duty. Several of them had done their duty—others had not; and, considering the extraordinary exigency of the case, his plan was to arm Government with more real power to apply to the purpose all the sums they deemed necessary. They ought instantly to carry out the mode of relief they thought necessary, responsible indeed to the House, but not fettered by the strict letter of the law. He wanted to see the House generously confiding in ministers, let them be chosen from which side of the House they might. The facts, as he well knew, were more terrific than they had been yet stated—the necessity was more urgent. He had not said one word to produce irritation; he had not uttered one word of reproach; and, without doing so, he

called upon Parliament to appoint commissioners to make inquiries in all parts of Ireland into the circumstances of those who were able to give—to specify and to name them, and to assess them for so much as they ought to contribute. A decisive measure of that sort should have his hearty support. Let every man's means be ascertained, and let the tribunal he would erect have the power of inflicting taxation. To inflict taxation without representation had not been unusual in Ireland, and the Grand Jury system was one of taxation without representation. The patience of the people of Ireland could not be too much admired. It had been exhibited on all occasions, and the forbearance of the lower orders, considering their almost intolerable privations, was wonderful. It was, however, possible that they might be driven from misery to madness; and as to the levying of rates, it was at present impossible. As to the reimbursing of England for her advances, he contended that she would be no loser at the present crisis any more than she had been on former occasions. He maintained that England had been a gainer by her loans to Ireland. He again assured the House that the lamentably destitute condition of the people, afflicted with poverty and visited by disease, was insupportable; and he called upon Parliament to interpose generously, munificently—he would say enormously—for the rescue of his country. Recollect how incumbered was the property of Ireland, how many of her estates were in chancery, how many were in the hands of trustees. She was in their hands—in their power. If they did not save her she could not save herself. He solemnly called on them to recollect that he predicted with the sincerest conviction that one-fourth of her population would perish unless Parliament came to their relief.

PUBLIC LETTERS.



PUBLIC LETTERS.

NOTE TO THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY'S LETTER.

IT may seem strange to those who are ignorant how this controversy arose, that I should reply to the second letter of Lord Shrewsbury without taking any notice of the first. I wish such persons to know the fact. The first letter was on a subject totally different from the second. It related to miraculous marks appearing on each of two pious women in the Tyrol, resembling the wounds our ever adorable Redeemer received in his awful passion. Lord Shrewsbury has in that letter given his evidence in favour of the authenticity of these miracles, and adduced also the testimony, to the same effect, of other respectable persons. It is a mere question of fact, depending at present upon human testimony; a matter of fact which every Catholic is of course at liberty to believe or disbelieve according to his own judgment.

For my own part, I confess I think the evidence quite sufficient to satisfy my mind of the reality of these miracles. It seems to me to require something like habitual incredulity to enable a man to resist the evidence of the persons who attest the fact. But still I must say, I think Lord Shrewsbury much to blame. He ought not to have brought forward these miracles

before the English public, and left them where they are, the objects of much ribaldry and insult. He is, I must say, having gone so far, bound to go farther; and to have a farther and perfectly impartial investigation on the spot.

What I should suggest is this: that he should endeavour to procure two intelligent gentlemen from the "Tractarians" of Oxford, and two others from the "Evangelicals" of Cambridge. To pay the expenses of their journey ought to be a pleasure to him. Let him lead them to the spot, and there with them investigate each case fully. I do believe that the result would be favourable to his views. But I really think he ought to have some investigation of this kind, as well for the sake of his own character as for that of Catholicity; though the latter cannot suffer by a mistake of his on such a point, even if it be a mistake.

LETTER TO THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY, &c. &c.

MY LORD,

I love the Jesuits—I admire the Jesuits—the greatest benefactors to religion and to literature that the world ever saw. There is a shrewd compactness in the way they embody common sense, greatly to be prized. One of their maxims is, "that there is no theologian so dangerous to religion as a very pious fool." The Jesuit who uses this phrase, does not intend personal offence to any individual, nor, certainly, do I! I use the expression, not as a description or designation: but, admitting to the fullest extent your lordship's piety, I give it as a caution. Do, my lord, I implore you, beware how you mix up foolishness with your sentiments of devotion!

But whatever course you shall please to take, you have addressed me so often in your pamphlet, and with such scant courtesy, that you compel me to reply. My complaints are many, but this is my first grievance. I might bear other evils, but I cannot endure that you should have loudly entered your protest, even

“upon religious grounds,” against the abolition of the Corn Laws. You have, for the first time, arrayed Catholicity against a concession to the poor and the starving; you have summoned the English Catholics; and you have more than insinuated, even by the multiplication of your titles of honour, a call on the Catholics of Ireland, to join with you in the sustainment of those laws, which have been characterised (and I think justly) as “the plunder of the poor for the benefit of the rich.”

I bitterly deplore that you should take such a part. I pay the most unfeigned respect to your motives; to your charitable disposition; to your animated religious feelings; but I am thoroughly convinced that you act most unwisely—that you stain and tarnish, and, I fear, deeply injure the sacred cause of Catholicity.

The reasons of my convictions are these. For the first time in the modern history of Catholicity, are the English Catholics called upon, as such, to take part in the political pravity of supporting taxation, and of transferring their attachment from statesmen who have ever been their friends to public men who—we are gratuitously told—are to be no longer their enemies. For the first time, you introduce politics into the very sanctuary. And what politics? politics whose frightful consequence is to enhance the price of bread to those who have but little to eat! and to sustain in office the narrow-minded haters of Catholicity—the men who have trafficked on that hatred, until they jobbed on it into power!

You would array the Catholics in this most unseemly warfare; an inglorious warfare even if successful. Not like the Talbots in their battles of old, you, my lord, with pure intentions, but alas! with perverted ingenuity, would strew your battlefield with the carcasses of starved manufacturers.

You have indeed placed yourself in a deplorable position. Because, although it must be admitted by everybody who knows anything of you, that you are reasonably free from scold or selfish motives, yet your position is that of a man who

contends against feeding the poor, in order that he may increase his own means, and augment his own rents, and for the accumulation of his own wealth. But by what modes of action? gracious heaven! by taking from the poor more money for his bread than that poor person would be otherwise obliged to pay for it! By coming to the table of the wretched widow with a small fixed income, and telling her and her children that before they taste their bread, there must be a toll paid to your lordship and your co-proprietors of the land! and that the crumbs that are greedily devoured upon her table shall be fewer in number, lest your class should not have so much money as at present to put into your landlord pocket.

This, my lord, is the unhappy position in which you are placed. I unfeignedly assure you, I deplore—I bitterly deplore—that so charitable and benevolent a man as you are should have placed yourself in so unamiable a position. But I ought to weep more bitterly at the position in which you place Catholicity; in which you, a moral and religious man, place the faith you profess—the glorious faith of your fathers. Catholicity was ever the promoter of every species of charity. It allures by the brightest reward, it commands under the most awful sanction, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the prisoner, to assuage the sufferings of the sick. Such are the “good works” which (duly performed) are, according to Catholic doctrine, meritorious in the concerns of eternity.

Yet, in what an attitude do you call upon the Catholics of England to place themselves? The poor man is sick from the faintness arising from his scanty food; and the English Catholics are to proclaim, under your lordship’s auspices, that his bread shall be more scarce to him! The operative is naked, and you call upon the English Catholics to tell him that his bread shall be so dear that all his earnings shall scarce suffice for food, and that there shall be no residue to purchase clothing. As to imprisonment, your poorhouses are prisons; and, alas! my lord, you taunt with insult those who, like me, do not relish the imprisonment of a poorhouse. As to the hungry; why, the

Gospel precepts are to be worked out in favour of the hungry, by making their food as scarce and as dear as the suffering multitude will endure.

Had you written and published your pamphlet, as a private individual of ancient family and high rank; had you published it as a landlord, or as a peer of Parliament; had you confined it to arguments (such as they are), to statistics (such as they may be), or to political economy (such as it ought to be), you might, my lord, at least I hope and believe you might, as far as I am concerned, have indulged yourself in as many insults and insinuations respecting me as you pleased, unscathed and unanswered. But your trumpet-sounds call Catholicity to battle along with you.

My complaint ought to be (and my chief complaint is), that you have sought to array Catholicity on the worst side of the worst cause that public penman ever supported; that you have thrown into the scale of the rich and the lordly, against the lowly and the poor, that influence which your ancient rank and high station, your generous and benevolent private character, entitled you to possess among the Catholics of England, in order—you have done so, in order to induce them to adopt the worst part, and to be solicitous about bad things.

This, however, my lord, is too sacred a cause to be abandoned. There is an awful duty to be performed. You shall not, my lord, you shall not bring Catholicity into the ranks of the ungenerous and the sordid. You may go yourself. You may be found (alas, the day!) among those ungenial ranks! But Catholicity still shall elevate her heavenly banner in her proper station. Even I, ungifted as I am, will wipe off the stain you have flung upon her escutcheon; and proclaim that Catholicity still is, as she ever was, at the side of the people; the mitigator of poverty and the comforter of the distressed; the opponent of aristocratic selfishness; the true guardian of the poor of the Lord.

See, great earl! what a glorious example the Catholic farmers of Ireland have set to men in higher station. It has often

been said that the Irish head is not unfrequently wrong, but that the Irish heart is always in the right. I doubt the former—I know the truth of the latter assertion. The Irish Catholic farmers did not enter into any minute details. They knew full well by the experience of every one of them, that the oft-repeated allegation that the Corn Laws increase the rate of wages, was totally false; the wages in Ireland being of the lowest; they knew that cheap bread does not make wages diminish. They, the Irish farmers, knew full well that “nothing can be politically right that is morally wrong.” And they, with cordial unanimity, supported the abolishers of the Corn Laws. My lord, I mean not to offend you, but I glory in the contrast between you and the Irish Catholic farmers.

Permit me, my lord, to cite my own situation as a public man, as one of the proofs that vindicate Catholicity from the selfishness of Corn Law advocacy. I have ever been, upon principle, and for reasons of humanity, the decided advocate of the total abolition of the tax upon bread. A fixed duty would, in my mind, be nothing more than a fixed injustice; and if, having no other choice, I am found voting for the eight-shilling duty, it is only as a substitute for the greater and the gambling iniquity of the sliding scale, and as an instalment of that justice, which cannot be complete without a total abolition of all toll or duty upon human food, whether that tax be imposed to relieve the wants of the State, or for the more glaring iniquitous purpose of augmenting the wealth of the landlords.

Notwithstanding these my opinions, I am at the present moment the representative of two of the largest agricultural communities in Ireland; a significant proof of their coincidence in my views, and approbation of my opinions.

If I have been bitterly ashamed of your lordship's attempts to rank the Catholics on the wrong side in this question, my dissatisfaction does not rest there. I blush deeply at the paucity, and I am sorry to say it, the shallow sophistry of what you appear to consider arguments in support of the Corn Laws. The grain of wheat, in the shape of reason, it is scarcely possible to

sift out of the anomalous heaps of chaff, of the same colour and almost in the same quality, stuffed now in the text and now in the notes with which you have overlaid the subject.

Your principal argument consists in asking, "Why manufacturers of various articles should enjoy their protecting duties of from 20 to 30 per cent. against foreign competition, and yet the manufacturer of corn be left without protection?"

I cannot conceal my surprise that anything so unfair, so replete with mistake of facts, should emanate from your lordship. Are you not aware, surely you must know, that our manufacturers export from England and sell to foreign nations, probably to the value of sixty millions of pounds sterling per annum of their manufactured goods? That is, they undersell the people of foreign countries in their own markets to that extent. To talk, therefore, of protection for manufacturers under such circumstances is really, my lord, to talk not wisely. The protection may be in the Statute Book; but it is as insignificant as if witchcraft were there! Your argument thus is destroyed at the first blush. There is, however, something worse behind; because it is impossible but you must know that the petitions of the manufacturers, the resolutions of great meetings in particular localities, and of delegates from many places, as well as the unanimous voice of the Anti-Corn Law League, with that exceedingly able man, Mr. Cobden, at their head, have, with one consent, disclaimed every species of fiscal protection. This disclaimer of protection has been made so loudly and so often, that you cannot possibly have been ignorant of it. And yet, my lord, you have thought it fair, and right, and honest, and, above all, religious! to found your reasoning, involving the interests of millions, and, in particular, involving the feeding of the poor, upon the basis of an immaterial fact; and which, even if it were material, is totally disclaimed by the manufacturing interests, who have called on the Legislature to abolish equally all manufacturing as well as agricultural protection.

The next thing that resembles argument is your allegation, in substance thus—"that a monstrous proposition is set up on

the plea of religion—namely, that a large portion of our corn-growing land should be thrown out of cultivation, and the labourers thereon thrown upon the towns" (p. 39).

I have stripped this assertion of some of the poetic imagining with which you have surrounded it. I wish—I heartily wish—I could admit it to be common sense. It is not so; but it has a still greater defect—it is not true! Nobody asserts—not even the "sectarian ministers" whom you charge with combination and agitation—that corn-growing land should be thrown out of cultivation. It is not sought for that any land capable of producing corn, with all the advantages of the home market, should be other than corn-growing land. That which is insisted upon is widely different, and you ought to know it. It is insisted that such land as now grows corn solely by means of an expenditure, which is prompted and compensated for by the unnaturally high price of corn in England, created by the bread-tax, should not have that stimulant for the misapplication of its purposes, but should be made to produce other articles of consumption, for which that land is naturally adapted. In the healthy state of the agricultural trade, every species of land will be made to produce that which it is best suited by nature to produce. There is no danger of a want of consumers for every species of agricultural produce. In England the population rapidly increases. You never will want consumers of the produce of any land cultivated as its nature requires.

In another passage you bring to the aid of exceedingly defective logic your Catholic and Christian faith. The passage is this—"That the prosperity of both classes (the agricultural and manufacturing) is a reciprocal benefit cannot be denied, and each ought to look for support from the other." Quite true. It should not only be fair and just, but reciprocal. Your lordship's reciprocity, however, savours of what is called an Hibernian quality, and is "a reciprocity all on one side." You continue—"But the idea of sacrificing the whole landed property of the country to satisfy the mania for commercial speculation is, indeed, anti-Catholic and anti-Christian."

No less! Anti-Catholic and anti-Christian!

For shame, my lord! Oh, for shame! How could you combine the idea of Catholic Christianity with the selfish and, I regret to say, essentially sordid notions that were passing through your mind when you wrote that phrase? Sacrifice of landed property, forsooth! Answer me—what landed property, or what luxury arising from your landed property do we ask you to sacrifice? Not any term or estate in your lands; not your splendid mansions, or your luxuriant gardens; not your fisheries or your graperies; not your pineries or your pheasant preserves; not your pampered horses or your stall-fed oxen or sheep. Feed and fatten on these, until appetite, provoked by every variety of delicacy, is satiated, or at least wearied. We require not your green crops or turnip heaps; not your hay or your grass. No—not your wheat, not your oats, nor your barley. Send these, as our manufacturers do their produce, to every corner of the globe where you can find buyers. Send them to the home market or the foreign market, as best suits your interest or your fancy, or your caprice. Or, if your wantonness makes you careless, destroy them if you please; or consume them, either yourselves or by your servants, or even by your pigs and poultry. In short, you are free to use or to abuse your lands and their produce at discretion or caprice.

What property of yours, then, is to be sacrificed? I will tell you—and you ought to blush that it should be necessary for me to tell you! The property of which we demand from you the sacrifice is nothing in the world but "the privilege to pillage the poorer classes of the community." What we desire to take away from you is, the powers which the Corn Laws iniquitously give you, to compel the operative to pay for your corn a larger price than that which he could get the same article for elsewhere; and yet you assume the air of an awful theologian, and tell us that to take away that power is anti-Christian and anti-Catholic.

The wealthy nobleman, "clothed in purple and fine linen," may credit you. He may imagine the Catholic religion was so

good a thing for the aristocratic classes that he ought to promote it. But the poor, starving mechanic, who, by reason of your law, has a slice of bread the less to give to each of his children, will despise your reasoning, and may, perhaps, hate that form of faith which you obtrude between his hungry family and a full meal. Should he hear your real character; should he hear that you really are, as an individual, humane and generous, bountiful and good, may he not on that very account form a loathing against that religion—in itself pure and undefiled—which thus seems to sear your conscience, and which makes you—even you!—an apostle of starvation and a preacher of monopoly?

I believe I have now touched upon all that savours of reasoning in your support of the Corn Laws. You have, it is true, mixed up many details of the statistics of corn and currency. But, even in that mist of figures, with which you so uselessly surround yourself, the natural benevolence of your disposition breaks out. There is not that iron tenacity about you which marks the Dukes of Buckingham and Richmond. You are ready to relax the pressure upon the working classes; and that poor and paltry concession, which some others also are ready to make for the purpose, by mitigating harshness to continue delusion, you, from better and purer motives, are willing to concede. Oh! how I should desire to make you perceive that even the concession so wrung from others, bespeaks the foregone conclusion—that the Bread Tax is in its nature too oppressive to be much longer endured in its present form and pressure.

I do not reply to your statistics on corn and currency. I would not take the trouble of confuting some conclusions or elucidating some mistakes. I leave you the full benefit of having them uncommented on and unreplyed to. Yet, I fearlessly assert that, even you yourself cannot be without some consciousness that the Corn Laws are un-Christian and un-Catholic, because they are unjust and oppressive. The matter lies in a narrow compass.

First—The Corn Laws operate to prevent the workmen in

manufactories from earning wages, inasmuch as they prevent the agricultural countries in Europe and America, which want our manufactures, from having a medium of exchange whereby they would obtain these manufactures. If they were allowed to send corn here, they would exchange that corn (or exchange the price of it, which is the same thing) for English goods. Thus there would be achieved for England a good with a double aspect. First, it would be good for the English to get an increased quantity of manufactures. But you, my lord, stand in the midst. You will not let the increased food come in; and you thereby prevent the increased quantity of manufactures from going out. And all this mischief you proclaim and sustain, with "religion" dropping from your lips in almost every sentence!

Secondly—The crowning injustice of the Corn Laws consists in this: the operative is indebted to Providence for the strength which enables him to labour, and to his own industry for the skill with which he applies that strength. His property is his labour, composed of two elements—strength and skill. There is not in the world a more rightful property. His title is infinitely beyond that derived from the casualties of modern descent, or the chances of ancient plunder. With his skill and labour he has earned money—a limited sum of money it must necessarily be; he wants food for his sustentation and support. He comes into the market for food. It would be the greatest tyranny and iniquity to prevent his buying that food in the market. It is a tyranny and an iniquity, less only in degree but the same in principle, to interpose a tax or other impediment which compels him to purchase a lesser quantity than he wants, and than he otherwise would be able to purchase. The principle is identically the same; but it would amount in morals to murder, by actual starvation, totally to prohibit him. Nor does it appear to me that the guilt is much mitigated by the fact that the lesser process is more slow in its operation, and does not so immediately cause death, and only anticipated the period of his demise by the more tedious mode of insufficient sustenance.

The provision tax, therefore, is in its nature most criminal. It is murderous. It is the most direct violation of the first principles of justice. It is not mitigated by the fact that such tax is applied to the necessities of the State and the maintenance of the laws, and thus confers some benefit, however remote, upon each individual in that State. The thing is in itself so radically oppressive and unjust that it is incapable of moral mitigation. However, this tax, though not to be mitigated in its severity by any circumstance, is yet capable of an enormous aggravation of its criminality. This aggravation arises when the tax is not for the benefit of the State or for any public purpose, but is a favour and a benefit given to a particular class of society; when it is levied—not for the expenditure of the Government, but for the sole profit of a privileged, and insomuch a plundering class; when, in short, it is a protection to a particular interest. The protected person thus, by the voice of the Corn Law, addresses the workman: “You shall not buy your breakfast, though you have by your own hand earned money to buy it with, until you have first paid me a heavy tax for liberty to purchase!”

Bread, my lord, is at this moment, in round numbers, at Paris, fivepence—in reality, fivepence and a fraction—for the loaf. A loaf of the same size, weight, and quality costs in England tenpence. The charges of bringing over from Paris to England the materials to make that loaf would not increase its price one penny. Thus the English artizan, and every English poor person, is defrauded of fourpence out of ten pence in the price of his loaf. And that fourpence is the plain and manifest plunder committed by the grower of English wheat, under the sanction and by the authority of the Corn Law.

I do not mean the least discourtesy to Lord Shrewsbury, but I cannot qualify my terms. This is a robbery—the worst species of robbery. It is the robbery of the poorer classes to enrich the wealthier. You may talk and write about it what you please—it cannot and will not be long endured.

The English people must not be led away by my Lord Shrewsbury, or anybody else, to believe that the Catholic reli-

gion sanctions this robbery, or that the great bulk of the Catholics, even of England, are favourable to this injustice. Self-interest may delude a great man, here and there; associating with other Corn Law plunderers, he may familiarize his mind to the injustice; but the Catholic religion is by no means responsible for his errors. On the contrary, those errors are in direct contradiction to the principles of that holy religion—a religion promotive of all good works, and the instigator of every charity.

Having thus disposed of your very futile attempt to sustain the hard-hearted iniquity of the Corn Laws, I turn with alacrity to other topics of your pamphlet. I will first take up your solicitation to the Catholics to forsake the Whigs, now that they are defeated, and to give in their adhesion to the Tories, now that they are in power. You, with much *naïveté*, ask, “Why should we follow the fallen fortunes of the Whigs?” Strange chivalry, gentle reader, for an Earl of ancient fame!

You really overrate your powers of seduction, and your capacity to create wholesale desertion. Even the question of creating political renegades smacks, in your language—pardon me!—of something like religious pretension. It would seem that you would endeavour to make it a point of conscience that the Catholics should abandon all political gratitude, forsake the fallen fortunes of the Whigs, and adopt, with a servile alacrity, the politics of the Tories.

Here, again, the Corn Laws seem to obtrude, for it is impossible to discover any other assignable motive for the desertion—in its own nature unprincipled—of the friends of your earlier political life; or for your embracing the malignant foes of your caste and creed, with a rapidity more remarkable for its abruptness than for its delicacy or decency.

This, indeed, is strange. This whirling rapidity of transition, from the avowed love of gradual amelioration to the determined resistance to every salutary change (for that is Toryism), would appear almost miraculous; but for the political creed, which in your second page, you announce, in all the emphasis of italics hashed up with capitals.

That creed may well indeed be called the slippery scale of politics. There is no political conscience that it may not exactly suit. It is everything and it is nothing! Here is your magnanimous profession of political faith; I give it verbatim. As a matter of curiosity it deserves to be preserved; embalmed amidst the no-meaning absurdities of plausible nothingness! You say, "I always was, and I hope I always shall be, a Whig; by which I mean, an advocate for the greatest possible degree of civil and religious liberty, and the greatest possible amount of religious toleration, consistent with the institutions, and the condition of the country."

There it is—a precious document!—a document which the monster, Emperor Nicholas, who, in one of his sanguinary freaks, swept the streets of Warsaw of, and bore for ever away, the children of Polish mothers; and in another fantastic barbarity, compelled nearly one million of his subjects to apostatize from the Catholic religion; he, even he, might sign this creed, together with the Earl of Shrewsbury. For he, too, will give all the civil liberty, and all the religious toleration which he deems consistent with the institutions and the condition of his country.

There is no tyrant, no bigot, who may not cry, Amen! to your lordship's creed. They are all ready to go every length for civil and religious liberty, provided they be allowed to qualify and to limit it to that which they deem consistent with the institutions, and, above all, with the condition of the country. Shakspeare says that your "if" is a great pacificator. Your "condition" is a great neutralizer of all that is valuable in your first assertion. If any measure to promote civil liberty or religious toleration be asked for, the negative reply at once may be, "It is not consistent with the institutions of the country; the country is not in a condition for such a change."

Really, my lord, it is surprising how a man of your understanding should give us, with all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of typographical dignity, such a bundle of unmeaning

words. The efficacy with which they can contradict each other renders the words devoid of any real meaning.

Surely, you cannot have forgotten that these were the very same cant phrases, with which we were met and opposed while struggling for Emancipation. We were met by the bigots and oppressors then with the declaration of a great wish to satisfy all his Majesty's subjects in their demands; but how could Emancipation exist with the institutions of the country? And, then, only think of the condition of the country! England was not in a condition to suffer such a change! Such was then the cry of all our enemies. And the very topics with which you qualify your opinions would have kept the Catholics of both kingdoms in thralldom for perhaps a century to come, if it had not been for one of us, my lord—you or I—I give you the choice to say which!

I cannot however pass without censure one expression in your creed. Nor can I talk of it with sufficient abhorrence, without violating that personal courtesy which I owe, and am most willing to maintain, towards your lordship. I allude to the word "toleration." Toleration means "permission," "sufferance." He who claims to be "tolerated" gives up his right of self-assertion. He who talks of "tolerating," assumes that he has the right to refuse permission. Now, my lord, I require the permission of no man, I despise the toleration of any man, for my worship of the adorable Creator and Redeemer, in that pure form in which my conscientious conviction tells me that the truth of God abides. It is my right; it is your right; it is the right of every Christian man! In fact, the word "toleration" admits the principle of persecution. No man can talk of tolerating another, unless in the assertion of the right to persecute. He who admits he has no right to persecute, gives up, necessarily, all title to tolerate. And I, as a Catholic, abhor and repudiate persecution; and, on behalf of the Catholic body, I reject toleration. Insisting on my own right, at my own awful responsibility to my Creator and Lord, and to Him alone, to worship Him in the full sincerity of

conscientious belief, I assert for every other Christian man precisely the same right at the same awful responsibility.

As I have already, I do hope, cleansed the sacred banner of Catholicity from the stain which you had by your bread tax advocacy flung upon it, so again do I brighten up that banner from the obscuration of your odious word "toleration."

I must not, however, be misunderstood. There is not in this, my assertion of freedom of conscience, the slightest tinge of indifferentism in the matter of religion. On the contrary, no man can be more thoroughly convinced than I am, that it is impossible for anything to be of so much importance as the truth of the Christian faith; or that nothing can be comparable in magnitude to the spiritual obligation upon everybody to believe and profess the true faith. But this is a question between man and his God. The obligation of belief is not to our fellow-man, but to the Creator of all. And the awful responsibility of which I speak, relates to an eternity of weal or of woe; and to nothing that human government can give or take away.

From this all-important subject I now descend to the ludicrous nature of your profession of political faith. It is like a nose of wax; it would fit any face. Or perhaps it resembles more the pledge of an anti-teetotaller, who made boast that he never would again get drunk in any man's company, unless he should be a friend, a relation, an acquaintance, or a stranger.

It is, after all, not so much your political non-opinions that I arraign. It is the ungenerous counsel that you give to the English Catholics. It is, permit me to add, the ungenerous example—in speaking to any other man, I would call it the paltry example—which you hold forth to the British Catholics. You took your place among the partisans of the late Administration, so long as they were in office, so long as they basked in royal favour, and that the Sovereign had it in her power to continue them around her. You were their prosperity friend. But now they have fallen into adversity; now that the Queen has

been compelled to send them back again into the ranks of private life; now that they have no longer ministerial rank, station, or dignity; now that the winter's gale is upon them; you—their “friend” in their season of prosperity—clap up your helm, sail in the squadron, and elevate the flag of their fortunate enemies, exclaiming, “Why should we bind ourselves to the fallen fortunes of the Whigs?”

This assuredly is not dignified, or generous, or noble. You are disinterested. But, yet, what encouragement does not your example give to the selfish, to the servile, and even to the treacherous?

Believe me, it little becomes the name of Talbot to exhibit an un-Catonian specimen of preference given to the victorious, but worse cause; and the abandonment of the better, though defeated party!

Judging by your conduct to my humble and insignificant self, I should be forced to the conclusion that gratitude was not, in your opinion, one of the cardinal virtues; at least that it was not an English Catholic virtue; but was rather a quality deserving little estimation. I should, indeed, have feared that this was a judgment formed by me in my natural prejudice in my own cause, if I were not irresistibly compelled to perceive that ingratitude, dark ingratitude, pervades all that portion of your pamphlet which calls on British Catholics to desert the unlucky Whigs and to join the lucky Tories.

It is impossible to conceal or to deny this ingratitude. Yes, my lord, it is, I am sorry to say, too obvious. It is, in its nature, too discreditable to be endured in silence.

No man did describe—few men have the ability to describe—in terms of such glowing eloquence, of bitter grief, and even of agony, as you did, my lord, describe the oppressive degradation and contumely which were inflicted on you, the premier Earl of England, and upon the English Catholics in their native land by the iniquitous “Penal Laws.”

Your plaintive cry was this—it bewailed the following grievances; take them in numerical order, as they have been all since redressed:—

1. "A Catholic cannot sit or vote in the House of Peers, and is thus deprived of his most valuable birthright.
2. "A Catholic Commoner cannot sit or vote in the House of Commons.
3. "A Catholic freeholder may be prevented from voting at elections for members.
4. "A Catholic cannot sit in the Privy Council.
5. "He cannot be a minister of the Crown.
6. "He cannot be a judge.
7. "He cannot hold any office in any spiritual, equity, or common law court.
8. "He cannot become a King's counsel.
9. "He cannot hold any office in any of the corporations.
10. "He cannot marry either a Protestant or a Catholic, unless the ceremony be performed by a Protestant clergyman.
11. "He cannot settle real or personal property for the use of his Church.
12. "Nor for the use of Catholic schools, nor for any other purposes of the Catholic religion."

You added this complaint :—

"From early youth to the last stage of existence, we, Catholics are doomed to bear about us a painful feeling of inferiority and undeserved reproach."

In a different passage you justly complained thus :—

"We are worse than aliens in our native land ; inasmuch as that an alien is under the protection of an equal law, which we are not. If an alien be a delinquent, or a presumed delinquent, he is entitled to a trial by his peers ; and half those peers are his own countrymen, and of his own religion ; whereas our delinquency, imaginary as it is, is tried by men who have no fellow-feeling with us, and who convict us upon evidence collected, produced, and attested by themselves. We are compelled to endure the stings of insult and of calumny, frequently without either the opportunity of reply, or the hope of redress by law. We are denied the privilege of the meanest malefactor ; that of being confronted with our accusers. We are excluded from the places in which the most galling and most influential of the calumnies pronounced against us are uttered ; and if we dare to answer them elsewhere, our calumniators may sit in judgment upon us, and punish our audacity with imprisonment."—*Reasons for not taking the Test.* Second Edition, p. 13.

Protesting against that infliction, labouring against the

iniquity, at the period of your unjust degradation and adverse fortune, was to be found Lord Melbourne, the late Prime Minister.

Advocating the cause of justice and liberality to you, in your then inferior and suffering state, was ranged the manly eloquence of the Marquis of Lansdowne, another member of the late Cabinet.

At that dark period of your political history, Lord John Russell, the late ministerial leader of the House of Commons, sustained with a power of oratory and argument almost unequalled, your interests, and vindicated your rights.

Need I remind you, my lord, of the sincere zeal and accumulated services in the Catholic cause, of the Ponsonby family? and in particular of that excellent nobleman, Lord Duncannon, another member of the late Cabinet?

Is it necessary to recal to your memory the sincere zeal and power of eloquence of Sir John Hoophouse, another member of the late Cabinet? Why should I unnecessarily multiply individual instances? Was not every man of the late Cabinet, who had a seat in Parliament before Emancipation, the decided friend, advocate, and supporter of our cause? The decided enemy of the Tory iniquity under which we suffered?

They were your friends, my lord; your true, your trusty, your tried friends. Your friends in the day of your need—in the day of your distress. Your friends, when you could not help yourself. They were the enemies of your enemies; the assertors of your rights; aye, my lord, they were more; they were the vindicators of your unjustly tarnished honour, and of the principle of your calumniated religion.

One thought more. So far from the members of the late Administration having supported the Catholic cause from motives of party interest, or from the ambition of attaining the honours and emoluments of office, the fact is, that they actually and voluntarily placed themselves under the ban of the Crown. They, with full consciousness, exposed themselves to the personal hatred, and even malignity of two monarchs, George III.

and George IV. They, with full knowledge of the consequences, raised, by their advocacy of Catholic rights, an almost impassible barrier against the enjoyment of the favour of the Crown, and the rewards, honours, and dignities of ministerial power. They knew full well that, if circumstances forced them on the King, he would soon find means, as he did on one remarkable occasion, of dismissing them from office.

They were, in short, my lord, the martyrs of your cause. They were your political martyrs.

Turn we now on the other side. Let us pass in array the chiefs of those on whose behalf you have now rushed into print, and whose power you have used all your persuasive influences to support and consolidate.

Let us select one of the leaders of the new Cabinet—the lauded of Lord Shrewsbury, the right hon. Henry Goulburn. Was he, my lord, sensible of the cruelty and injustice under which you and the Catholics laboured? Had he the feeling of the wrong—the sense of the iniquity perpetrated against you? No, my lord! no. He rejoiced in that wrong; he gloried in that iniquity. He would have continued it to the present day. His only regret was that the injustice ceased—that the wrong was alleviated. It is his great regret to the present moment. He actually resigned office—and no man ever loved office, perhaps, so much as Goulburn; certainly not more. Yes. He resigned his office when the Cabinet to which he belonged had determined to grant Emancipation. Nor has he ever relaxed his undying hatred of Pope and Popery. Nor has ever one word betrayed him into the disgraceful inconsistency of favouring the progress of liberality.

I will tell you an anecdote of Goulburn, whilst he was the Orange patronising Secretary in Ireland. There is an Italian—you may have heard of him—named Bianconi; a man of the greatest worth and integrity. He came here a friendless and almost penniless stranger. He has acquired a large independent fortune by opening up all parts of Ireland to very cheap and very expeditious travelling, by maintaining upon the roads

what are termed jaunting-cars. He had purchased stations, and built stables for his horses in many localities. In a short time he discovered, from some of the persons in the employment unjustly retaining possession of the buildings, that being an alien and a Catholic, he had no legal power to evict the fraudulent occupier, or to assert dominion over his own property.

He was a Catholic. Had he been a foreign Protestant, no matter from what country, by landing in Ireland he would have been naturalised, and have possessed all the privileges of a British subject. But he was a Catholic; and therefore he continued an alien.

Under these circumstances, he was advised to apply to Goulburn for letters of denization. It was thought he would have got them quite as a matter of course. No man could have a higher character for industry, activity, public utility, and personal integrity. He was, however, a Catholic, and his most reasonable request was refused by your new ally, Goulburn. A second and a third application met the same fate. Nor was the inconvenience and impediment to his business removed until those Whigs, whom you so wisely and so gratefully advise us to renounce, came into office—when at once he was made a denizen.

You, my lord, with all your titles, birth, and fame, would continue to be denied the privilege of the meanest malefactor, if Goulburn's vote could have kept you in that unenviable situation; or if it could at the present moment restore you to it, he would be the most unprincipled of human beings if he did not cheerfully pronounce that vote. Yet you call on us to go over to him!

The next of these new allies to whom you vow fealty is Sir Richard Knatchbull: a man whom you must admit to be one of the most unmitigated enemies to the rights of the Catholics in or out of these realms. He never relaxed his hostility. He never avowed, because he never felt, the slightest mitigation in his enmity to the Catholics. He spoke in every debate; he

voted in every division in the House, he exerted all his influence out of the House, to keep us all still slaves. There was a virulence in his hostility, unchanged and unaltered to the present hour. He assailed Peel for yielding to the necessity of granting Emancipation. He it was who, in the excess of his indignation and animosity against the Catholics, taunted Peel with a "*nusquam tuta fides.*"

What he was on the day when he uttered these words the same is he at the present day.

I place him second upon the list of your favourites among the present Cabinet Ministers.

The third shall be the Duke of Buckingham. Pretty much on a par with Knatchbull in point of talents, he if possible exceeded him in virulence. And like Knatchbull, he has never relaxed or qualified his hostility. You would still, my lord, "be denied the privilege of the meanest malefactor" (oh! how I thank you for the words!) if the Duke of Buckingham's vote in Parliament could have detained you in thralldom, or could now consign you back to slavery.

But let me not rest with the minor fly of the present Cabinet. Let me proceed to the highest name amongst them all—the Duke of Wellington. Let me confine myself to your own words, when I speak of him, the most fortunate of the fortunate!

You, my lord, published two editions of your "Reasons for not taking the Test." The first in March, the second in October, 1828. You alluded to the hope which the then preceding Administration of Mr. Canning had inspired. In both editions of your book there is this passage:—

"After many anxious vicissitudes of hope and fear; after passing through a trying variety of temperature; the political horizon appeared to have settled in almost unclouded sunshine upon the Catholics of the empire; when, to our dismay and horror, it is now again suddenly darkening around us. We cannot but fear that the appointment of the Duke of Wellington as Premier is a fatal omen to our cause; for hitherto he has but too often ranked amongst the most signal of our opposers."

You were right, my lord, you were right. He was, indeed, my lord, ranked amongst the most signal of our opponents; and, I would add, amongst the most ungrateful. You yourself proclaimed his ingratitude. Yes. More dishonouring ingratitude was never (at least until very lately) exhibited; because he was most deeply indebted to the sacrifice of Irish Catholic blood for his elevation to the dukedom. You, yourself, say:—

“Were it not for his Catholic troops, the Duke of Wellington had never gathered one solitary laurel; for all the laurels he wears have sprung from their valour and been watered by their blood. But for the confidence reposed in him by Catholic Governments, he had never been carried forward in his career. But for the honours heaped upon him by Catholic monarchs, his breast had never blazed with half that brilliancy that beams upon it now; and many of those high-sounding titles, which so loudly proclaim his glory to the world, would have been mute.”

Yet the first vote he gave as a duke, the very first and most deliberate vote for which he left his proxy, was a vote to continue the degrading slavery of the Catholics.

It was, to him, a degrading vote. You may speak of him, my lord, as you please. I will always speak of him as he really is; as the most lucky of all the ungifted and ungenerous beings that ever were wafted by fortunate chances and accidents to great elevation.

To the passage which I have first quoted, you add:—

“If the Duke of Wellington be the bigot which many imagine, our fate is sealed so long as his counsels prevail. But we are willing to hope against hope.”

Whilst you thus avowed your fears from the bigotry of the Duke of Wellington, you declared your determination not to despair, “to hope even against hope.” And yet I may say, by way of parenthesis, that you now come out against me, and bid me to despair of carrying the Repeal of the Union, although I hope for that event, not “against hope,” but with events that cluster hopes around me, whether in Spain, in France, in Africa, or in the East—or in America. For, my lord, the moment the Irish are

sufficiently combined amongst themselves to obtain that respectful attention which they will then assuredly merit; or, mark me, my lord! the moment that England wants the assistance of the people of Ireland, that moment England will obtain that assistance—but the Union shall be repealed.

But to return:—

In 1828, you were quite conscious of the Duke of Wellington's bigoted opposition. You denounced him as the enemy of the Catholics. But you may allege that he subsequently altered his opinions, mitigated his hostility, and emancipated the Catholics.

I admit the last fact. He did emancipate the Catholics; but he emancipated them because (as he himself avowed) emancipation was no longer to be resisted. We had our moral Waterloo, my lord, and our victory was more useful, if not more glorious. We chained the valiant Duke to the car of our triumph, and compelled him to set us free.

But I utterly deny that he altered his opinions or mitigated his hostility. He avowed that his enmity to Catholic rights, that his preference for Catholic degradation, were still the same; whilst he added the plaintive conclusion, that further resistance was impossible. He declared that his hostility was still unmitigated. Nay, he said that the Emancipation would be more useful to the expansion and establishment of Protestantism, by the union of action which would continue amongst Protestants; whilst the Catholics, no longer kept together by political interests, would tarnish themselves by their feuds, disgrace themselves with their dissensions, and weaken themselves by both.

Was his soul prophetic? Good, my lord.

The Duke changed his politics and emancipated us; but he never changed his bigoted opinions. He opposed, during the late Administration, every concession to the Irish people, every attempt to assimilate the franchises of the Irish with those of the English. It was he who thrust into the Irish Parliamentary Reform Bill the clause which preserved the rights of the exclu-

sively Protestant freemen. And the express grounds on which he perpetrated these enormities, was to preserve, as far as he could, the ascendancy of the Protestant Church in Ireland.

He more than once, during Lord Melbourne's Government, laid it down as a maxim in the administration of Ireland, "that Protestants should be encouraged." By "encouraged" he of course intended, and avowed he intended, that they should be "preferred" to the Catholics on all practicable occasions.

With that maxim of his, I leave him for the present, under the protection and special favour of the Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury.

The next that I offer to your lordship's consideration is Lord Lyndhurst. Of him, too, you entertain hopes which I shall leave undisturbed, because such hopes are, and must be, intact by any process of reasoning, or any approach of common sense! They can spring only from that species of sensibility which when translated into words, is familiarly called "twaddle;" and when confined to mere thought, falls within the category of dotage. You are too young and too wise for either twaddle or dotage, and yet I must, in despair, abandon you to your "hopes" (!) of Lord Lyndhurst. He has been guilty of most mischievous discretion—let me call it dangerous, too. It is true that it was only the Irish Catholics on whom he affixed the appellation of "aliens in language, aliens in blood, and aliens in religion." It will be well, however, to recollect, that as an "alien in religion" you—even you—are stigmatized. Though you are emancipated, he still brands alienage upon you! after having in Parliament exerted all his faculties, and even availed himself of the excellence of his memory, to detain you in a state worse than that of an alien. Nay, he incurred, to keep you in degradation, all the odium of being a renegade, and of abandoning all his former liberal opinions, for the vile love of place and promotion. He poured out against you that speech which was "once Toby Philpott's;" and ranked himself at the side of bigotry, in a manner which entitled him to be classed among the most unprincipled and the most narrow-minded of modern statesmen.

Perhaps, indeed, there may be something in the private life of this nobleman which inspires you with hopes and encourages your confidence. If so, I am totally ignorant of it. But, if it be so, I leave you to the full benefit of its influence.

Let me next point your attention to some of the minor fry of triumphant Toryism. There is Mr. Milnes Gaskell, and there is Mr. Sidney Herbert. The one, it is said, has been liberal; I do not vouch for it; but this I know, that at present his disposition is to call you, my lord, a "Romanist." But if he were disposed to an excess of civility, perhaps he might condescend to call you a "Papist."

As to Mr. Sidney Herbert, the only way, so far as I can judge, in which he earned office was by a speech in which he most grossly calumniated the Catholic priesthood of Ireland—distorted the evidence before the Intimidation Committee, so as to show that he had some ability, and more inclination, to range himself for life as a No-Popery champion.

This, however, as addressed to you, is a topic of some delicacy; for you have in your pamphlet, as I shall shortly show, sanctioned some of his charges against the Catholic clergy, and adopted some of his calumnies. But whether coming from him alone, or sanctioned by you, high as you are, it is a subject which forbids mincing delicacy, and compels me to proclaim the charges false as they are foul—unfounded as they are injurious. Yes! the calumniated Catholic clergy of Ireland can set not only him, but even you, at utter defiance!

Last, but not least, comes Sir Robert Peel. And what is his history? He began his career in Ireland by organising Orangeism; by joining with Saurin in that corruption of the Irish Bar which now promises us a plentiful crop of bigoted, intolerant, and partial judges. He reorganised and armed the Orange yeomanry of the north of Ireland, whose orgies were annually celebrated in the blood of the Catholics; whilst he proclaimed in the House of Commons, that the only fault of these Orangemen was their "excess of loyalty;" those very Orangemen who have been scattered by the unanimous condemnation of Parliament.

He filled every office with their then sworn partizans. He raised himself from obscurity into notice and high station, as the child and champion of intolerance. There was no dirty dexterity of which he was not capable, even upon the most awful of all possible subjects; but let me give your own charge in your own words:—

“It was asserted” (by Peel), “with much parade of solemn and momentous accusation, against the most unimpeachable prelacy in the world, that they were guilty of the most audacious impiety in cancelling a precept from the Decalogue; and it was at least insinuated that they did so in order to flatter their favourite propensities to idolatry.”

The charge, of course, was false. You have proclaimed it so; and shown the miserable chicanery upon which it was founded. But that chicanery was Peel's—that falsehood was Peel's! On the subject of the Decalogue itself, he was guilty of bearing that false witness against you, and against every one of us, from our highest prelate down to the humblest attendant upon our worship. What was your own description of him? You began by paying him a compliment which he little deserved. You said—

“It is astonishing that a man of Mr. Peel's character and reputation for fair dealing should condescend to use misrepresentation when he finds argument fail him. But it only shows the extent of his delusion, and how fitted his mind is to receive impressions contrary to truth, reason, and common sense, when his favourite prejudices are to be cherished. If that delusion only affected the individual we should lament it without presuming to correct him; but when the delusion of an individual stands between the happiness of millions, and that individual is the champion of a party opposed to the best interests of the empire, then, indeed, it is a delusion which ought to be exposed to the whole world.”

Has your lordship been seduced by being called “vilely superstitious?” Or have you been won by the flattery of being termed “an abject idolator?”

But you may reproach me with the fact that the Whigs enacted “a base, brutal, and bloody” Coercion Bill. Recollect, however, that the English Catholics were unaffected by that

measure. There is, therefore, no English excuse for a treacherous desertion of your old friends. Push not, then, your sympathy for Ireland too far. We are in the habit of suffering, and therefore we can bear it more patiently. We are like the eels, accustomed to be skinned alive. Recollect, good my lord—pray, recollect—that, of two of the most influential members of the present Cabinet, the one, Sir James Graham, was the ardent supporter, and the other, Lord Stanley, was the contriver, fabricator, and triumphant advocate of the “base, brutal, and bloody” Coercion Bill for Ireland.

Now, my lord, make your choice. Show your highmindedness, your generosity, your noble gratitude for past services; your just indignation against unprincipled hostility. Make your choice—but, alas! your choice is already made! The highmindedness is gone; the generous feeling for a fallen friend is obdured and perceived no more! The gratitude is obliterated; and your just indignation at iniquitous hostility merges into puerile servility to the minions of place, power, and authority.

Oh, ingratitude unparalleled! Oh, preposterous selection! Never was such a choice made as you have made and enforced.

“Blow, blow thou wintry wind,
Thou art not so unkind,
Nor is thy tooth so rude
As man’s ingratitude.”

Yes. If the English Catholics follow your lordship, the biting, chilling, bitter blasts of ingratitude were never so basely blown and so keenly felt as they will be by every disinterested friend and lover of the generous emotions.

You have, however, your reasons for this desertion of your friends and selection of your enemies. You endeavour to persuade the Catholics of England to abandon those friends and to select those enemies. Your business is to justify a mode of action so repugnant to every right feeling, and so derogatory to every sense of political honour or honesty, that it could be palliated only by the most overpowering necessity.

Such was the task you imposed upon yourself. Heavens! how miserably have you failed! Your reasons are to be found in the fourth, fifth, and sixth pages of your letter. I am compelled to say there never was anything more flimsy, more fantastic. It is with pain I must add that drivelling idiocy or childish folly could scarcely attain to anything so weak—so mawkish. I will endeavour to analyse the puny material.

First—You allege that “all the great paramount reforms are accomplished” (oh! most sapient sage!), “and that there is now only a mere distinction without a difference between Whigs and Tories.”

Let me admit your facts—a matter of some difficulty—in order to admire the conclusion you draw from those premises. Your logic is, indeed, of a rare quality. What! because there is “only a distinction without a difference” between Whigs and Tories, therefore the English Catholics should, according to you, abandon the Whigs, their consistent friends, and support the Tories, their unrelenting enemies!

Such a specimen of reasoning is not, I believe, to be found among “the royal and noble authors” of any other century or country.

Secondly—As your second argument you state—

“That the Tories have adopted the late reforms as an integral part of our institutions; and even profess a willingness to concede such changes as the altered circumstances of society might still require.”

I cannot concede your facts here; because you told me just now “that all the great paramount reforms were actually accomplished.” Nor do I believe that the Tories intend in anything to ameliorate our institutions. At all events, you must admit that the Whigs are at least equally desirous of political improvement. How, then, can you be so preposterous as to expect that the English Catholics should consider this a reason to abandon their tried friends the Whigs, and to support their known enemies the Tories?

Thirdly—Your third argument insinuates that—

“The powers of mischief of a Tory Government are sufficiently restrained both by the established reforms themselves, and by the continually growing force of public opinion.”

I leave, without a single observation, this third sagacious reason why the English Catholics should desert their tried friends the Whigs, and support their known enemies the Tories.

Fourthly—Your fourth argument is accurately abstracted thus; you say—

“If a larger measure of reform be needed, which it certainly is, in Ireland, the new men, in the joy and generosity of their triumph, may possibly compromise upon a sound and equitable adjustment.”

There, my lord—there are your words; not all your words; but still, as far as they go, *ipsissima verba*. We have it that a larger measure of reform is “certainly needed” in Ireland. But, gently—gently, good my lord! Told you not me just now that all the great paramount reforms are accomplished?

There is a class, indeed, of whom the proverb says, that they have occasion for good memories. You, my lord, are a truthful man; and therefore you dispense with remembering what you wrote but a short time before.

Let me now just analyse this last specimen of reasoning:—Because the Tories may, “possibly,” in their joy and generosity do some justice to the Irish, therefore the English Catholics ought to grovel in the mire of deep, dark ingratitude to the Whigs!

I remember an Irish barrister, who, when addressing a jury, requested them, “not to be carried away by the dark oblivion of a brow.” He was stopped by the judge, who exclaimed, “Why, sir, that is nonsense!” “Oh, my lord,” returned the unabashed counsellor, “I know it is nonsense—but it is good enough for a jury.”

Thus, my good lord, your inference that the Tories may possibly in their generosity and joy do something for the Irish is stark nonsense. But upon a matter of political treachery, you deem it good enough for the English Catholics.

Fifthly—Your fifth and last argument may be condensed thus: you say, “the times are so menacing and so unsettled, that it is a problem for futurity to solve, whether Whig or Tory rule might be better or worse for the country.”

Bravo! So, because there may be a problem for futurity to solve as to the comparative merits of Whigs and Tories, therefore the living English Catholics are in the interim to decide the point for themselves, by wallowing in the mire of ingratitude and desertion of friends!

I rejoice that I have got through these miserable attempts at persuasion. I cannot, however, avoid saying that they fill me with ineffable disgust. Fortunate, my lord, indeed is it for you, that the weakness of your head may detract but little from the goodness of your heart.

I have thus followed you through the two leading objects of your pamphlet.

First, your attempt to array the English Catholics and Catholicity itself in favour of the grinding bread-tax.

Secondly, your attempt to bring over the Catholics of England, and even to arm Catholicity itself, in the cause of the Tories.

By the first, attainting the sacred banners of apostolic Christianity with the guilt of starving the poor, in order to satiate the avarice of the rich. In the second, inflicting a black spot upon English Catholicity, by making it exhibit the most profligate ingratitude to high-principled (but now powerless) friends; and, with the most abject servility, sharing in the ungenerous joy of malignant enemies.

The rest of your pamphlet is really ancillary to those two great objects—starvation and ingratitude. You introduce your other topics merely to gratify or allure English prejudice and English partiality. You, my lord, know as well as I do, that the English Catholics have in their day of power been as oppressive and as contemptuous of the Irish as the English Protestants have since been; and there still remains in the minds of some of the former as bitter a hostility as ever to the Irish. This

unhappy feeling you have sought to gratify, in the selection of your incidental topics. These topics relate—first, to a most important subject—the conduct of the Catholic clergy of Ireland; secondly, to a subject, trivial politically and personally in importance and magnitude—the individual who replies to you—I mean myself. The third relates to a subject of national urgency—the Repeal of the Union. In the foregoing order shall I make a few observations upon each of these topics.

As to the first—the conduct of the Catholic clergy of Ireland—I really do not know how to restrain myself. I would not wish to use harsh language towards your lordship; but how is it possible to speak with dignified temper of the audacity with which you presume, in utter ignorance of fact, to censure men in every moral point of view your superiors? To fulminate your anathemas against the faithful, the enduring, the devoted clergy, the only real friends of the afflicted and poor people of Ireland—the anointed priests of the Most High God.

Perhaps I am the more ready to yield to irritation, by reason of the impertinent intrusion by another English Catholic nobleman—a prattling peer, with some zeal but no discretion—into the concerns of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Ireland. His most uncivil assault upon one of the meekest, and gentlest, as well as most pious of human beings, the Right Rev. Dr. Browne; his gross and gratuitous attack upon the character of that exalted personage, the “lion of the fold of Judah,” the Most Rev. Dr. M’Hale; these attacks seem to me to bespeak this foregone conclusion—that the English Catholic nobility are in the habit among themselves of speaking with indifference, if not with contempt, of the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland; but let me return to your lordship.

In page 18, you call the Catholic priesthood of Ireland “a political priesthood” (did you borrow the phrase from the *Times*?)—“removed from the meek and peaceful spirit of humanity.” And you wish to check their “*now* uncalled-for interference.”

Yes, my lord. The “*now*” in italics is yours; and you are

right to mark the distinction; because there was a time when you lauded the political interference of the Catholic clergy of Ireland. But then you had a personal interest in their conflict. The Irish priesthood were then struggling to free you from political degradation; to elevate you from a position which you yourself have described as being worse than that of an alien; "more degraded than that of the meanest malefactor." They were then lauded and bepraised by you. They were struggling for the good of the Earl of Shrewsbury! They are now censured and vilified—they are struggling for the good of Ireland! In p. 20, you insinuate that a considerable alienation from Catholicity has been created in the minds of many in England, by what you call delinquencies of a portion of the Catholic clergy in Ireland.

I would most mournfully ask your lordship, how you could write such calumnious nonsense? Delinquencies, truly! of the Irish clergy! I thank you for the word. It becomes you highly to use such an expression. It does, forsooth! become the Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury to presume—I must use the word—to apply such language towards our clergy. And then—their causing the alienation of English minds from Catholicity. What would you, English Catholics, be, if it were not for Irish priests and Irish Catholic laymen residing amongst you? But the absurdity of the charge disarms its malignity. And there I leave it, in the precious keeping of your lordship.

You proceed in the same page, by admitting that "persons of all classes justly bestow praises on the exemplary conduct of the Irish Catholic clergy." But this is only meant to make the dagger-stab of the next sentence more fatal. You continue thus: "and while people may with reason be scandalized at some, let us not be unjust to others."

I crave your mercy. You are "scandalized" in good truth, at the conduct of some of the Catholic clergy. "Scandalized!" It is a hard word. But let me implore your lordship to mitigate the sensitiveness of your piety. "Scandalized" again.

Who are they among the Catholic clergy who thus give scandal? You will answer—the Repealers. And then see how sweeping your vituperation is. Take two of the largest dioceses in Ireland; those of Westmeath and Ardagh; there is not a single clergyman in those extensive dioceses, including near one-third of the island, who has not sent in his contribution to the Repeal Association as a Repealer. I believe that nearly four-fifths of the priesthood are in favour of Repeal. I know but of one priest who has declared himself publicly and in print opposed to that measure. Eleven of the bishops are enrolled as Repealers. Do all these scandalize you, good my lord?

Heaven help us, Father Abraham—what these English be! You were yourself, my lord, at one time a Repealer; and yet, here you are now the ally of the *Times* and of Exeter Hall, pronouncing the Catholic clergy of Ireland “scandalous;” because of the Repeal.

You were a Repealer, when your interests as an aspirant for constitutional equality and political power were likely to be promoted by Repeal agitation. You were actually a Repealer before I agitated for the Repeal. The great and overwhelming majority of the Catholic priesthood of Ireland are Repealers in their zealous love for the temporal as well as the spiritual interests of the Irish people. They are (as is every honest candid man who understands the question, and is not influenced by selfish motives) in favour of Repeal; because they see (as everybody who wishes to look steadily at the subject must see) that the oppressive ascendancy faction is revived, and will be perpetuated by reason of the Union, if the Tories continue in power. Because they see that Orange murders have already recommenced under the *regimé* of your friends the Tories; and that there is daily more blood on the face of the land shed by the allies and minions of your friends the Tories. Because they practically know that, under the influence of the Union, poverty must increase, destitution must augment, the fiendish spirit of anti-Catholic bigotry must necessarily accumulate. Because

they have seen that the justice of equality with England in rights, privileges, and protection, has been refused not only by the Tories, but even by the Whigs. Because they know, as every rational lover of Ireland must know, that there is no relief, no redress for Ireland, save by the restoration of her own Parliament.

So much for the Catholic clergy of Ireland.

I next come to your second alluring topic—alluring to the anti-Irish spirit. It is your vituperation of my humble self.

Your attacks upon me are really curious, and distinguished above all other things by gratitude, sweet gratitude, and by your magnanimous disregard of matter-of-fact.

There is something comical in the extent of your inventive powers. Take the following specimen. After speaking of my not knowing where to stop in my career, you add:—"Once, indeed has he" (O'Connell) "been most signally discomfited, and bound hand and foot to the chariot wheels of his antagonists. For a time he was politically dead, and the liberties of his country were extinguished in him."

What the deuce is the meaning of this? What idle fantasy is careering through your dreaming brain? What driftless imaginings were playing with, and deluding your inventive power? Speak, gentle sphynx; resolve the riddle! When was I bound either by hand or by foot? When was I bound to the wheels of chariot, gig, cab, or buggy; real or imaginary; poetical or actual?

I have beaten my poor wits into powder to discover your meaning; and can scarcely venture, after all, upon a conjecture. Even my conjecture is founded only upon a fact unattached, so far as I know, in any way to your lordship. The fact is this: the Duke of Wellington, a few years ago, asserted in the House of Lords that I had been convicted of a misdemeanour in a prosecution instituted by that silliest of the silly, poor Lord Anglesey. He said I was a convicted criminal.

In my place in the House of Commons, I refuted the assertion, and showed its utter want of truth. So far from being

convicted, I never was even tried! Wherefore Lord Eldon came to the aid of the valiant duke, and obtained an order of the House of Lords for copies of all the proceedings in that prosecution. They were produced and printed by the House of Lords; and you, my lord, must have been furnished with a copy, as I had been the instrument of obtaining for you the privilege of the peerage.

Some two or three years after this, the military duke repeated his confuted calumny. I immediately met him with a letter, published in the London newspapers, in which I proved to demonstration, not only the falsehood of his charge, but that he must have known its falsehood.

Now, my conjecture is this, that your paragraph may be intended to suggest that there was already one triumphant prosecution, and that there may be at present another, in which the Attorney-General might be able to read from the pamphlet of the Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury (simply as part of his speech) how little of favour I could deserve from Catholic jurors.

This conjecture is somewhat aided by the very hostile spirit manifested in your attacks on me. It is still but a mere conjecture. But, if it be not this, why, then, it is a simple invention, which might (if I had the least disposition to be rude, which I have not) be expressed by a shorter word.

You are, really, my lord, an imaginative man.

In the vivacity of your fancy, you have, in the paragraph last quoted, been guilty (however unwittingly) of the *suggestio falsi*. In the paragraph which I shall next quote, this ingredient is mixed up with what I do not know how to describe as other than a wilful *suppressio veri*.

In page 33, I find you allege that I have drawn from an advertisement in the *Tablet* for a servant, with a reserve, "that an Irish person would not suit," my sweeping proofs of disaffection amongst the whole body of English Catholics, "high and low, great and small." You add, "that it turned out to be a compliment to her "own transplanted countrywomen,

from a respectable housekeeping Irish lady herself." And you conclude thus:—

"There never was a finer burst of impassioned eloquence than that speech; but never argument so weak, or provocation so unfounded; and, to judge from the cheers and groans that accompanied its delivery, never impression more profound, or success more complete, in exciting hatred and animosity between the two countries. But where were charity and truth all the while? Or where the charity, truth and justice of many of the statements in the famous proclamation to which it was the prologue? Now making every possible allowance for a warm temperament and excited feelings, there can be no excuse for so false, so exaggerated, so virulent a denunciation. Even if his premises were true, the deduction had been false. Was not the wish the father to the thought, because it suited the purpose of the moment? But, while Mr. O'Connell forgets that violence, and exaggeration, and undeserved abuse, defeat themselves, no man ever presented us with a more signal illustration of the truth of this axiom than himself; and it is by this prodigal indulgence in the most unmeasured strain of vituperation that he is now reduced to the least enviable of all positions—in which his praise is censure, and his censure praise."

I wish the reader to peruse that paragraph over again. I will treat it, I hope, with as much coolness as a man so outraged and insulted can possibly do. At all events, I hope to treat it good-humouredly. In the first place, I will remark, that the assertion, "that the lady advertising for a servant, was a respectable and experienced housekeeping Irish lady," is the pure invention of Lord Shrewsbury's prurient fancy. All that he knew upon the subject was, that an anonymous paragraph appeared in the newspapers, stating that the lady was Irish. I do not believe it. If she were Irish at all, she had certainly resided in England, amongst English Catholics, long enough to have caught prejudices; and to have servilely imitated their dislike to her countrywomen. This would rather strengthen my case than diminish its force.

This, however, is not of much importance. But there is that which really is so. You, my lord, say that I made that advertisement my argument of disaffection to the Irish "among the whole body of English Catholics, high and low, great and

small;" these are your words. Yet you cannot but know that this, your assertion, is totally untrue; that it is directly the reverse of the truth. You avow that you read my speech (for you describe it), and therefore you must have seen, and especially known, when you wrote the contrary, that I, in that speech, so far from accusing all the English Catholics, great and small, high and low, made large and sweeping exceptions; that I asserted and boasted that there were very many English Catholics willing and anxious to do justice to Ireland.

Now, may I not retaliate—and I only retaliate—your saucy question, "Where now is your charity—where is your truth?"

Neither is this all. In the paragraph thus quoted, your allegation is that my proofs of English Catholic disaffection to Ireland were confined to the advertisement in the *Tablet*. That is your intent, or your language would have no rational meaning. Yet you must have known that this suggestion of yours was utterly untrue; because, in page 36, you charge me with an unmannerly attack upon Sir John Gerard for his adherence to Conservatism.

Now, that "unmannerly attack" was merely the statement of one of my many proofs of English Catholic disaffection to the Irish. You had, therefore, those proofs before your eyes. And yet you have the coolness to assert that I gave but one weak argument to prove the truth of my denunciation.

Let me once more retaliate your saucy question, "Where now is your charity? your truth? your justice?" I deny their existence. I prove that they do not exist. The language is to be sure harsh—but then it is yours. I use these queries upon great, and totally unmerited, provocation—for I offended, I assailed you in nothing!

You used them upon cool, deliberate, written, and printed premeditation; against a man whom I do not allege, but whom yourself admit, to have been your bountiful benefactor.

Oh, shame! ten thousand times shame on that malignant spirit which could thus taint the chivalrous Earl of Shrewsbury!

To relieve the tedium of personal conflict, which you have deliberately provoked and commenced, let us by way of parenthesis decide the matter of Sir John Gerard.

You accuse me of an "unmannerly attack" upon him. I allege that I did but make a just, a reasonable, and a thoroughly well-founded attack upon that unworthy person. I attacked him only as a public man. And my full justification is this: the Irish Catholics had, by your own profession, raised Sir John Gerard from a situation which you have yourself described as being "worse than that of alien, and more degraded than that of the meanest malefactor."

They procured for him the right—that most important right, to vote for members of Parliament. They procured for his tenants that most important right—the right to vote for members of Parliament. And the gratitude of Sir John Gerard, the use which he makes of the franchise we procured for himself and his tenants, is, by the means of that franchise, to return to Parliament a bitter enemy of Ireland; one actually labouring to extinguish the franchise of the Irish Catholics! and this conduct of Sir John Gerard's you call by the gentlemanly name of "adhering to Conservatism." Be that so.

Such, however, is the "political caittiff" over whom you cast the chivalrous shield of the Talbots. Alas, alas! I fear the client is worthy of the patron!

Having thus taken a breathing in the bye-battle respecting Sir John Gerard, let us return to our own personal quarrel—a quarrel which you have, in the wantonness of noble insolence, volunteered to create. But I do not shrink from the contest. The only thing I require—it may be indeed too much to require—is this: that you should not use the poisoned weapon of hypocrisy.

You allege that I was scant of proof of the English Catholic disaffection to the Irish.

Do I want proofs now, good my lord? for, laying aside your lucrative support of the Corn Laws, what but the most contemptuous indifference, or indeed hostility, to the Catholics of

Ireland, could have dictated such a pamphlet as yours? What but this hostility could have inspired your calumnious malignings of a large body of the Irish Catholic clergy? If the spirit had not been as strong as it must be malignant, would not they, at least, have escaped unassailed? But I cry you mercy. They have "scandalized" you.

Let me however ask, what else could have stimulated you, on your mere motion, to assail even me, whom you admit to be the representative of the wishes and of the wants of the Irish people? What else could have stimulated you to the cold-blooded calumny of the great masses of the Irish Catholic people, who have joined with me in the demand for the Repeal—treating them as separatists, revolutionists, and subverters of the monarchy and of social order?

If you, my lord, be well affected to the Irish Catholics, never did mortal man exhibit affection in a manner so strange and so repugnant. A manner indeed "capable" (to use your own words) "of exciting hatred and animosity between the two countries."

Let us, however, draw somewhat closer. In the paragraph which I have so lately transcribed, you accuse me of declamation and false reasoning; of exciting hatred and stirring up animosity between the two countries. You accuse me of want of charity, want of truth, want of justice. You accuse me of exaggeration, virulence, and falsehood. And to cap the climax of your chivalrous civility, you denounce me as a man "whose praise is censure, and his censure praise."

My lord, there is assuredly no novelty in the phrase. You have not the malignant merit of inventing it. It is as old at least as the days of Junius, and has been repeated ten thousand times since with as little truth as in the present case.

But you could not avoid adopting it. It was used by Peel at a moment when I had not the power to reply. I had made a speech, showing many of the meritorious acts of the Whig party—showing that all that in recent times had been obtained of amelioration in our institutions—that all the recent measures

sacred to liberty and humanity had been achieved by the Whigs. I showed that the catalogue of Tory virtues was a miserable blank; while the effects of their unjust wars, their bigotry, and their crimes, were, and are still this present time, grinding the people in oppression and misery. What was Peel's reply? Did he confute any statement of the Whig merits? No such thing. Did he vindicate the Tories from my censure? No such thing. In truth, he could not; for my arguments were based upon public and notorious facts. He accordingly rose in a rage; made a furious, virulent, and, indeed, ferocious personal attack upon me, which he concluded with the hackneyed phrase you have so gloatingly adopted from him, "that my praise was censure and my censure praise." There was not one single reasonable man upon either side of the House who did not condemn his conduct in that respect. I have not met any reasonable man out of the House who did not equally condemn it. But it seems to deserve your sanction and patronage. Peel forged the charge as against me; and you have given it currency with the English Catholics, by endorsing it with your name and titles of honour.

You have taken up his quarrel against me. You have flung in my face the "dirt and dust" of Peel. You have taken up his weapon to break my head. We have, therefore, a right to inquire what claims the combatants had upon you as an English Catholic—the character you boast of—that you should make battle for the one, or treacherously assail the other. Let there be no words of mine. Let me give your own statement of the combatants. You describe me—even in that pamphlet in which I am so virulently assailed—in these terms—

"O'Connell is undoubtedly the man whom Providence has employed as the dispenser of many blessings both to Ireland and to us. Without him we had laboured in vain; we had still been the victims of a misguided bigotry and grinding oppression."

Such, in your most unfavourable moment, was your description of me, whom you now with gratuitous virulence assail. How

did you describe—and truly describe—my antagonist? You said of him—let me repeat it—“that he was a man using misrepresentation when he ‘found argument to fail.’” You said of him—“that his mind was fitted to receive impressions contrary to truth, reason, and common sense, when his favourite prejudices were to be cherished.”

Thank God, good English Catholic, for the words! You also charged Peel with “making a solemn and momentous accusation against the Catholic bishops of Ireland,” whom you then called the most unimpeachable prelacy in the world, “of being guilty of the most audacious impiety in cancelling one of the ten commandments, in order to flatter their favourite propensities to idolatry.”

In short, you proved that he made of the divine Decalogue itself an instrument of forgery and fraud to injure Catholicity; that the words that were uttered on Mount Sinai amidst the lightnings of Heaven, were distorted by him to bigoted party purposes. You stigmatized him as having lit a torch of those lightnings in order therewith to blast the reputation and annihilate the hopes of the Catholics. You proved him to be a blasphemer for paltry party purposes, and you declared that he ought to be exposed to the scorn and derision of the world.

Yet you ape his intemperance, you imitate his virulence, and you actually adopt and employ his scurrility against the man, without whose aid you are forced to acknowledge that you would still be in a condition “worse than an alien, and more degraded than that of the meanest malefactor.”

Proud lord! I rejoice in the contrast between us. No man with one particle of feeling would, for your honours and estates, malign his friend and embrace his enemy as you, in the purest spirit of gratuitous treachery, have volunteered to do.

Let me revert to the worst part of your charge against me. You accuse me of “want of charity and want of justice in exciting animosity between the two nations.” Read the charge over again, and weigh well—for you cannot exaggerate—its

severity. And when you have convinced yourself of the enormity of the guilt it alleges, read this passage—

“The spirit of hostility which actuates the peasantry of England against the poor, wandering, expatriated Irish, is the same which has ever governed the higher classes in their treatment of that unhappy country.”

Whose language is this? Stand forth, Earl of Shrewsbury, Waterford, and Wexford, for these are thy words.

Are they false? Then no stigma can be dark enough to brand the man who uttered them. Are they true? If it be true that the English, the highest classes included, are, and ever have been, governed by the vulgar prejudices and the mean hostility of the lowest peasants in their treatment of Ireland—then what censure can be severe enough to inflict upon the man who in his own controversy published these truths, “exciting animosity and hate between the two countries,” and who then turns round upon me and accuses me as guilty of deep crime in exciting that animosity; merely because I said, not that the majority of the people of England, who are Protestants, but a small minority of the minority of the English people, who are Catholics, were hostile to the Irish?

And you—you, Earl of Shrewsbury, thus accuse me, and charge me with the want of charity, of justice, and of truth, though I did not go the one-tenth of the length of uncharitableness you yourself proclaimed.

If it were a crime in me to make the mitigated assertion, what can be the degree of your guilt, your want of charity, of justice, of truth, when you made the sweeping, the all-comprehensive allegation of ever-enduring bitterness and hostility to the Irish on the part of all classes, “high and low, great and small,” of the English nation?

In sad and sober truth, I envy you not your position, noble earl!

Let me come to another paragraph in which, without copying Peel, you have gone even beyond aught that ever fell from him. In page 30 you have made an insinuation, clearly attri-

buteing to me the basest of all possible motives. Your words are, "had not people long surmised that a continuance of agitation in Ireland is much more likely to augment the rent than to benefit the country."

Of course nothing more derogatory to man could be suggested than this last charge. It is impossible to exaggerate the intensity of its foulness, if it be true—or the black malignity of its calumny, if it be false.

This every man must admit. Yet you have so little notion of preserving even the semblance of veraciousness, that you actually say in the next paragraph, that you treat me fairly and even indulgently!

Thanks for the fairness; ten thousand thanks for the indulgence!

And, now, what will inevitably happen? Why, this—that you who have accused me in express terms of want of charity, of truth, and of justice—you, who have accused me of virulence, vituperation, and falsehood—you, who have accused me of the paltry sordidness of sacrificing the loved land of my birth to my own grovelling pecuniary interests—you who, having exhausted all the resources of your own rancour, have condescended to resort to the hackneyed virulence of mine enemy—you, who have never received any injury from me, and never heard my voice raised respecting you except for praise—you and your English friends, especially your Tory press, will affect a saintly horror at the vulgarity and coarseness of my invective. You will prate of my "abusing" you. You will turn up the white of your eyes, and thank your stars that you are not like this publican?

Yes; I see it as clearly as if I were already reading the phrases of your allies. You and they will forget that you have volunteered to accuse me of all that is mean, base, seditious—aye, and revolutionary. They will forget that you yourself, in all the politeness of your chivalry, used the very language in which the vulgar express their bad passions. Yes, this (and, if needful, ten thousand times more) would be forgotten in itself, and forgiven to you! You will be set down as the essence of

sweet courtesy; and I, who merely defend myself, will be—not tried, but convicted of all uncharitableness. Be it so. I consent. But I will not consent that my claim to the “rent” should be misunderstood. That claim may be rejected; but it is understood in Ireland; and it shall not be misstated anywhere without refutation.

My claim is this. For more than twenty years before the Emancipation, the burden of the cause was thrown upon me. I had to arrange the meetings—to prepare the resolutions—to furnish replies to the correspondence—to examine the case of each person complaining of practical grievances—to rouse the torpid—to animate the lukewarm—to control the violent and the inflammatory—to avoid the shoals and breakers of the law—to guard against multiplied treachery—and at all times to oppose, at every peril, the powerful and multitudinous enemies of the cause.

To descend to particulars. At a period when my minutes counted by the guinea, when my emoluments were limited only by the extent of my physical and waking powers, when my meals were shortened to the narrowest span, and my sleep restricted to the earliest hours before dawn—at that period, and for more than twenty years, there was no day that I did not devote from one to two hours, often much more, to the working out of the Catholic cause. And that without receiving or allowing the offer of any remuneration, even for the personal expenditure incurred in the agitation of the cause itself. For four years I bore the entire expenses of Catholic agitation, without receiving the contributions of others to a greater amount than £74 in the whole. Who shall repay me for the years of my buoyant youth and cheerful manhood? Who shall repay me for the lost opportunities of acquiring professional celebrity, or for the wealth which such distinctions would ensure?

Other honours I could not then enjoy.

Emancipation came. You admit that it was I who brought it about. The year before Emancipation, though wearing a stuff gown, and belonging to the outer bar, my profes-

sional emoluments exceeded £8,000—an amount never before realised in Ireland in the same space of time by an outer barrister.

Had I adhered to my profession, I must soon have been called within the bar, and obtained the precedence of a silk gown. The severity of my labour would have been at once much mitigated; whilst the emoluments would have been considerably increased. I could have done a much greater variety of business with less toil, and my professional income must have necessarily been augmented by, probably, one-half.

If I had abandoned politics, even the honours of my profession and its highest stations lay fairly before me.

But I dreamed a day-dream—was it a dream?—that Ireland still wanted me; that although the Catholic aristocracy and gentry of Ireland had obtained most valuable advantages from Emancipation, yet the benefits of good government had not reached the great mass of the Irish people, and could not reach them unless the Union should be either made a reality, or unless that hideous measure should be abrogated.

I did not hesitate as to my course. My former success gave me personal advantages which no other man could easily procure. I flung away the profession—I gave its emoluments to the winds—I closed the vista of its honours and dignities—I embraced the cause of my country! and, come weal or come woe, I have made a choice at which I have never repined, nor ever shall repent.

An event occurred which I could not have foreseen. Once more, high professional promotion was placed within my reach. The office of Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer became vacant. I was offered it; or, had I preferred the office of Master of the Rolls, the alternative was proposed to me. It was a tempting offer. Its value was enhanced by the manner in which it was made, and pre-eminently so, by the person through whom it was made—the best Englishman that Ireland ever saw—the Marquis of Normanby.

But I dreamed again a day-dream—was it a dream?—and I

refused the offer. And here am I now taunted, even by you, with mean and sordid motives.

I do not think I am guilty of the least vanity, when I assert that no man ever made greater sacrifices to what he deemed the cause of his country than I have done. I care not how I may be ridiculed or maligned. I feel the proud consciousness that no public man has made more, or greater, or more ready sacrifices.

Still there lingers behind one source of vexation and sorrow—one evil, perhaps greater than any other—upon the gratitude of my countrymen. It consists in the bitter, the virulent, the mercenary, and therefore the more envenomed hostility towards me, which my love for Ireland and for liberty has provoked. What taunts, what reproaches, what calumnies have I not sustained? what modes of abuse! what vituperation, what slander have been exhausted against me! what vials of bitterness have been poured on my head! what coarseness of language has not been used, abused, and worn out in assailing me? what derogatory appellation has been spared? what treasures of malevolence have been expended? what follies have not been imputed? in fact, what crimes have I not been charged with?

I do not believe that I ever had in private life an enemy. I know that I had and have many, very many warm, cordial, affectionate, attached friends. Yet here I stand, beyond controversy, the most and the best-abused man in the universal world! And, to cap the climax of calumny, you come with a lath at your side instead of the sword of a Talbot, and you throw Peel's scurrility along with your own into my cup of bitterness.

All this have I done and suffered for Ireland. And let her be grateful or ungrateful, solvent or insolvent, he who insults me for taking her pay, wants the vulgar elements of morality which teach that the labourer is worthy of his hire; he wants the higher sensations of the soul, which enable one to perceive that there are services which bear no comparison with money, and can never be recompensed by pecuniary rewards.

Yes; I am—I say it proudly—I am the hired servant of Ireland, and I glory in my servitude.

I go back to another paragraph—the last that I shall extract at any length. I select it especially, because it is a specimen of the dexterity of the delusions which you proffer to the English Catholics. Speaking of Irish grievances, you say that they are principally either fancied, or, at least, grossly exaggerated. You add these words:—

“There are circumstances when ignorance is bliss; and I think if the people of Ireland were less instructed in their grievances, they would be much less conscious of them, and live in a happy ignorance of half the ills of which they now so loudly complain. Were it not for O'Connell we should never hear of Repeal; should never hear of 50,000 annual murders perpetrated by cold, famine, and disease, and most charitably divided between the Irish landlords and British misrule! And this, gentle reader, from him who has ever been the loudest to extol (and I am sure very justly so) the charitable benevolence of his own countrymen, and the most strenuous to oppose the introduction of Poor Laws.” (Page 23.)

This is indeed a specimen of your *savoir faire*. It condenses so many faults and follies, that it would be supremely ridiculous, if it were not imbued with qualities of a criminal nature. How truly ignorant you are of the people of Ireland! Or rather, what trouble you take to forget what the Irish people really are! That shrewd, that sensible people, that people whose tact exceeds intellect, are, forsooth, in your opinion so brutally stupid, that of half the ills whereof they now so loudly complain they would be unconscious, and in a happy ignorance, if they were not instructed (that is your word) in their grievances. Your assertion is, that of the grievances of which the Irish complain, some are grossly exaggerated, others are merely fanciful, and the one-half do not exist at all. According to you, O'Connell is to blame for all. It is I who have invented them. They exist in my statement, but not in reality. I have “instructed” the people to believe in their existence! The Irish, you tell us, are so stupid, that they believe they are aggravated, only because I tell them they are so; and that they loudly complain of the imaginary grievances, taking them not from reality, but from my word!

Softly, good my lord. Gently! There was a time when I was not the best instructor, or even the sole instructor of the Irish people as to their grievances. Let us see, when it was your interest to describe Ireland as she was, and is, how you "instructed" the Irish as to the evils they suffered. Then, my lord, you taught the Irish that their best and only hope was to look for the weakness and humiliation of England.

"For," said your lordship, "the day of England's prosperity has never yet been a day of grace or justice to Ireland."*

I now quote from the next page, where you tell us that—

"History, which is philosophy teaching by example, shows that the monsters whom regenerated England employed to govern Ireland, have mowed down whole generations of Papists at a stroke; ravaging the field with fire and sword, in the hopeful expectation that a harvest of Protestants would arise; when, lo and behold! in lieu of Protestantism, Popery springs up again; but only to be cut down once more, and to be cast again into the fire. Still the crop of Protestants never once grew up. The land was obstinate and impracticable; and in spite of every new system of experimental cultivation, has continued as barren of Protestantism and as fertile of Popery ever since."†

Again, in a few pages forward, you refer to the condition of Ireland:—

"Parliament," you say, "has devised one scheme of emigration after another; has expended thousands in Charter School grants, and thousands in the draining of bogs. But misery still reigns predominant, and threatens the very existence of the country."‡

In the next page you describe:—

"The yearly droves of ragged and hungry Irish peasants, a faint portrait of the still greater misery they leave behind, who traverse England in search of a precarious subsistence."§

* "Reasons," &c., second edition, p. xxxix.

† *Ibid.* pp. xl., xli. ‡ *Ibid.* p. li. § *Ibid.* p. l.

You add the hostility with which those Irish peasants were met by the English labourers; and you continue thus—I like to quote the passage twice:—

“But the spirit which actuates this feeling of hostility amongst the peasantry of England to the poor, wandering, and expatriated sons of Erin, is the same which has ever governed the higher classes in their treatment of that unhappy country.”*

Such were your “instructions” when you had an interest in teaching the people of Ireland. You were then as ready to admit the existence and reality, and the unendurable nature of these grievances, as I could be! There was then no paltry sneering on your part at miseries which, even when described in your eloquent style, appear much diminished of their sad and sorrowful reality.

You now accuse me of stirring up strife between the two countries; of calumniating the English, and misrepresenting their dispositions towards the Irish. But when it suited your own purposes, you emphatically proclaimed that “England’s prosperity was Ireland’s oppression;” for that the day of England’s prosperity was “never a day of grace or justice to Ireland.” You then yourself proclaimed this very sentiment, even more extensively than I did—that the English people “high and low, great and small, were equally hostile to the poor sons of Erin.” I love to adopt your words.

There was, however, part of the counsel which you suggested to the people of Ireland at that time, which I condemned then and condemn now. Mark this—mark the disloyal suggestion in the following passage. You say—

“In wretchedness the Irish outvie those Papists of the East, the very Greeks themselves, without being equally fortunate in attracting the compassion or good will of the nation. The Greek dies nobly in the field, and his death is sweetened with the compassionate regard of the whole civilized world, while the victim of English bigotry pines out a miserable existence,

* “Reasons,” &c., p. lii.

or sinks under the slow, but deadly poison of disease and famine, with scarcely a heart to lament him.*

You were hurrying us on a little too fast, Earl of Shrewsbury. But we were too wise and too loyal to take your hint, or to believe from you that death would be "sweetened" by sanguinary rebellion.

Look at the passages I have just quoted from your former work, and then blush for shame. Blush for your falsehood, if you think you have stated untruths. Blush, if you have stated the truth (as you certainly have done), for your malignant calumny upon those who continue to repeat your truths. But, above all and before all, sink with shame to the earth at the absurdity of supposing that the Irish do not know and understand their own grievances; or that they would be in "happy ignorance" (!) if they were not told of their miseries. Even John Bull himself, who is not the most perceptive of animals, is beginning to perceive that an empty belly is, after all, no joke.

Having disposed of the matter of "the fictitious grievances of the Irish"—(would to heaven that they were fictitious!)—let me revert to another part of the lengthened paragraph which I have above extracted from your letter at page 23.

You there sneer at me for my praise of the charity and benevolence of the Irish people; and in particular for my opposition to the Poor Law. Are you aware that the Irish Poor Law is much more harsh and cruel than that of England? Are you aware that the commissioners are more despotic than in England? Are you aware that no relief whatever—no! not to the extent of a single sixpence!—is, or can be, given out of the workhouse? Are you aware that the same cruel separation of families takes place here as with you? Are you, above all things, aware that what could have easily been foretold has already occurred—that sectarian prejudice has already made

* "Reasons," &c., p. lv.

the poorhouse in more than one locality an instrument of vexation, if not of actual persecution, to the Catholics? and that this spirit is naturally, nay, necessarily, fated to increase under the inauspicious reign of the present Administration—those friends whom you cherish and for whom you do battle? Are you aware that, although from this wretchedly impoverished city upwards of £30,000 in the last year have been expended, and in this year more than £40,000 must be levied; yet both our union workhouses are completely full; not one additional pauper can be received, though the gates are thronged with the imploring destitute! Our streets are crowded with mendicants, and our institutions of voluntary charity feel the pressure of claimants beyond their means of relief, and are struggling in a precarious state of existence; whilst the poor-law establishment itself costs as much money as would, if judiciously applied, relieve much, very much, of our destitution.

I thank you, my lord, for your sneer at my opposition to the Poor Law. It was not courteous, but it was useful to me. I was opposed to the Poor Law. I am so still: Other measures should have preceded it; measures of utility to the resuscitation of Ireland; and even then it should have been so essentially different from the present law, as not to be recognisable as belonging to the same category.

I assure you, my lord, that I have now most numerous converts to my opinion; and those who vilified me once upon this topic now laud my sagacity.

Although I have thus received with moderation and temper your sneering insinuation respecting my opposition to the Poor Law, how shall I be able to control my disgust and abhorrence of the contemptuous levity with which you treat the annual perishing of myriads of the Irish people from cold, famine, and disease?

You treat as something monstrous, my representation of the loss that Ireland sustains in her population, of 50,000 persons annually. Cold, cruel, heartless man as you are—how dare you throw the cloak of your protection over this wholesale

destruction? Mine a misstatement! Mine an exaggeration! Look at the statistics—look at the census for 1821—then look at that for 1831—then at that for 1841. You will there find that the population of Ireland increased between 1821 and 1831, by 965,570; whilst they increased between 1831 and 1841 by only 437,980; making a difference in the last ten years of 527,590; and thus giving for each year of the last ten years, a defalcation, not of 50,000, as I had expressed it in round numbers, but of 52,729 souls, as actual enumeration demonstrates.

What has produced this extraordinary difference between the two periods? Not emigration; for there was as much emigration in the first ten years as in the last—perhaps more. What has then produced it? The Depopulating System; the Irish landlords who cleared their farms of human beings to augment the number of oxen and swine; and the Tory faction, then, as landlords, now in power, who countenance the exterminators.

As you are so anxious to turn the English Catholics over to the ranks of the Tories, in support of the present Administration, you may hear with some not very Christian pleasure, that the Irish Tory Government has chosen for its legal adviser at the Castle, a barrister, who has been accused, without contradiction, of having depopulated his property of 173 Catholics, to make room for four families, of whom three were Protestants, and the fourth differing nothing in politics, and probably not much more in religion, from the Protestants.

Yes, my lord. You may sneer at me for saying that 50,000 of the Irish perish yearly of cold, famine, and disease. But how else can you account for this diminution in our population? You, yourself—I have quoted your words—you have said that the Irish peasants perished by the deadly poison of disease and famine, with scarcely a heart to lament them. You, indeed, have no heart to bewail them! If you had, could you assail with ribaldry and with little jests, the man who in sober melancholy deploras the misery of his fellow-countrymen, and con-

signs to execration, as murderers, those who cause them to perish?

You cannot deny that they perish. In what silken terms shall you treat their slayers?—or how will you palliate the crimes they commit against man and against God? Ireland has not ceased to be fertile and naturally productive. No blight has come upon her plains. No sterility has visited her soil. The blessings of nature, the bounties of Providence, are as abundant in the last decade as in the former. Sneer at me as you please; be as ribald towards me as you choose. You do well to pass over with flippant and fastidious levity this the depopulation of the Irish nation. But how can you account for the wholesale destruction of human life in any other way than the cruelty of the landlords, and the ungenial rule of the Government?

In 1828, when you published your “Reasons for not taking the Test,” in aid of the interests of your order, and in the promotion of your own worldly objects, you stated the fact that the Irish Catholics “outvied in wretchedness the unhappy Greeks; while as victims of England they either pined out a miserable existence, or sank beneath the slow but deadly poison of disease and famine.” I have, therefore, your own testimony of the then existing misery of the people of Ireland.

Since that time, the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry have ascertained by actual enumeration, that no less than 2,300,000 of the Irish poor require charitable relief for at least a portion of each year. I did, my lord, extol, and loudly extol the charitable benevolence of my countrymen; and, though you taunt and deride me for doing so, I repeat my praise. For, my lord, this multitude of paupers, whilst they may blame bad government for their wretchedness, found, as many of them still find, the means of existence in the benevolence of their fellow-countrymen, though almost as wretched as they were themselves—an instance of charitable benevolence, with such limited means, more extensive than that afforded by any other people on the face of the globe.

There remains one phrase in the paragraph which I have last quoted from your pamphlet and commented on, which deserves to stand forth in all the prominence of capitals. Here are your words:—"Were it not for O'Connell we should never hear of Repeal."

If I were disposed to use harsh language, might I not ask how you could presume to make such an assertion? But I will limit myself to asking, whether any man, circumstanced as you are, ever made so unwise and self-derogatory an assertion?

Mark me—until Emancipation was obtained, I postponed all agitation of the Repeal of the Union. But I would not be guilty of any deception. I therefore publicly avowed that the Repeal was my ulterior object; and I declared, and acted on the declaration, that it should remain in abeyance until Emancipation was obtained.

But what was your conduct? Listen, Earl of Shrewsbury, to the following paragraph relative to Ireland:—

"To say nothing of days long since gone by, the bare memory of which harrows up the very soul, let us cast a glance at the history of times so recent as to be within the recollection of all; and when neither ignorance, nor barbarism, nor any fancied provocation to vengeance can plead an excuse, or even offer a palliation for the wrongs we (the English) have inflicted. No details are requisite to illustrate the picture. The shades are so deep, and the general gloom that pervades the whole piece is so profound, as to be visible to all. Goaded into rebellion by the wily policy of a wicked and ambitious minister; then terrified by the atrocities committed in her subjugation; she was inveigled into a renunciation of her rights and a resignation of her independence. While thus captivated by bribes, overawed by threats, and deceived by promises, in an evil hour did she consent to throw herself on the mercy of her relentless master. She has never ceased to repent her folly; for she has been a slave instead of an honourable partner. Though full seven-and-twenty years have elapsed since her marriage articles were signed, and she became legally betrothed to her imperious lord, during which period she has ever most religiously comported herself as a dutiful and submissive consort, she has never been permitted to solemnize her nuptials but by mourning and by sorrow. As yet the note of gladness has never yet dwelt upon her ear, nor happiness

ever settled on her brow; neither has she been decked in her bridal dress, nor partaken of her bridal banquet. The fruits of a happy union have never yet appeared, neither was it to be expected that they should. For there was too much of fraud and violence necessary to effectuate the marriage contract. There was too wide a departure from the principles upon which alone a happy alliance could be founded, ever to allow her to look to other consequences than those which have rendered this union so abortive of good, and so prolific of evil. Being only a union of words and not of hearts, deficient in all the qualities necessary for a legal marriage, *she has just cause to demand a dissolution of that tie*, which could only have been valid and effectual by the free consent of the contracting parties, and by the strict fulfilment of the stipulated conditions."

Your language becomes too prurient for me to quote more—nor is it necessary.

But in sober truth it is all but utterly incredible that you should be the author of the paragraph I have now quoted; that you should, twelve years ago, have written and published so strong a reprobation of the Union, and so ardent an appeal for the dissolution of that tie; and yet that you should have also published the assertion that "Were it not for O'Connell, we never should hear of Repeal!"

It may be accounted for, as some wicked wags assert, you used the pen and the head of some assistant composer, and only graced the composition of another with your name, and the style, title, and dignity of your blushing honours. If that be so (which I do not believe), the individual who wrote in 1828 the first paragraph, may have been other and different from him who wrote the charge against me in 1841. Thus you might possibly escape the guilt of plain, palpable, untruthful contradiction.

If, on the other hand, you wrote both the first and the last paragraphs; if you in 1828 wrote that most powerful and eloquent passage demonstrating the fitness of the Repeal of the Union, without ever having had the slightest communication or connection with me upon the subject; if you also wrote and deliberately published in 1841, "That were it not for O'Connell we should never hear of Repeal,"—mark you,

“never !” why, in this state of facts, I must say you occupy as unenviable a position as any human being possibly can be placed in, who either possesses or affects a regard for veracity. Would to Heaven that some one would buy a parrot, and teach him to cry in your ear, “That were it not for O’Connell, you should never hear of Repeal !”

Read once more your description of the causes and consequences of the Union ; and then recollect what it was for which you accused me of “want of charity—of justice—of truth ;” in exciting “hatred and animosity” between the two countries ; then, if you have the sentiments of a Christian, or the feelings of a man, retract—repent—amend !

Delighted as I may be at this exhibition of a man who, without the smallest provocation save the gratitude he owes me, has assailed me in a tone of such unjustifiable virulence, I must not in the hilarity of my triumph forget the interests of Ireland.

You alleged in your anti-Union paragraph that Ireland “consented” to throw herself on the mercy of her “relentless master,” meaning thereby England. You are mistaken. Ireland never consented to the Union, as I shall presently show more in detail. Ireland never did—Ireland does not—Ireland will never consent to the Union. She suffers it only until the favourable moment occurs to dissolve it, and by dissolving it to render the connection with the British Crown perpetual.

There remains much more matter deserving of comment in your letter. Though it is not easy to see what is the drift of your leading idea, the *grande pensée* of your mind is the sustentation of the Corn Laws. The second object seems to be a preposterous and most uncalled-for attack upon me. The third consists in your endeavour to attach the banner of English Catholicity to the arch of triumph of the Tory Administration. The first of these I have disposed of. On the second I have said more than enough. Of the third, the most ungracious of all, little more remains to be told. I

cannot help, however, noticing the fatal facility with which you persuade yourself of the actual existence of that which is only the deceptive creature of your imagination. It is this; in page 36, you say :—

“ There is abundant proof that the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and even Lord Lyndhurst, from their own solemn and deliberate declarations, did fully and fairly intend to carry out the Catholic Relief Bill in a spirit of just equality.”

Let me assure you, that, instead of “ abundant proof,” there is no proof at all of any such thing, but emphatically and directly the reverse. During the discussion on the Catholic Relief Bill, Peel repeatedly insisted on the great advantages Protestantism would derive from conciliating the prejudices of the Catholics; this he insisted on as the leading reason of the concession to the Catholics. The Duke of Wellington proclaimed his intention to give them a legal, as contradistinguished from a practical equality; and he has been perfectly consistent ever since. He has always declared that the Government should encourage the Protestants. His repeated attacks upon Lord Melbourne’s Administration were principally on the grounds that it did not encourage the Protestants. His cuckoo-cry has always been—“ Encourage the Protestants.”

Now, you cannot encourage the Protestants, as such, without preferring them to and excluding the Catholics; and that, it is, of course, needless to say, is the game which the present Administration in Ireland are playing since they came into office.

I wish I could make you perceive in what an anomalous situation you place yourself, when you declare that you are the friend, patron, and advocate of the Tory Administration. How bitterly do the people of Ireland feel your cruelty, when they hear that the Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury is the ally and advocate of our present governors!—when they see the consistent enemy of Catholic education selected for the coin!—when they see the private legal adviser of the Castle chosen

from amongst the avowed depopulators of Ireland!—when they behold Serjeant Jackson (for his name, at all events, must have reached you, and therefore description is unnecessary) appointed Solicitor-General!—when they feel that Dr. Lefroy is raised to the supreme bench of justice; a man, than whom a more unrelenting enemy of Catholicity never existed; he, whose opposition to the Catholic Emancipation Bill was carried to such an extent, as to declare that the passing of it into law would dissolve the duty of allegiance to the Crown; when they feel that he is to have the disposal of their properties, their liberties, and their lives—when they perceive that the stipendiary magistrates (whose real responsibility made them honest, or, at least, kept them so) are in progress of dismissal; and when they hear, shuddering, of the augmentation to the magisterial bench of irresponsible persons who are not the friends of Catholic Ireland; when they hear, and know, and feel all this, and much more; and when they learn that you, a Catholic earl, are the advocate, supporter, and ally upon principle of this ungenial Government; oh! with what a hearty execration they will scathe your name, exclaiming, "He may be Catholic, but is he not English?" Blame them not, my lord. You yourself told them that "the feeling of hostility amongst the operatives of England to the poor sons of Ireland is the same which has ever governed the higher classes in their treatment of that unhappy country."

Your Tory friends and allies have not contented themselves with merely disturbing the sources of justice. They have not been satisfied with selecting partisans for all-important offices. The influence of their deeds has gone infinitely farther than the powers of public functionaries. It has rallied the scattered spirits of Orangeism. The yell of "To hell with the Pope!" is again heard triumphant, and that stream of Catholic blood which the Whigs first checked and then stopped, outpours again.

Instead of sneering and taunting us, Catholics of Ireland, do but take up some of the honest Irish newspapers; in particular, take the trouble of reading the *Belfast Vindicator*; you

will find the repetition of outrages which mark the action of Toryism in Ireland since its last restoration to power. In one number of that paper in the present month, no less than four atrocious outrages are detailed so circumstantially as to excite that lively interest which the certainty of their truth ought to inspire.

I mean to inflict them all upon you; but in order to induce you into the perusal, I begin with the lightest:—

“**CORNREANY, DEC. 30, 1841.**—About nine o'clock, on the night of Monday last, a number of Orangemen were observed walking along the road leading from Lurgan to Bleary, with guns in their hands, singing Orange songs. When they arrived at the residence of a man named Owen M'Nierney, they fired three shots at his house, and struck the door violently with the butts of their guns, shouting ferociously, 'To hell with the Pope!' After they had wreaked their wrath sufficiently upon this family, they withdrew cheering in a most frightful manner. When this insulted man thought it safe to open his door, he observed the wadding burning on the top of the house; and were it not that the day was wet, thus preventing the thatch from taking fire, in all probability the house would have been consumed.”

The second is under the same date, and has features of a peculiar character. You will perceive the artillery soldiers were engaged in it. You may also have an inkling of the mode in which justice is administered to the Catholics. You, who are so hearty a Tory, should, read, meditate, and inwardly digest these facts:—

“**CHARLEMONT.**—The Orangemen of this place are never very backward in the work of destruction and riot. Worse, still, the artillery at present stationed here, are almost in the daily habit of abusing Catholics. A few days ago, one of these gallant sons of Mars went through the streets shouting 'To hell with the bloody Pope,' in a most furious manner. He then commenced an attack on the house of a Catholic named Ternison, who, in self-defence, retaliated, and struck the artilleryman. A few hours subsequently, Ternison and his journeyman were arrested in their beds by some of the Moy police, without any order from a magistrate, kept all night in Moy blackhole, and next day detained prisoners in Charlemont garrison, where they underwent a very lengthened examination, which terminated in the sending of Ter-

nison as a prisoner to Armagh gaol, guarded by a party of the 55th regiment. The result of the investigation has had the effect of stimulating the Royal Artillery to traverse nocturnally the streets of Charlemont, and abuse any Catholic who may chance to come in their way. On the night of the 28th instant, between the hours of eight and nine o'clock, two bombardiers, when within a few perches of the garrison, commenced shouting, 'To hell with the Pope!' About ten o'clock on Christmas night, the Orangemen of Moy and Charlemont went through the streets of the latter, shouting, 'To hell with the Pope!' when, as Simon, John, and Patrick Ryan, three Catholics, were passing through the town on their way home, they were attacked by a host of Orangemen, who abused them so inhumanly that they could not be conveyed to Mr. Olphert's, the nearest neighbouring magistrate."

The third requires no comment. Oh! how delighted we ought to be with the English Catholic allies of the present Administration!—that Administration for which you write, and for which the "political caitiff," Sir John Gerard, votes.

"On Christmas evening a number of the Orangemen of Killyman committed a most savage outrage in that locality. As two men, named Kennedy, were returning home, after accompanying the Catholic clergyman to his own house—the reverend gentleman having had a sick call from his sister-in-law—they were attacked at a place called Loughery's Corner, by a party of vagabonds, who commenced shouting, 'To hell with the Pope,' and throwing stones at them in such a violent manner, that the poor men were compelled to fly for refuge to the house of a Protestant named Fulton. Here the Kennedys did not remain long, on account of the riotous conduct of their opponents, who swore that if Fulton did not turn them out, they would pull his house about his ears. Fulton not being able to protect them, the persecuted men took to flight for the house of their brother, when they were again hotly pursued. They reached the place in safety; but the ruffians coming up immediately, commenced yelling hideously, throwing volley after volley of stones through the windows and against the door, until the latter was forced open. They then rushed in, and tore down the shelves and every other movable article they could lay their hands upon; never ceasing until they left the place an entire wreck. In the room lay the dying woman, the mother of seven young children, who were all with their parent at the time. Hearing the noise, the little creatures hid themselves under the bedding, thinking that thus they would be safer; but one of the ruffians hearing their cries, went up to the spot, and thrust a bayonet into the coverlet, plunging it into the head

of a boy nine years of age. One of the fellows then asked where the price of a cow was that Kennedy had sold the day before. Notwithstanding all his menaces, he did not succeed in this. Others, finding that the Kennedys had made their escape through a back window, went to the house of one of their brothers-in-law, named M'Gillian, and wrecked his house, tearing his webs, and smashing his weaving apparatus. Poor M'Gillian himself, who is a weak, infirm, old man, they forced to rise from his bed, encircling his body with the points of their bayonets. They then amused themselves by making him cry out, 'To hell with the Pope!' for some time, after which the ruffians left. Their worthy companions did not retire from Kennedy's until after the most urgent remonstrances on the part of a respectable Protestant named Wincross. The poor woman and the little wounded boy still remain in a very dangerous state."

There remains no more. It is indeed significant! I cannot detain you from perusing it: and then I will leave you to enjoy the comfortable reflection that this is the power you will consolidate and perpetuate. Aye, and you would do so—sacred *heaven!—in the name of religion!—of the Catholic religion!

"The public will naturally desire to have the facts connected with the murder of M'Ardle calmly stated, and we give below the desired narrative, as furnished by an authority in every respect competent to the task:—

"A more cold-blooded or atrocious murder than that of M'Ardle was never perpetrated. Recollect, there was no riot, no drunken brawl, no provocation whatsoever. The facts are these:—The Orangemen of Shanaghan, who designate themselves by the sobriquet 'the Gold Pinks,' and others from the townlands of Moneyisland, Crosskilt, Drumadonald, and the neighbouring haunts, retired after the shooting match to a public-house on the road leading to Ratesbridge. Four Catholic boys, some of them sons of most respectable farmers in the neighbourhood, passed by where the Orangemen had assembled, and after passing quietly and peaceably down the road, went into another public-house, kept also by a Protestant. They had scarcely entered, when word was brought to the landlord of the house that the Orangemen were coming to murder them; and that their vengeance was particularly directed against one of the M'Ardles, son to Brian M'Ardle—a youth about nineteen years old, of most gigantic strength. At that age he weighed fourteen and a half stone, all bone and sinew; yet although of such amazing strength, he was one of the most harmless and inoffensive young men in the entire county. It is said that he never was heard of as being

engaged in a quarrel. The landlord humanely warned him against his danger, and sent him through a back window. He ran to the house of a Catholic named Murphy. The Orangemen, when they did not find him, assaulted those in the house, and afterwards pursued him in force into the house where he took refuge. After rendering him nearly senseless, they dragged him outside the door of the house. Two of the heartless murderers held him, whilst a third, placing the muzzle of a musket loaded with ball close to his heart, literally split the heart in two! Three more came up, and stabbed, and mangled the corpse with grape! His brother received a ball in the head, and is severely wounded. Others were wounded in like manner."

These extracts are taken from a single publication of the *Belfast Vindicator*. There is just placed before me the last *Tablet*—that of Saturday, the 15th of January. Look at page 40 for an extract from the same newspaper of a previous date. Read there the appalling fact, that since the restoration of the Orange Tory rule, four foul murders have been perpetrated in one county alone, the county of Down, during the last three months! Read, if you can, with a dry eye the story of old M'Ardle, roaming through the country with his murdered son's coat on his arm—a raving maniac!

Oh, Lord Shrewsbury! your friends, the Tories; have a strange way of showing the "joy and generosity of their triumph."

Perhaps this is what you meant, when you assured us at page 6, that the "new men"—as you fantastically called the Tory Administration—would in the "joy and generosity of their triumph" be guided by moderation! You cannot however be permitted to escape condign reprobation upon the poor pretext that you were ignorant of the Orange faction; that you were unacquainted with the iniquitous and sanguinary spirit of that party. No, my lord, I cannot allow you to escape censure on any such pretext. You wrote a book—you wrote a precious book. How sagacious was the exclamation, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!" Mine enemy has—thanks to my kindly stars—written a book. Let me give you one more quotation from it, to seal your literary and political fate for ever and for aye. Here it is:—

“Ireland is given over to a malevolent faction which, like a raging lion, goeth about seeking whom it may devour—which not only preys, but gorges on its victims: a faction against which innocence is no protection, and a verdict of “not guilty” no acquittal; and to brighten her prospects for the future, her avowed and determined enemies are placed at the head of the government. Good God! when will the follies of your rulers cease?”

Was there ever a passage disclosing a more perfect knowledge of the subject? It is a passage of perpetual truth and ever-living accuracy. It is the history of the passing day. But what a most monstrous and unnatural alliance is that which subsists between him who wrote that paragraph and the “avowed and determined enemies of Ireland,” whom he then described and has now embraced, and amongst whom he is numbered. Alas, for consistency!

It is with pain I am forced to declare that it is difficult to calculate arithmetically the number of shapes in which, in so short a pamphlet, you have rendered yourself the scoff and scorn of the thinking portion of mankind. And even your attempts to escape from the ludicrous position which you have adopted raise the sense of ridicule to so high a pitch as to cease to excite merriment, and to render you only worthy of commiseration.

The most ridiculous of all is the effort you make to justify a rebellion, if it had happened in the attainment of Catholic Emancipation. Your classic quotation, “*in extremis extrema tentanda sunt*,” goes the full length of revolutionary determination. Pamper yourself with notions of loyalty as much as you please; it is a Jacobin, a Chartist phrase, redolent of physical force and sanguinary violence. It seems as if you had preached the doctrine, that the immense good of the end to be achieved justifies any means of achievement. If that be your sentiment, you ought to know that such a maxim directly contradicts Catholic doctrine and morality. You, however, insist upon it; you assert, at page 17, that while you were struggling for Emancipation the object then was great, distinct, and pressing; it was worth the risk—aye, the risk of insurrection, rebellion, revolution. You add, indeed, that the danger was small. You,

however, embrace it; and now avow that you were determined to embrace it in every extremity.

Good my lord, I do assure you I was totally unaware that so humble an agitator as myself had for one of my colleagues so decided a revolutionist as your lordship. To be sure, I knew full well that there was no danger of insurrectionary violence or rebellion. But, whilst I was arranging my civic forces for Parliamentary victory, you, it seems, had your imagination full of tented fields and glorious deeds of arms. In your martial ardour you dreamt of an Irish Cressy, Poitiers, or Agincourt. Instead of being the Talbot of peaceable and indefensible Towers, you were in your visions of glory converted into another Talbot of a hundred fights—the triumphant vanquisher on the ensanguined field of slain.

But, in sober sadness, this is precious! Your personal interests were involved in the contest at that time. A question of the utmost importance and value to you, individually, was agitated. The contest involved your elevation from a political state of the lowest degradation to the high rank, privileges, and prerogatives of the proudest earl in England. Accordingly, everybody is called upon by you to admit that, in order to win for you this gemmed and glittering prize, no agitation could be too violent, no declamation too inflammatory, no eloquence too overpowering, no constituted authority could be bearded with too much ferocity, no organisation could be too revolutionary! Even if all this and much more had existed, you have justified it all in five words—"It was worth the risk."

It is necessary for me to contrast the overweening preference which you give to the cause in which were involved your personal interests and privileges, with the contemptuous indifference with which you treat the more tranquil and more patriotic movement which now animates the peaceful and determined myriads of Irishmen in looking for the Repeal of the Union. That Repeal is a national cause. It involves a question between legislative independence and entire servitude. I need only appeal to your own eloquent words already quoted, descriptive

of some of the evils that have flowed from the Union. But you have not, my lord, described the one-half of these evils. You yourself have told us that your countrymen, "high and low, great and small," hate us. And they have now an opportunity of working out that hatred. You have described the incessant and unmitigated horrors which England has inflicted on us even before the baleful Union, and which you showed to continue down to your date in 1828. The Poor Law Commission had since brought to light the frightful accession of subsequent misery. The accumulating recurrence of destitution and pestilence mark its frightful progress. Another famine is impending; while our "avowed and determined enemies" (how I thank you for the words!) are placed at the head of the Government.

Your pamphlet may be reduced in the language of common sense to a few words! containing the full scope and meaning of your Irish politics. Whilst your own interest was involved in the political contest in Ireland then it was lawful and commendable to incur any risk, to undergo any danger, in order to attain your object. But now it is culpable in the extreme to make any exertion, to continue any agitation for the political rights, the prosperity, or the liberty of Ireland.

For myself; whilst I was labouring not merely with, but—what is infinitely more important—for you, there was no encouragement too vivid, no praise too exaggerated to be bestowed by you upon me. Now, when, as I readily admit, nothing can be achieved for you but the giving you in a higher degree that which you already enjoy; now, indeed, the tables are sadly turned, and no censure can be too severe, no insinuation can be too degrading, no invective too gross to be bestowed on me by you.

Perhaps these things are consistent with integrity and simple honesty; but full certain I am that they do not consist with that high, chivalrous spirit which fears to soil its robes of dignity because it knows that a stain is worse than a wound.

There is something yet more distressing in the contempla-

tion of your fallen estate. It is this. You mix up religion!—religion!—the repetition of religion! in your pamphlet with unsuitable companions until the blood boils with indignant sorrow! And then you range religion under such strange banners! You at once disclaim the Liberal party in every clime and country; and you place the most sacred cause of religion under the sole protection of the various despotisms and absolute powers in Christendom! You declare, or at least you plainly suggest, despotism to be the only protector of the Catholic religion.

Is this wise, is it prudent, but what is infinitely more, is it true? Here I meet you foot to foot, and dare you to the combat. I take my position on this, that the despotisms of the world are unfavourable to religion; and, on the other hand, that the Liberal opinions in politics, 'mid the party of the bloodless movement, are favourable to the culture of all the moral virtues, and to the development of the great truths of religion, and, in particular, to the maintenance and propagation of Catholic verity and of the Catholic Church.

The real Liberal party almost respect all the sacred as well as profane rights of our fellow-men.

The absolutism which you cherish is the promoter and patron of every immorality and practical vice. Look at the courts of all absolute sovereigns, ancient and modern, and, with few and rare exceptions, you will find them teeming with every sensual gratification which violates the rules of morality and the laws of God. The total absence of responsibility leaves the bad passions without any human restraint, and naturally seduces into the indulgence of the sensual and criminal appetites. It was from the court of France that the practice of domestic profligacy took its abundant source, and deeply inundated the entire land with immorality; that immorality which produced and was punished by the demoniacal horrors of the Revolution.

The Church, too, suffers grievously from despotic sovereigns. In fact, the far greater part of her history consists in struggles against the encroachments of despotic power. Absolute monarchs have, at all times, refused to make the distinction be-

tween the dominion over temporal concerns (a dominion which is of their province) and authority in spiritual affairs, which is of a higher order, and belongs to the Church of God alone. Uncontrolled in their sway over the lives and fortunes, the laws and institutions, of their subjects, they have, at all times, desired and endeavoured to control the consciences and govern the spiritual concerns of their people.

Their irregular and wicked ambition has led them to usurp, on every possible occasion, that jurisdiction which the Divine Redeemer has vested in the Head of the Catholic Church. Despotic sovereigns have constantly interfered with the communications from the See of Rome to the clergy and laity of their dominions; communications so essentially necessary to maintain the unity of faith and discipline. They have insisted on the direct appointment, or an absolute control over the nomination of episcopal sees, and to important spiritual dignities. They have substituted, wherever they could, the sword of State for the staff of the Great Pastor; and they have assumed for the tyrants of the earth dominion over the sacred things of God. These are not fanciful statements; they are practical grievances and crimes illustrated by the history of every Christian country that has been subject to despotic rule. In despotic states, these crimes are practised at the present day as well as at former periods. The greatest despot in Europe is the greatest enemy to religion, and especially of the Catholic Church. The monster Nicholas ought to be the *beau-ideal* of your political imagination; and, accordingly, he is the greatest persecutor of Catholicity who has lived since the days of Dioclesian. Talk to me, after this, of the danger you apprehend from the Liberal movement party! To go a little back, the monarch of France, when he enjoyed absolute power, was, from the reign of Philip to that of Louis XVI., the tyrant of the Church. Under the name of Gallican liberties, a real servitude was constructed; and the progress, first of Jansenism, and afterwards of infidelity, might, perhaps, be traced to the triply-fettered state of the clergy. In Spain, and in Portugal, too, the kings were no less despotic

over the clergy and the Church than they were over the people at large. With the appearances of much Catholicity, religion suffered from the servitude of the clergy to the state. And it was in despotic Portugal and Spain that the first edicts were issued for the suppression of the great support of literature and religion—the society of the Jesuits.

But, to turn to the times we live in ; in Protestant Prussia, where perfect absolutism reigns, the Catholic Church is in thralldom, and in, as yet, unbroken chains. You may, perhaps, say it is because Prussia is Protestant. I say she works out her Protestantism through her despotism ; and, but for the undying but not tumultuary resistance of the Catholic movement party there, Catholicity would be annihilated in the Prussian dominions.

What will you say to Austria ? the most Catholic monarchy at present in Europe. Yet, I ask you, if the Catholic Church is not there in perfect thralldom ? Does not the Emperor claim power and authority over the Catholic Church almost as great as that arrogated by Henry VIII. ? The late Emperor was personally a religious man, most attentive to all acts of private devotion ; yet he never relaxed the iron grasp which the crafty Metternich made him take of the Church. Nothing can be more painful to a rational Catholic, than to think of the degrading rule of a temporal magistrate over the spiritual functionaries. In the Austrian dominions the clergy and the corporals are appointed after the same fashion, and bound alike to the state by the same implicit unreasoning submission. Besides the crime of thus usurping spiritual authority, religion suffers to the core from the disregard and contempt to which a clergy thus appointed and constituted are necessarily subject ; a state-dependent clergy are always detested or despised. It is, therefore, perfectly clear you are thoroughly mistaken, when you imagine that absolutism is useful to religion or to the Catholic Church.

Here, again, I have reason to complain of your mode of

acting. You endeavour by your advocacy, as a Catholic, of the Corn Laws, to stain Catholicity itself with the guilt of that sordid monopoly. You endeavour, by your advocacy of the prudence of deserting the fallen fortunes of the Whigs, to stain Catholicity with the deepest, the blackest, the most causeless ingratitude that ever dishonoured public men. You endeavour by your assertion of the utility to religion of despotism, to stain Catholicity itself with the foul blot of servility and of attachment to arbitrary power. My humble endeavour is, to rescue the sacred cause of the Catholic Church from all the defilement of your mistaken advocacy. My conviction thoroughly is, that the real Liberal party—the peaceful movement party—is that which can alone produce salutary results to man, and also, that it most conduces to the good of religion and the just independence of the Catholic Church. It is therefore that I am the humble, but most zealous supporter of that peaceable Liberal party which, for shortness, I shall call the movement party. I cherish it as the best hope of rational freedom. I cherish it, because I am the friend of perfect liberty to every man, of every colour, cast, and creed, throughout the world. I cherish it, because, by leaving conscience unscathed by temporal or legal restrictions, it predisposes man to listen to the sweet soft voice of persuasive truth, and thus give to Catholicity its genuine influence, whilst it secures the Catholic Church itself from the blighting effects of state power, and from the tyrannic sway of temporal authority.

You have one great advantage over me. You dexterously confound the “peaceable liberal party” to which I belong, with the sanguinary wretches who polluted France with blood under the assumed names of “Liberals” and “Friends of Freedom.” You confound with us the persons who in many parts of Europe assume the name of Liberals, not because they are the friends of liberty, but because they are the enemies of religion. Several of these mock Liberals have sought to disturb Italy, and have failed. But their mock liberality is triumphant

in Spain, where the vile Espartero revels, amidst his ill-gotten power, in sanguinary persecution of the Catholic clergy and Church.

I belong not to such parties. I am more their enemy than you are. The party to which I belong has a necessary tendency to promote private morality and the practice of every public virtue.

Yes! With a popular Government, private morality is under the guard of public opinion. And a free press has frequently more control, is more potential to restrain the enormity of vice, than the influence of much teaching. In a popular Government, legitimate ambition can be best gratified through the channels of popular elections; and no man can afford to undergo the ordeal of a democratic election, unless his private character and moral conduct are so correct as to enable him to defy any serious accusation of guilt or turpitude.

It may be said that I exaggerate the good effects of democratic institutions. But it cannot possibly be denied, that the efficacy of public opinion in such institutions, must have considerable influence in causing men to be really that which they would wish others to believe them to be.

It is to the Church—to the Catholic Church—that the honest spirit of democracy ought to be, and must be, the most useful. In an honest democracy, there would be no paramount interest to subjugate the Church, or to seek to make it the creature of the state. The respect which each person would claim for his own opinion, would require of him to treat with equal justice the opinions of others; and the hopelessness of establishing a clerical ascendancy would take away from sectarianism the temptation to turbulence and the temporal reward of bigotry. Under such a Government, the Church would be free; uncontrolled by temporal enactments, and totally unchecked by legislative restrictions. The intercourse with the centre of unity would be as unfettered as the intercourse by letter through the post office. And the hierarchy would meet no impediment in their arrangements touching spiritual matters, which thus would

be for ever separated from merely political concerns. The differences on matters of belief between various classes of Christians, would be left open to free discussion and tranquil reasoning. And from contests of that description, the Catholic Church would have everything to hope and nothing to fear.

That religion and the Church would be left free under a popular Government is not mere matter of theory. Its practical proofs abound. And as I began with the effects on religion of despotism in Russia, I will now first refer to the political antipodes of that country—the United States of America. Here, if anywhere, the democratic spirit exists, and animates the entire Government; and here religion extends, and the Church accordingly prospers. When the thirteen states were provinces of Great Britain, there was no Catholic bishop in British America. Even after their independence was established, there was but one bishop. Behold how gloriously that Church now stands forward! There are now in the United States one archbishop, and twenty bishops—in all twenty-one. Catholicity is spreading at every side. The English travellers, notwithstanding all their paltry prejudices against the Catholic religion, admit—I use their own words—that its increase is “rapid”—“surprising”—“enormous.” Some of them, in the excess of their fears, excited by the facts that surrounded them, declare that all the professing Christians of America will speedily be Catholics; whilst others, restrained by their prejudice, limit that pleasing anticipation to what are called the Western countries; that is, the great valleys of Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi; immense, almost incalculable tracts of fertile countries, rapidly becoming peopled with myriads of human beings, all destined to be Catholics.

From America let us pass rapidly to the banks of the Rhine, and there you will find that the protection of Catholicity against the despotism of Prussia, to which I have already alluded, is entirely due to the spirit of the movement among the people. Men imbued, like you, with the apathy arising from Tory opinion, would have submitted, and acquiesced, and permitted

the mischief to be completed, whilst you hoped for something good to arise at some future period from the "joy and generosity" of your triumphant enemies. The Rhenish people were not of that disposition; the groundswell of popular discontent that presages the coming storm was distinctly perceived; and the throes of the struggling, though pent-up volcano, were becoming daily more and more perceptible. Then indeed, but not before, the Prussian Government deemed it prudent to recognise the causes of coming mischief, and to promise (and at least in part to perform the promise) to give more freedom and security to the Catholic Church in the Prussian dominions. Thanks to the movement and spirit of the people for this, or perhaps, shortly, a more useful result.

May you not, my lord, pause for one moment upon Ireland, and see whether her moral condition has not improved during our democratic struggle for extended freedom.

I might incur again your contemptuous sneer if I were to praise my loved fellow-countrymen as they really deserve. But, without meaning you any offence, I may be permitted to remark that the only country in the world capable of exhibiting the moral miracle of upwards of four millions of human beings pledged to perfect sobriety, is my country—Ireland! You cannot deny that this result has been produced after the moral elements of political strife were raised into agitation, and kept in commotion longer and more continuously than in any other country in Europe, thus proving that the democratic principle has its tendency to elevate the mind and improve the moral tact of feeling: We are, my lord, eminently a Catholic people. Our glorious and unbroken hierarchy—the unclouded jewel of our once national crown, is in perfect canonical submission and in perfect Catholic attachment to the centre of unity—the Holy See.

We do combine the principle of the fullest civil liberty with the most entire religious fidelity to the faith and doctrine of the Catholic Church. Even I myself cannot resist the impulse that makes me declare, that, whilst no man living is a more

ardent and undeviating advocate of the purest principles of democratic liberty than I am, so there is not in Christendom any one human being more submissive to the authority of the Church, or more obedient to the voice of her Chief Pastor.

My individual opinions on these subjects are, I well know, of no importance or value for being mine. They are deserving of attention and respect only because of their identity with those of the universal Catholic people of Ireland.

There is much in your pamphlet which has given me pain—bitter pain; it grieves me exceedingly to see the Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury exhibit such rankling prejudices against the development of the principles of civil liberty. Why, you carry this envenomed prejudice to so great an extent, as actually to tarnish with your suspicions and doubts the glorious and successful struggles of the Belgian people in the sacred cause of religion and liberty.

Do you recollect the state of the Belgians before their "glorious and immortal" revolution? Loaded with an enormous public debt, which the Belgians never contracted, never got value for, and did not justly owe; oppressed by cruel taskmasters, "aliens in blood, in language, and in religion;" impoverished to support those oppressors in riot and luxury, they endured all the political evils that misgovernment could inflict. But still worse was the state of their religious sufferings. Protestantism has in itself something so foreign from stability or security, that it must necessarily be intolerant of dissent. Besides the scheme of the late king, whose mantle (rather the worse for the wear) has fallen on the present monarch, his scheme, I say, to form a great Protestant power in the centre of Europe, of which he was to be the chief leader, was eagerly embraced by the King of the Netherlands, under the auspices of the English Tory government. The Belgian Catholics were accordingly persecuted with emaciating rigour; not the persecution of the sword and the faggot, and of the other cruelties of the Vandermucks and the Soncis of former days, which, though they inflicted the pains, yet conferred the

glory of martyrdom. No! the persecution of the Netherland king was of a low, pettifogging, unhonouring nature. It was more like the rancour of an envious trader, and more suited to the malignity of an undersold manufacturer. It was, however, skilfully managed, and admirably contrived for success. The Catholic Belgians were discountenanced in every way. They were discouraged in every trade and branch of industry; the Protestants, especially Dutch Protestants, preferred to them. They were excluded from all the high ranks, almost without exception in the army; from all the high stations almost without exception in the revenue and judicial departments. They were admitted only in small numbers and with much difficulty into the lower ranks, grades, and stations from which they could not well be excluded. They were reduced to something like the state of serfs in their native land. Practically, they were a slave class, having a master class ruling them. Even in the legislature, Holland, with one-half the population of Belgium, had as many representatives as Belgium—a most iniquitous, although, my gentle lord, a mitigated copy of what you advocate elsewhere!

The attack on the Catholic religion and Catholic Church was still more insidious, more artful, and of course, more criminal. The plan was first to leave the several dioceses without bishops, and in the absence of the pastors to corrupt and defile the immediate guardians of the flocks. Accordingly, as the sees became vacant, the king prevented their being filled. In the beginning this was done under the pretext that there should first be a regular *Concordat*, or compact between the Pope and the state. The king demanded from the Pope a *Veto* upon the nomination of the bishops, that is, in other words, a circuitous power of appointment; for he who has an unrestricted veto has really the selection of the bishop. The inconvenience was manifest; yet as see after see became vacant, the Pope, at length, fearing that the Belgian prelaty would be totally exhausted—there were, as I recollect, all the dioceses vacant except one—did in an unhappy hour concede the *Veto* of the king; a concession which, I trust, neither the present

nor any other Pope will ever again make to any other monarch, potentate, or state—Catholic or Protestant.

The king now expected to be able to fill the vacant episcopacies with pliant slaves in holy orders. But to the immortal glory of the Catholic priesthood of Belgium not one corrupt priest could there be found to enter into the king's views or to promote his sacrilegious purposes. The consequence was, that although the king had the power of appointment thus in his hands, not one single bishop was consecrated, and there remained but one bishop in the entire Belgian territory at the epoch of the liberation of that nation.

The project for the ruin of the parochial clergy was still more crafty, subtle, and disgusting. Education was interfered with at its source. The diocesan seminaries should not exist. The succession of pastors was to be interrupted. I may include all in one sentence—no priest should be ordained to serve in the Belgian Church unless he should first spend three or four years in the Philosophie College of Louvain! The young man was thus to be taken from the protection, care, and guidance of experienced instructors of known piety and learning; he was to be taken from the precept-speaking-by-example of his pious sacerdotal superiors; he was to be taken just at the period when nature, in the freshness of youth, is most subject to every bad passion, and is most strongly tempted to every vice. At that period the youth was to be taken from his spiritual fathers, teachers, friends! He was to be exposed to the loose discipline, the lax habits, the sneering infidelity of worthless companions, and more powerfully corrupting instructors. He was to prepare for the awful duties and painful restraints of the priesthood, by just that kind of course which would be best calculated to render him totally unfit for that high and holy office.

The Belgians—blessed be Heaven!—have flung off the incubus of tyranny and bigotry. The people possess their natural rights; the representatives are chosen by most extensive suffrage. The native country of the Belgians is possessed and governed by the Belgians themselves.

Well-regulated freedom affords protection to all—partiality to none. Education is free, the Press is free, conscience is free. The churches are filled with pious pastors of the people. The dioceses boast of their dignified and sanctioned prelacy. The diocesan seminaries flourish. The Jesuits—the exemplary and admirable Jesuits—extend the blessings of education in all arts and sciences to the wealthier classes; whilst the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine spread useful and, above all, pious knowledge amongst the humbler and lower classes. The sainted sisterhoods of nuns distribute similar blessings amongst the females of every rank and station.

Conscience, my lord, is free. In Belgium no legal preference, no legal exclusion affects the full freedom of man's conscience. In that eminently Catholic country there exists no coercion or control by the law or the constitution over the perfect freedom of worship. In that eminently Catholic country the pure democratic principle of representation is successfully worked out to almost its fullest extent. How I rejoiced when the virtuous De Thieux proposed in the Belgian House of Representatives a grant to build a church for the Protestants of Brussels. The motion for the grant was carried in that Catholic assembly by a large majority—a majority of nearly two to one. There were four Catholic priests in the division; and if one voted against it, three voted for it, and made part of the majority in its favour.

How little does the narrow-minded bigotry of English Protestantism and infidelity understand these things! Do you also forget that the punishment of death had been for so many years abolished in Catholic Belgium? The experiment has perfectly succeeded, and humanity is freed from one of the greatest of horrors.

But you, my lord—you are so horror-struck at popular liberty that you actually question whether the Belgian revolution has done more of good or of evil! Why, it was you who some time ago deemed it but small risk to peril “blood and blows”—ay, “brains and blood,” in a quarrel in which your personal

privileges were involved!—the Emancipation struggle; and yet you shrink from the results of that goodly, glorious change, which gave cheering, national independence in the room of heartless foreign subjugation, which gave the rule of law in place of the arbitrary will of the oppressor, and substituted for the unconcealed conspiracy to extinguish Catholicity, the benevolent reign of freedom of conscience, and the consequent triumphant security of the Catholic religion and Catholic Church.

In your capacity of a Tory you may embrace despotism in all its forms, and rest all your hopes of the security of rights and the safety of your creed upon the “joy and generosity” of dominant minions of absolute power.

For my humble part, I will, notwithstanding your authority, continue to believe that the real security to human rights is to be found in the expansion of popular liberty, and that the best temporal safeguard of religion is to be met with among men devoted to the amelioration of political institutions, and the redress of all popular grievances.

It is true that your antipathy to Liberal opinions in political affairs is especially animated with regard to the Repeal of the Union. The Repeal is, in your judgment, the great evil—the giant mischief of Liberality. Is it credible that you have the vanity to believe that the Irish people could be swayed by your lucubrations, put into the shape of a pamphlet, to abandon or postpone the agitation of that measure? If that vanity be yours it will be totally disappointed. You may as well assail a citadel with a pop-gun, as think of staying the course of the Repeal struggle by your small logic! Learn from me that the Repeal is a struggle already canonized in the hearts of the Irish people, and that its attainment is a pure question of time. Casual circumstances may retard it; unexpected events may accelerate it; but there is no other hope for Ireland, and even if there were, the Repeal is so much preferable to any other relief that its advent is inevitable.

As for myself, I have no apology to make; I offer no excuse, I require no vindication for my agitation of the Repeal. On

the contrary, the pride and boast of my life now is, that I have devoted all my energies, and consecrated all the rest of my existence to the restoration of the Irish Parliament. That this is my solemn and sacred duty I am thoroughly persuaded. My conviction is deliberate and fixed upon these points—

Firstly—That Ireland has a clear, indefeasible right to a Parliament of her own; the Union being in constitutional principle a nullity; there having been no competent authority to annihilate the constitution of Ireland.

Secondly—That even if there had been a competent authority to enact the Union, yet the means used for that purpose were so notoriously unjust and profligately iniquitous that the Union for this cause alone would be a nullity.

Thirdly—That even if the Union were not a nullity, from the defect of competence, or from the iniquitous mode of obtaining it, yet there is no real Union at all, nor any thing more than an oppressive mockery of a Union.

Fourthly—That this Union has inflicted injustice, oppression, and misery unparalleled on Ireland; and there is not, and cannot be, any hope for present redress, or future security, save by a restoration of the Irish Parliament.

In England, the first of these topics is totally disregarded—the inherent and essential invalidity of the Union. There is a species of robber-conscience made up on the subject. They have gotten the spoil, and deem it superfluous to inquire how the spoliation was achieved. But the rightful owner is knocking at the door to demand restitution; and that demand will become too loud and too multitudinous to be neglected. You must answer for your title to withhold what is justly and lawfully ours. Yes; it is perfectly clear that there was no authority competent to enact the Union. The right to an Irish Parliament was a right inherent in the inhabitants of that country. It was a common law right, part and parcel of the inheritance of the English people—the right to be taxed only by their own representatives—the right to have the laws by which they are governed made by their own representatives.

The right practically exhibited itself in Ireland almost as soon as it became ostensible in England.

It is true that at first, and for many years, a Parliament was enjoyed by and confined to persons of English descent. The Parliament was in its origin confined to the English pale, and it expanded or shrunk in its dimensions as the English power extended or was contracted. But the Irish who became subjects participated in the right, showing that it was an essential portion of English freedom—inherent in the natural frame of English policy. At length, in the reign of James I., the English power extended all over Ireland. The remnants of the Irish nation were admitted to the fellowship of allegiance, duties, and franchise; the royal prerogative also expanded, and was employed more abundantly than wisely. All Ireland thus had her rightful Parliament, and continued to have it from 1612 to the year 1800.

The Irish Parliament was thus founded on constitutional principles, sanctioned by long usage, and sustained by analogy to the English form of government. It was also fortified by the experience of the colonies and dependencies of England. Wherever Englishmen or Irishmen, or both settled, they carried with them the right of representation. The thirteen States of North America, while they were provinces of England, had each its local Parliament. The English subjects in Canada enjoyed and enjoy the same privilege; so in Nova Scotia; so in Jamaica—I need not multiply instances.

A local parliament is the inherent and inefaceable right of subjects of the Crown of England, wherever they are located in sufficient numbers as to exercise that right. Ireland had not enjoyed this right for centuries. She had as valid a title to a Parliament as England had—perhaps a better; because Ireland having been left to her own protection during the American war, raised a volunteer army, upwards of 80,000 strong, horse, foot, and militia, levied, clothed, and disciplined, without the expense of one shilling of the public money. She set the foreign enemy at defiance.

Ireland might then, without difficulty, have separated from England, and established, after the example of America, a Government altogether national. But Ireland chose, as she still desires, to preserve the connection with England. Ireland, however, insisted that the conditions of her future connection should be defined. Her just demands were acceded to. Her legislative independence was formally recognised, and was established "for ever." Her judicial independence was formally recognised and established "for ever." Ireland had been thus recognised by England, who declared perpetual her exclusive right of making her own laws, of interpreting her own laws, of administering her own laws; she had the exclusive dominion over her own taxation, debt, and revenue. In short, the result was a recognition in practical effect of all these rights which she was entitled to, and which she had, notwithstanding some interruptions and English usurpations, enjoyed for centuries.

There never yet was a more deliberate and solemn national compact. It was declared on all sides to be a "final adjustment." That was the appropriate description of this compact, given to it in the King's speech to the English Parliament—in the Lord Lieutenant's speech to the Irish Parliament—in the responding address of the British Lords, and also of the British Commons—in the responding address of the Irish Lords, and also of the Irish Commons.

But the greatest validity of this compact was its being formed on the clearest inherent right and on the most unquestionable constitutional principle. By its ratification England preserved the brightest, the emerald gem of the British crown; and Ireland fondly believed that she had secured for ever her legislative independence. Such was the "final adjustment" of 1782. Ireland, with her proverbial fidelity, performed her part. England, with her proverbial treachery, violated the "final adjustment," as soon as she found, or rather made, an opportunity for its violation.

That violation has not, and cannot have taken away the right. Fraud or force, or both together, can never take away

the right of any property; still less can they destroy the unalterable, indefeasible right to self-government. Such is the actual right of Ireland to self-government; suspended in its operation for the present, but existing in truth, reason, justice, and constitutional principle as fully and as powerfully as if no invasion had been made in its practical working.

First, there is the clear principle, that the right of the people of Ireland to self-government could not be extinguished. Secondly, the Irish Parliament was totally incompetent to enact the Union. Consider the nature and purpose of its formation. In its nature it emanated from, and was subordinate to the constitution; in its nature it was strictly confined within the limits of the constitution. Its purposes were, within those limits, to do right and justice to all men.

On the other hand, it was not instituted to destroy the constitution or any other part thereof. It could not abolish the kingly office nor the peerage, nor annihilate the House of Commons.

Let it be recollected that I am now speaking of the rightful authority to do these things, not of the power to do them. Any branch of the legislature may in bad times and by bad means acquire the power of abolition and of annihilation of the rest. But that power does not—cannot—change the right. The Long Parliament abolished the kingly office, and took off the head of the king. They did the one by a formal statute, the other by a recorded judicial proceeding. But no man hesitates to declare that both the one and the other were outrages and crimes, and not a binding law nor an authorised judgment. The statute was admitted to be of no rightful force or effect, and, accordingly, when by the change of time Charles II. was able to return to England, he assumed the throne at once. It entered into no man's thought that it was necessary to repeal the Abolition-of-Royalty statute, or to make any law of restoration. The kingly office was at once in full life, and was judicially as well as universally admitted to have been, in point of right and justice, and of constitutional principle, existing all the time of the king's

absence; and historians, statesmen, and lawyers all reckon the years of the king's forced inaction as years of his actual reign.

So with respect to the peerage; the same Parliament abolished the House of Lords. It was an abolition by power and not of right. And accordingly the House of Lords revived with the restored monarchy, without any restoring law, or any person imagining that it was or could be necessary formally to abrogate the abolishing ordinance!

No; the peerage was judicially, as well as universally, admitted to have been in existence in point of right, of justice, and of constitutional principle, all the time of its apparent annihilation.

So with respect to the House of Commons itself; that was also abolished, and a clumsy "instrument of Government" substituted in its stead. But it was an abolition by power and not by right, and accordingly the functions of the Commons revived with the privileges of the peerage, and with the authority of the monarch, without any restoring law, or any person imagining that it was or could be necessary to abrogate the "instrument of Government." No; the right to elect a House of Commons was judicially as well as universally admitted to have been, in point of right, of justice, and of constitutional principle, existing all the time in its apparent annihilation.

Thus the Irish constitution still lives. The prerogatives attached to her Majesty's imperial crown of Ireland still exist. And the just right of the Irish people, in point of justice and of constitutional principle, to representation in the Irish House of Commons, subsists in full and undiminished rightful capacity.

The prerogatives of the Irish crown have been shorn of some of their beams by the Union. Yet they are capable of expanding again, and of reviving and restoring into pristine vigour and practical operation the entire constitution of Ireland.

This ground of want of competence in the Parliament to enact the Union was taken at the time the measure was in agitation. It was taken at several meetings, and embodied in published resolutions and petitions to both Houses. It was

asserted in Parliament, and had, in and out of Parliament, the sanction of the highest names in the profession of the law, the highest amongst whom was Plunket.

Here are his solemn words, in a speech in the House of Commons, against the Union :—

“I, in the most express terms, deny the competence of Parliament to do this Act. I warn you, do not dare to lay your hands upon the constitution. I tell you that if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this Act it will be a nullity, and no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it. I make this assertion deliberately, and call on any man who hears me to take down my words. You have not been elected for this purpose. You have been appointed to make laws, not legislatures. You are appointed to act under the constitution, not to destroy it. You are appointed to exercise the functions of legislators, not to transfer them; and, if you do so, your Act is a dissolution to the Government, and no man in the land is bound to obey you.”

Again, in another passage, he addressed the House thus :—

“Yourselves you may extinguish, but the Parliament you cannot extinguish. It is enthroned in the hearts of the people—it is established in the sanctuary of the constitution—it is immortal as the island it protects! As well might the frantic maniac hope that the act which destroys his miserable body should extinguish his eternal soul. Do not dare to lay your hands upon the constitution—it is above your power!”

Such was the solemnly-delivered and recorded judgment of Plunket. Is his authority to be disputed? It cannot be because of any censure he incurred or any punishment he suffered for the promulgation of his opinions. Quite the reverse. He attained and enjoyed the highest station and honours in his profession. He was made Master of the Rolls in England. He was made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in Ireland. He was made a British peer. He finally filled the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland for more than ten years. Can his authority be disputed?

Plunket was a Whig. The next is a high Orange-Tory authority—it is that of William Saurin.

“You may make the Union,” said he, “binding as a law, but you cannot make it obligatory in conscience. It will be

obeyed so long as England is strong ; but resistance to it will be in the abstract a duty, and the exhibition of that resistance will be a mere question of prudence." The man who proclaimed this doctrine as his solemn, conscientious opinion and advice, was soon after made Attorney-General for Ireland. He continued for more than twenty years in that office, possessing more of the confidence of the English Government—all Tories—than any other Attorney-General that ever held that office. He was the high Orange Attorney-General of Perceval, and Castlereagh, and Peel. He was offered, and he refused, the seat of Lord Chief Justice of Ireland.

Yes. The Union was a nullity. I attest Plunket and Saurin for the doctrine. The immortal soul of the Irish constitution still lives, glorious and perpetual. It is not dead—it only sleeps, to be aroused into active existence once again, "so soon as England ceases to be strong," and Ireland ceases to be weak in her internal dissensions. Until then the Union is to be obeyed as a law, sustained by judicial and military power ; but "the abstract duty of resistance" will be unchanged, and the question of prudence left to coming events ; with this consolation, that when the hour for the peaceful assertion of existing rights shall arise—and I believe it not to be remote—the prerogatives of our gracious Queen will speedily and satisfactorily restore the constitution of Ireland.

The second position, namely, "That even had there been an authority competent to enact the Union, yet the mode and means of procuring that enactment were so flagitiously iniquitous, as to render the enactment utterly void and of no rightful effect."

Upon this head I need do little more than quote authorities. Lord Shrewsbury himself admits that, in order to carry the Union, "Ireland was goaded into rebellion by the wily policy of a wicked and ambitious minister ; then terrified by the atrocities committed in her subjugation."

But the wily policy of that ambitious minister was still more wicked than Lord Shrewsbury has admitted, for the people were not only, on the one hand, goaded into rebellion, but, on

the other hand, the rebellious proceedings were actually fostered until the organisation was considered sufficiently extended to produce an explosion violent enough to enable the Crown to obtain despotic authority, in order to put it down. The direct evidence of this diabolical fomentation of rebellion is to be found in the fact, that the progress of the military organisation of the Presbyterians of Ulster (the treasonable conspiracy having commenced with them) was perfectly well known to the Government for eleven months prior to the rebellion. It appears by the Report of the House of Lords, that during all that time one of the rebel colonels was a spy in the pay of the Treasury, and that he transmitted to the Castle regular reports of all the meetings' proceedings. The Government could, therefore, at any period during those eleven months, have laid hold on the entire of the rebel staff. And, of course, they would have done so, if they had not had in view the ulterior object, to obtain which, they thought any sacrifice of blood cheap. That object was the Union.

This wily and wicked minister also promoted the most bitter religious dissensions among all classes of the people. But let me use Lord Plunket's words in his charge against that minister: "I accuse him," he said, "of fomenting the embers of a lingering rebellion; of hallooing the Protestant against the Catholic, and the Catholic against the Protestant; of artfully keeping alive domestic dissensions for the purposes of subjugation?"

This was not all. It should be recollected that during the entire time in which the Union was discussed, Martial Law was proclaimed; the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; there was in Ireland no species of legal protection for property, liberty, or life; the persons of the King's Irish subjects were at the caprice of the King's ministers. The gaols were crammed with victims, unaccused by any species of legal evidence; and the scaffolds were actually reeking with the blood of wretches, untried by any legal tribunal.

All the time the Union was under discussion, courts-martial had unlimited power over life and limb. Bound by no definite

form of charge, and by no fixed rule of evidence, the courts-martial threatened with death those who dared to resist the spoliation of their birthright, and awarded execution against whom they pleased.

During that time, the use of torture was familiar. Men, against whom there was no evidence of guilt, were flogged, very many nearly to death, to extort confessions. Some were actually flogged to death, and died under the excruciating torment.

There were upwards of 175,000 British bayonets in Ireland. The officers had recognised power of life and death. The "Ancient Britons" and other private soldiers took that power. Public meetings were called by magistrates and other local authorities, to petition against the Union. They were either prevented from assembling, or were dispersed when they met by military violence. Two prominent and striking instances amongst many may be related:—A meeting of the nobility, gentry, and freeholders of the county Tipperary was duly convened by the high sheriff to meet at Clonmel, in order to petition against the Union. The meeting was attended by noblemen and gentlemen of rank, fortune, and undoubted loyalty; yet, the high sheriff had scarcely taken the chair, when a division of the army marched into the courthouse, drove the sheriff from the chair, and dispersed the meeting. The sacred right of petition was violated by a like military outrage at Maryborough. Although the meeting was convened by the high sheriff of the Queen's County, yet it was dispersed by Colonel Connor, of the North Cork militia, at the head of a party of horse, foot, and artillery.

I am spared all trouble, however, save that of copying the emphatic description of Lord Plunket of the time and manner of carrying the Union. Here are the words of Lord Plunket:—

"I will be bold to say, that licentious and impious France, in all the unrestrained excesses that anarchy and atheism have given birth to, has not committed a more insidious act against her enemy than is now attempted by the professed champion of civilised Europe against Ireland; a friend and ally in the hour of her calamity and distress. At a moment when our country is

filled with British troops; when the Habeas Corpus Act is suspended; whilst trials by courts-martial are carried on in different parts of the kingdom; while the people are made to believe that they have no right to meet and deliberate, and whilst the people are palsied by their fears; at the moment when we are distracted by internal dissensions, dissensions kept alive as the pretext of our present subjugation and the instrument of our future thralldom; such is the time when the Union is proposed."

Such was the time and such the manner in which the Union was proposed and carried. Breathes there a man so devoid of all sense of justice as to say, that the Irish could be justly, and as of right, deprived of their native legislature by means such as these? Even Lord Shrewsbury admits—I quote his own words—"that there was too much of fraud and violence to effectuate the Union; there was too wide a departure from the principles on which alone a happy alliance could be founded, ever to allow Ireland to look at other consequences than those which have rendered the Union so abortive and so prolific of evil."

But the direct means of carrying the Union were, if possible, more infamous and iniquitous still. It was the most open, base, and profligate bribery and corruption that ever yet stained the annals of any country.

The late Lord Chief Justice Bushe declared, I use his words, "that the basest corruption and artifice were exerted to promote it; that all the worst passions of the human heart were entered into the service, and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect was tortured to devise new contrivances of fraud."

The leading feature in the Union was the daring profligacy of the bribery and corruption by which it was carried. They were reduced into a regular system. They were avowed in the House; acted on everywhere. The minister set about purchasing votes. He opened office with full hands. The peerage was part of his stock in trade, and he made some two score of peers in exchange for Union votes. The episcopal bench was brought into the market, and ten or twelve bishoprics were trucked for Union votes. The bench of "justice" became a

commodity, and one chief justice and eight puisne judges and barons ascended the bench, as the price of votes for the Union! It would extend beyond my calculation to make out a list of the generals, admirals, colonels, navy captains, and other naval and military promotions that rewarded personal or kindred votes for the Union.

The revenue departments have long been notorious merchandise of corruption. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Board of Excise and Customs, either conjointly or separately, and the multifarious fiscal offices, especially the legal offices, were filled to suffocation as the rewards of Union votes.

The price of a single vote was formally known. It was £3,000 in money; or a civil or military appointment to the value of £2,000 per annum.

Lord Castlereagh actually declared in the House of Commons that he would carry the Union, though it might cost more than half a million in mere bribes! His words, as reported by Grattan, are these:—"Half a million or more was expended some years since to make an opportunity. The same, or a greater sum, may be necessary now." Such was the open, the unblushing, the impudent effrontery of Lord Castlereagh. Grattan added: "He (Lord Castlereagh) had said so in the most extensive sense of bribery and corruption. The threat was proceeded on: the peerage sold—the caitiffs of corruption were everywhere—in the lobby, in the streets, on the steps, and at the doors of every Parliamentary leader: offering titles to some—offices to others—corruption to all."

Lord Castlereagh went to an extent of corruption far beyond the half million for bribes. The Parliamentary papers, published since the Union, show that no less than £1,275,000 was paid as the actual purchase money for close and rotten boroughs. And the best calculation of the actual bribes, over and above the borough purchase, was no less than £1,500,000.

Yet, strange to say, all this direct corruption did not avail. The Union was rejected by the Parliament of 1799; and was carried in that of 1800, chiefly by the introduction into nomi-

nation boroughs of Scotch and English officers, quartered in Ireland, but having no species of connection by birth or property with this country.

Although every possible opposition was given to the petitions of the Irish people, yet it should be recorded to the honour of that people, that no less than 707,000 of them petitioned against the Union; whilst all the artifices and direct bribery of the Government could not procure full 5,000 to petition in its favour.

Let it be remarked, that no one has ever yet had the audacity to say that the Union was a bargain between the two countries. It stands out in its native deformity, the mere creature of fraud, force, bribery, terror, and corruption; utterly incapable in its nature of depriving Ireland of her clear right to her own Parliament.

Having thus shown that there was no authority competent to extinguish the Irish Parliament, and that even had there been such an authority, yet the means of carrying the Union were so flagitious that they could not confer any right upon England, or deprive Ireland of any right, I proceed in my third assertion.

Thirdly, "That even if the Union were not a nullity, from the defect of competence, or from the iniquitous mode of obtaining it, yet there is no real Union at all, nor anything more than an oppressive mockery of a Union."

There is no real Union. If there were there would be no difference between the franchises, and rights, and privileges of the two nations. A real Union would be an amalgamation of both. Both would be combined. They would be one nation—one people; not two nations—two people; the inhabitants of Kent and of Kerry, of Meath and of Hampshire, would be identified, or rather England, and Scotland, and Ireland would be identified. There would be no preference for one and enmity for the other. The inhabitants of one would be on a perfect equality with those of the others. National jealousies and antipathies would be unknown, for their causes would cease to exist. There is no legal distinction between

Englishmen and Irishmen; there would be no legal distinction between Irishmen and Englishmen.

But is this so? Is there such an amalgamation? such an identification of the two nations? No man is absurd enough to allege that there is; it is perfectly plain that there is not. It follows of inevitable, irresistible conclusion, that there is no real Union.

On this point, my lord, your authority is express. You yourself have avowed that the Union made Ireland "the slave of her relentless master (namely England) and not a handmaid; the servile dependent instead of an honourable partner." You declared, and declared truly, "that the Union was abortive of good and prolific of evil; being only a union of words, not of hearts; of force, not of affection."

If the Union were real, the Irish people would have the enjoyment of the same freedom, in matters pertaining to religion, that the people of England and of Scotland have.

The people of England have this religious freedom; that the entire English people are not compelled to apply the ecclesiastical state revenues of England to the support of the church of a small minority of the English nation. On the contrary, these revenues are appropriated to the sustentation of the Church of the great majority of that nation.

The people of Scotland have their religious freedom; the entire Scotch people are not compelled to apply the ecclesiastical state revenues of Scotland to the support of the Church of a small minority of the English people. On the contrary, these revenues are appropriated to the sustentation of the Church of the overwhelming majority of that nation.

The people of Ireland alone of the three nations do not enjoy this religious freedom. On the contrary, they endure this miserable servitude, embittered by the contrast with the two other countries, that the ecclesiastical state revenues of Ireland are exclusively appropriated to the Church of an exceedingly small minority of the Irish nation.

Thus, in this most important concern, the Union is

a barefaced mockery, and resembles in nothing Union.

This is probably the most unendurable inferiority that can be inflicted on any country, under the delusive pretext that there was a Union with the ascendant nation. Look next at another insulting inferiority. England and Scotland have enjoyed an ample measure of municipal reform for several years.

Ireland was contemptuously refused any municipal reform during those years, and finally received a restricted, limited, and vexatious measure of municipal reform.

Is it possible for you to call that a Union? Can anybody be found sufficiently audacious to assert, that a Union is the right name for such a connection between the two countries?

In England every citizen assessed to the poor and borough rate is a burgess, and entitled to vote at all municipal elections, on condition that he pays that one tax. It is immaterial how low an English citizen is rated. He is entitled to his municipal franchise, if rated at all. It is so in Liverpool.

But in Ireland—in Dublin, for example—it is essentially different. No man is entitled in Dublin to the burgess franchise unless he be rated at £10 a year. As the valuation for rating is always much lower than the real value, the Irishman in Dublin must, in fact, occupy a tenement worth near £20 a year to be entitled to be a burgess.

Besides this, there is another essential difference. In Liverpool or Bristol, the resident Englishman is entitled to be a burgess upon paying one tax. In Dublin the Irishman must be, as I have said, rated at £10, and he must pay nine taxes at least, in order to enjoy the franchise.

What is the consequence? Why, that in Dublin there are 22,000 persons rated to the poor rate. If these persons were English, and living at Liverpool, at least 20,000 of them would be entitled to the burgess franchise. Whereas, in Dublin, less than one-third of them, or only 7,000, are so entitled.

Can anybody be so absurd and, I will add, so vicious, as to assert that there is a real Union between the two countries,

when the Englishman in Liverpool has, in point of municipal franchises, three times the advantages which the Irishman has in Dublin; and while the Irishman has but one-third of the advantages which the Englishman possesses in Liverpool?

There is another most important disparagement of the Irish municipal constituency. In Bristol, for example, the municipal burgesses are entitled to elect that officer, so important to the protection of life and property, the high sheriff. In Dublin the burgesses are totally deprived of that advantage.

Is that a Union? Lord Shrewsbury, I ask you this question. Or, if it be a Union, is it not the Union which—to use your own language—subsists between a slave and his relentless master?

Again, my Lord Shrewsbury, if there were a real Union, the people of Ireland would be entitled to as abundant a Parliamentary franchise as the people of England. The electors would be in the same proportion to the general population in Ireland as they are in England. But how is the fact? The fact is, that there are not in Ireland quite as many as two per cent. of the male adult population in the agricultural counties possessing the elective franchise; whereas in England from 25 to 30 per cent. of the same class have the franchise.

Do you call this a real Union?

In the county of Hereford the population is 95,977. The voters are only 5,013.

In the county of Galway the population is 381,564. The voters are only 3,061.

Is this a real Union, Lord Shrewsbury; or is it a mockery, having the name, but not the substance of a Union?

Again: the Isle of Wight has 28,731 inhabitants. The voters are 1,167.

In Mayo the inhabitants are 366,328. The voters are only 957!

Is this a real Union?

Another instance. In Anglesey the population is 33,508. The voters are 4,187.

In Kerry the population is 265,126. The voters are only 1,161!

Is this, too, a real Union?

One instance more. In the county of Cork the agricultural population is now 750,000.

In Wales the entire population is, in round numbers, 800,000.

In Cork county there are but 3,000 voters. In Wales, 36,000!

Can that be called a real Union that gives results of such different magnitude in the enjoyment of the electoral franchise—the most valuable of all?

Nor does the degrading inferiority rest there. For, instead of having the least hope of obtaining an extension of the franchise of Ireland, the direct contrary is decreed. Lord Stanley has determined to cut off probably two-thirds of the existing voters. He had a majority even in the last Parliament. He has a most triumphant majority in the present. And that faction which now enables him to trample at his discretion upon the rights of Irishmen is hounded on by Sir John Gerard and the redoubtable Earl of Shrewsbury.

There is another equally, if not more, potential proof of the deceptive nature of the Union. It consists in the most afflictive deprivation of Ireland of her rightful portion of representatives in the House of Commons.

Ireland has but 105 members out of 658. She ought to have at least 170.

By the calculations made by Lord Castlereagh himself, at the time of the Union, Ireland was entitled to 108 members. The scale that he calculated upon was as follows: he stated that Ireland was entitled,

				Members.
For comparative population, to	202
„ Exports	100
„ Imports	93
Revenue	39
Total	<hr/> 434

The mean of these quantities gave 108 and a fraction. And thus, on Lord Castlereagh's own showing, Ireland should have had 108 members. He struck off eight in the insolence of despotic power.

This calculation was corrected soon after by Mr. Newenham, who proved that, upon Lord Castlereagh's own showing, the scale ought to have been as follows:—

				Members.
For comparative population	228
" Exports	179
" Imports	168
" Revenue	85
" Rental	186
				<hr/>
	Total	846

The mean of these five quantities is 169 and a fraction.

To simplify, however, the claim of Ireland, or rather the evidence of her right to an increased representation, I will place it upon the joint basis of comparative population and comparative revenue only. Taking two periods, the one of 1821, and the other of 1831, I begin with that of 1821.

The population return of 1821 gives to England twelve millions, and to Ireland seven millions of inhabitants, taken in round numbers for the sake of clearness.

For the same purpose I take the representation of England at 500 only.

There is a Parliamentary paper which shows the comparative revenue of England and Ireland in the year 1821, by which it appears that Ireland paid in that year more than one-eighth of the entire revenue. Taking it then upon these grounds, the right of Ireland would be—

				Members.
For population 5 to 12 upon 500, gives	291
For revenue, one-eighth gives	62
				<hr/>
	Total	353

The one-half, or mean, of those two numbers gives Ireland the right to 176 members.

I now come to the year 1831. The population returns of that year gives England, in round numbers, a population of thirteen millions and Ireland of eight millions.

The following is a correct abstract of the revenue produced by both countries in that year—

Revenue credited to Great Britain ..	£48,325,215	
Deduct teas consumed in Ireland ..	500,000	
Deduct for all other customable articles consumed in Ireland ..	1,000,000	
		<u>1,500,000</u>
Real revenue of Great Britain ..		<u>46,825,215</u>
Revenue credited to Ireland ..		4,560,897
Add the above		<u>1,500,000</u>
Actual Irish revenue ..		£6,060,897

Now, to avoid all cavil whatsoever, I will take the Irish revenue as only one-tenth of the English; and even at this most disadvantageous mode of making the calculation, the right of Ireland to increased representation did, at the time of the Reform Act, stand thus—

		Members.
Ireland for population, 8 to 13 on 500, gives	307
" Revenue, 1 to 10 on 500, gives	50
		<u> </u>
Total	357

The mean of these two being one-half, entitled Ireland to 178 members.

I recapitulate thus:—

First—That, according to the detested Castlereagh himself, Ireland ought to have 108 members from the time of the Union Statute. The Reform Act has given us only 105.

Secondly—According to Castlereagh's calculations, corrected by Newenham, Ireland ought, by the Union Statute, to have 169 members. She has but 105. The consequence is, that

upon Castlereagh's own principle, Ireland is defrauded of 64 members.

Thirdly—Upon the combined bases of population and revenue, taking the return of 1821 for the population, and taking the revenue of Ireland as one-eighth, she ought to have 176 members. She has but 105. Ireland is therefore defrauded of 71 members upon this calculation.

Fourthly—Taking the population return of 1831, immediately before the passing of the Reform Act, and estimating the Irish revenue as only one-tenth, yet Ireland, at the passing of that Act, was entitled plainly and demonstratively to 178 members; and the Reform Act therefore defrauded her of 73 members.

Now, if there were a real Union, there ought to be no difficulty in obtaining for Ireland at least, 150 members in the House of Commons of the United Parliament. To give the interests of her people due protection, there ought not to be less. I have proved that, on the result of combined population and revenue, she is entitled to much more. But there is such an absence of reality in the subsisting Union, that it is idle to demonstrate how clear our title is to such an increase of Irish representation.

Call the connection between the two countries what else you please; but I conjure you, in the name of common sense and common honesty, do not venture to call it a Union, unless you add some word expressive of how thorough a mockery it is.

When the Reform Bill was before Parliament, I urged the claim of Ireland for a full representation. I demonstrated her title to it. There was then a fair and ample opportunity of doing us justice, but we were contemptuously refused. And this refusal was aggravated in its insulting nature by the increase that was made in the representation of the English counties.

Every county in England with more than 50,000 inhabitants got an increase of one member.

Every county in England with more than 100,000 inhabitants got an increase of two members. There is but one county

in Ireland with so few as 100,000 inhabitants; yet no Irish county got any increase to the representation.

A few instances will make this contrast more striking.

The population of Worcestershire in 1831, was 211,356. The Reform Bill gave that shire two additional representatives. It has therefore four members.

The population of the county of Galway was then 381,407. It got no addition, and has therefore only two members.

The population of Leicestershire was in 1831, 197,276. It had two members. It got by the Reform Bill two more. It has therefore now four members.

The population of Tipperary was 380,598. It got no addition. It has therefore but two.

Northamptonshire had a population of 279,276. The Reform Bill gave it two additional representatives. It has therefore got four.

The population of the county of Down is 307,571. It got no addition. It has but two members.

The population of Cumberland was 126,681. It got two additional members. It has four.

The rural population of Cork was in 1831, 713,716. Cork got no addition. It has but two members.

Could these things be, if there were a real Union, and not a mocking servitude?

Let it be recollected that the principle upon which the augmentation in the English counties took place, was that merely of population. If there were a real Union, the same principle would be applied to Ireland.

We are laughed to scorn, even by Lord Shrewsbury, when we ask that the same principle should be applied to Ireland as to England. But will you, my lord, after this, presume to say that there is a real Union between the two countries? If you do, your own decision will be retorted upon you, and your assertion will be treated by the Irish nation with contemptuous scorn.

It has been foolishly alleged, by way of reply, that there are in England also, anomalies in the representation; small con-

stituencies returning two members, and large ones that return no greater number. Aye, there are. But they all return the representatives of Englishmen; all connected with, and obedient to English interests. It is a mere question of distribution among themselves. The Irish nominate none of them. Nor are any of them pledged to their constituents in favour of Irish interests. There would be something indeed in the inference drawn from that fact, if our complaint was against the distribution in Ireland of Irish members. It is not so. We take Ireland against England, and we thus find that England has in every point the insulting superiority; and Ireland, in every respect, a disgracing inferiority.

Denominate this a Union, if you choose; I call it by its proper name, a mockery. I now come to my fourth assertion:—“That the Union, such as it is, has inflicted injustice, oppression, and misery unparalleled in Ireland; and there is not, and cannot be any hope for present redress or future security, save by the restoration of the Irish Parliament.”

In 1782, Ireland forced the English Government to recognise her independence. In 1782, Ireland attained self-government. What ensued? Peace and prosperity; the most rapid, the most extraordinary strides in improvement of every kind. Prosperity in every department and in every branch; commerce fostered and increased; agriculture encouraged and enriched; manufactures promoted and extended; party spirit checked and decaying; every class daily increasing in wealth and in comfort; the labourer becoming a farmer; the farmer rising into the rank of gentleman; the gentleman falling into the rank of baronet; the baronet elevated to the peerage; commercial men acquiring estates; towns growing into cities; population accumulating; and cheerful merriment, so congenial to the Irish disposition, gladdening the land at every side.

No country on the face of the earth ever made so rapid a progress in improvement of every kind as Ireland did in the fourteen years which succeeded her legislative independence, and that in spite of the odious incubus of the tithe system.

I am not speaking of imaginary things. I am not indulging the visions of fancy. I assert only that which every human being knows to be literally true, and which no man can have the hardihood to deny, namely, that the uprise of Ireland in all the arts, comforts, and blessings of commerce, agriculture, and civilisation, for the fourteen years ensuing her legislative independence, and produced by that measure, has never been equalled in any other country, in any age or period of time.

The bankers of the city of Dublin met on the 18th of December, 1798, and entered into these resolutions against the then threatened Union:—

“RESOLVED—That since the renunciation of the power of Great Britain, in the year 1782, to legislate for Ireland, the commerce and prosperity of this kingdom have eminently increased.

“RESOLVED—That we attribute these blessings, under Providence, to the wisdom of the Irish Parliament.”

The guild of merchants of Dublin met on the 14th of January, 1799, and entered into the following resolution:—

“RESOLVED—That the commerce of Ireland has increased, and her manufactures improved beyond example, since the independence of this kingdom was restored by the exertions of our countrymen in 1782.”

A thousand more such documents might be easily procured.

There is another fact equally unquestionable; that the Union has not conferred any one benefit on Ireland.

In the words of Lord Shrewsbury, “it has been abortive of good and prolific of evil.” It gave up our national independence. It handed over our inherent right of self-government. It stultified ourselves, and proclaimed our incapacity. It degraded and provincialized our country. It gave her up to the stranger and the unfriendly. It was treason against our native land. What value—what consideration have we received in return? None—none—none! “The wages of sin is death.” Such are the wages of the Union. The sin was the crime of others—ours was the punishment!

This one truth, I repeat, is indisputable—that the Union has not conferred upon Ireland any one advantage.

Having brought the minds of my readers to this one indisputable truth, I now call on them to turn their attention to the fatal consequences of the Union. If that measure has been unproductive of good, it has, alas! been most fruitful in evil. Its mischiefs, its miseries, have been multitudinous.

I place some of them before you in the following order:

Firstly—It deprived Ireland of self-government. It reduced her into the state of a province from being an independent nation.

No man can undervalue self-government, but a man of low and grovelling mind; some person who imagines that Englishmen, or Scotchmen, or perhaps Frenchmen, are of a higher order of beings than the Irish. If an Irishman be equally fit to govern, to make laws, and to execute them, as the native of any other country, why should we give to others the power of making laws for us, or of executing them? Is it not evident that no persons can have so great an interest in there being good laws in Ireland as the inhabitants of Ireland? Having, then, the most deep interest in there being good laws in Ireland; having our properties, our lives, our comforts, our liberties, all at stake in the good government of our country; must we not be the most fit persons to take care of those properties by wise laws; to protect our lives by just institutions; to attend to the promotion of our comforts by salutary regulations, and to establish our liberties by sound legislation? Who else can have the deep, the entire, the perpetual interest we have in these things? If this be so—as it certainly is so—is it not the height of wicked absurdity in us to devolve upon strangers the care of these most important concerns, and to deprive ourselves of the natural control and superintendence over our own affairs?

This government and management we were deprived of by the Union; they can be restored to us only by the abrogation of that measure.

It is true—familiarily true, even to the triteness of a proverb—that he who entrusts his business to others is sure to have it neglected; that no man's business is well done but the business of a man who superintends it himself.

What is true of each individual is equally true of the aggregate of individuals called a nation. Each nation has a sacred duty imposed on it, to attend to its own affairs; that duty is also a sacred right, which in our case has been most treacherously as well as basely violated.

This, as I have said, is manifestly an evil inherent in the Union, and for which there can, of course, be no remedy but in the repeal of that measure.

The second great evil of the union is the financial robbery of Ireland which has been effected by means of that measure.

At the time of the Union, Ireland owed something under twenty millions. England then owed more than 446 millions. That is to say, England owed a debt 23 times and a quarter larger than the debt of Ireland. If the Union had been a just and reasonable compact, the future debt and consequent taxation of both countries should have remained in the same proportion. Ireland was entitled to have the same protection from debt and taxation in the united Parliament, that she had obtained from her own legislature.

It is so manifestly fair and just that these proportions should be preserved, that if the rule were to be applied to a private partnership, every person would say it was that which common sense and common honesty required. If the estate of A. were burdened with a debt of £20,000, and the estate of B, C, and D, burdened with a debt of £446,000, A. would be quite mad, if, for the mere sake of forming a partnership, he were to give B, C, and D the power to charge his estate with a greater proportion of future debts than that which it bore to the existing debts at the time of the commencement of the firm. He certainly would not do so except in recompense for his getting a greater share of the profits of the concern. Such, however,

was not the case with Ireland. All the profits have gone to her partners, and she is left to abide by the loss.

It is manifest that, upon a fair bargain, the debt of each country would have remained at the same proportion. The debt of England has about doubled since the Union; the debt of Ireland ought not to have more than doubled also.

In that case—the fair and just case—Ireland would at this moment owe at the utmost forty millions; a sum which she could easily pay off within ten years; contributing her full proportion to the burdens of the state, she might easily be the least taxed country in the world. What is her present state now by means of the Union? Why, she is chargeable as a portion of the United Kingdom with the entire of upwards of £800,000,000 due by England. There can be no sensible diminution of taxation in Ireland until the Greek Kalends, that is, until a substantial portion of the English debt, is paid off.

If such an injustice were committed between man and man, everybody would cry out against the robber. But when the robbery comes to be committed against a nation, at the rate of hundreds of millions, then there is nobody to exclaim against the plunderer, and it is expected that the plundered nation will tranquilly endure the spoliation.

I want to know this: what pretext can there possibly be, in point of common sense and common honesty, why Ireland should be chargeable for one shilling of the 446 millions which England owed at the time of the Union? It was voted by the English Parliament—raised by the English Parliament—spent by the English Parliament—Ireland all the time supporting her own establishments, and instead of receiving money from England, remitting money to that country. Again I ask, whether there ever was so flagrant a violation of honesty and justice, as charging Ireland with one single shilling of that debt?

The case of Ireland is still stronger on this point, because there was an absolute undertaking that Ireland should have no concern whatsoever with the debt then due by Great Britain.

It will be convenient that I state with precision what the amount of that debt was.

I have called the British debt at the time of the Union 446 millions. It stood accurately thus:—

Funded debt,	£420,305,000
Unfunded debt	26,080,000
Total debt, . . .	£446,385,000

Annual interest:—

Charge of funded debt,	£15,800,000
Charge of unfunded debt,	1,021,000
Total charge, . . .	£16,821,000

This being understood, we now come to the solemn declaration of Lord Castlereagh upon this subject, made on the 5th of February, 1800. His pledge was in these words: in respect of the past expenses, Ireland is to have “no concern whatsoever with the debt of Great Britain.” Again, he said, “Great Britain now paid taxes for interest on her debt, ten millions.” (Observe here, that he should have said she paid in interest £16,821,000.) His inaccuracy however was not material, because he added, “for any proportion of this, she (Britain) could not call upon Ireland.” It was therefore absolutely necessary that the respective debts of the countries should remain distinct.

The misstatement of the amount of the annual charge upon the then existing debt of Great Britain and the annual charge on it, whatever that charge might be, should be borne exclusively by Great Britain, and she should not call upon Ireland for any proportion thereof

This created an obligation upon Great Britain to pay taxes, of which no part should be chargeable in Ireland, to the amount, in round numbers, of seventeen millions per annum.

Has she done so? I have the finance ~~accounts~~ for the year

1839 before me. The following are the items of the separate taxation of Great Britain:—

Land and assessed taxes,	£3,939,000
Bricks,	463,000
Soap,	782,000
Post-horse duty,	224,000
Total,				£5,408,000

In certain stamp duties, and home-made spirit duties, there is a higher rate of taxation in England than in Ireland. Its produce is at present uncertain, but it may be ascertained. Assuming it to add a fourth to the foregoing items, the total is £6,775,000.

Taking for granted that England has given herself a similar relief—say, in round numbers, ten millions annually for the last ten years, there would thus, without going farther back as we might do, be a sum of one hundred millions of which the English have been exonerated by increasing unfairly the burden on the Irish.

One strange instance of the mixture of insult with injustice, in matter of finance, since the Union, is to be found in the fact, that the Committee of the English House of Commons have transferred to the charge of Ireland, the £1,275,000 paid by England for the purchase of nomination boroughs—thus compelling Ireland to pay the wages of her own degradation.

There is one more financial grievance that I shall mention, and then conclude this topic. Since the peace, Great Britain has exonerated herself of annual taxes to the amount of forty millions a year, and exonerated Ireland only to the amount of one million annually. Assuredly I need not follow this subject farther.

Now, Lord Shrewsbury, what remedy can Ireland have, save by the restoration of her own Parliament? How or where else can the question be fairly discussed? How otherwise can Ireland get rid of her liability to 446 millions, of which she does not justly owe one farthing? How otherwise

is she to get rid of her liability to an additional 400 millions or thereabouts, of which she does not owe more than, at the utmost, about one-tenth? You now perceive how deeply seated are the evils of the Union; and how all-powerfully interested are the people of Ireland in procuring its repeal.

The third evil resulting from the Union is one that now no compensation can be given for. It was not the less a monstrous mischief.

It was this: the Union retarded the emancipation of the Irish Catholics for a full quarter of a century. A full generation lived and died in slavery, who would have enjoyed the blessings of equal laws but for the Union.

It is not probable that any reasonable man can doubt the effect which the Union had in retarding the full emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland. If such persons are found, let me ask them to recollect the facts that preceded the Union.

Emancipation commenced in 1778-79. A considerable instalment, especially as related to the enjoyment of property by the Catholics, was obtained in that year.

In 1782, a glorious epoch! another and a large instalment was obtained, creating perfect equality with respect to property in land; and, what was yet more valuable, allowing Catholics to open schools and have their youth instructed in science and literature.

The third instalment was in the latter end of 1792, and opened the profession of the law to Catholics. Another and greater instalment was granted in 1793, which above all other things gave to the Catholics the instrument of full liberation—the elective franchise.

In 1795, another, a complete act of emancipation was carried in the House of Commons, by an overwhelming majority, and would have passed into law but for a change in the English ministry.

Thus, within the space of fifteen years, four different statutes of relief were passed by the Irish Parliament, in favour of the

Catholics. The English Parliament refused to concede the same extent of rights to the English Catholics. The distractions of the year 1798 might be said to retard the progress of Emancipation for a moment, but it could not possibly retard it long. There were in favour of procuring Emancipation, the increasing number of the Catholics; their increasing wealth; the business habits of the Catholic barristers; the great practical influence of the Catholic attorneys; an influence which to my knowledge was used with the noblest disinterestedness, and greatest practical utility, during our struggles for Emancipation. The Catholic attorneys received little public honour, and less emolument. But they were eminently useful in bridling the oppressor, vindicating the oppressed, and creating the general co-operation of all classes.

In the first struggles for Emancipation, the Catholics were obliged to hire Protestant secretaries and managers. They had now men of their own—accustomed to appear before the public, and capable, as well as ready, to distinguish themselves in the public cause.

With all these advantages, and with this still greater advantage, that the votes of Catholics could influence the return of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty members of the Irish House of Commons, it was utterly impossible that three, or at most, four years after 1800, could have elapsed without their full and complete Emancipation.

But the Union intervened. The Parliamentary influence of the Irish Catholics in the British House of Commons fell to the lowest ebb, and scarcely existed at all. It was scattered and unorganized. We had to go before a foreign and unfriendly Parliament; and even when we thrice obtained a majority in the House of Commons, our bill was as often thrown out in the House of Lords! I will not further refer to the history of our struggles; but, acquainted as I am with their details, I do not hesitate solemnly to declare my conviction—I may almost say my certain knowledge—that the Union retarded Emancipation for upwards of twenty-five years.

In fact, no man can deny this—that the Catholics of Ireland were driven to the necessity of making so formidable (though legal) a combination as to induce, even in England, a constitutional necessity on the part of most unwilling statesmen to yield Emancipation. What a small portion of the same constitutional force would have sufficed to obtain the Emancipation Act from the Irish Parliament!

The fourth evil resulting from the Union is one of a purely practical nature. It relates to the employment of Irishmen in the various departments of the State and collection of the revenue.

Before the Union the taxes were raised and collected, and they were also principally expended by Irishmen. All the offices in the law, as well as in the revenue, were filled by Irishmen. The boards of excise and customs were Irish. The stamp departments were filled by none but Irish. The post-office knew no employés but Irish. The influence of the Irish Government was considerable in the army. It was partially felt to an important extent in the navy. There was then no transfer to England of duties which ought to be performed in Ireland. In short, the entire of what one may call the staff of Government was essentially and almost universally Irish. If the Union had not taken place this must have continued, and when there was room for it, it must have augmented.

How is it now? Alas, alas! many of our departments are transferred to England, and all else that can be removed are literally on the wing. If you go into any of the public offices that remain, your ear is shocked with the contented gabble of some stall-fed English invader; or the harsh, though shrewd remark of some Scotch inspector. Here and there you meet an Irishman; but they are "rarinantes," and with difficulty keep themselves afloat amongst ungenial superiors. English barristers have actually been converted into attorneys, in order to exclude Irish solicitors from the revenue department. We have had five English Chancellors since the Union, and (with the exception of a few months) we have had in fact but one Irish

Chancellor; and I believe it is not intended that we should ever have another. It has been publicly asserted that the Irish bench was to be opened to the English bar; and it is not likely that even the assistant-barristerships will be long the exclusive possession of those who may be designated, however inaccurately, as "mere Irish."

It is quite clear that nothing but the Repeal of the Union can remedy this grievance; but that would effectually do it. The Scotch cry of "our ain fish-guts for ain sea-mews" may be the exaggeration of nationality; but it is no exaggeration to wish and to insist that the salaries paid by the Irish people should be reserved for and received by Irishmen alone.

The fifth evil resulting from the Union is one I have already alluded to, and which I may therefore pass over with a single remark. It is the utter inadequacy of the Irish representation in Parliament.

We have less than one-sixth of the representation; 105 out of 658 members. Accordingly, whenever English interests or English prejudices clash with Irish rights it would be as well that Ireland had no representatives at all. The present posture of public affairs elucidates this assertion. The English antipathy to Ireland; the English hostility to the religion of the people of Ireland, united with the congenial elements of monopoly and corruption, have produced a Parliament so inimical to Ireland that we are completely at the mercy of the British Cabinet. They can now dictate to a willing Parliament their own terms of Irish servitude. Would it not be better that we had not one single Irish member in the House than to have us there to be dragged at the chariot wheels of our bitter enemies? Oh! for the self-government which the Repeal would ensure!

The sixth evil resulting from the Union I have already alluded to. It is the miserably and insultingly restricted and limited state of the Parliamentary franchise in Ireland.

The statistics upon this subject I have already sketched. They give results of the most painful nature to the feelings and judgment of every Irishman.

The seventh evil resulting from the Union I have already detailed. It is the miserably and insultingly restricted and limited state of the municipal Reform Bill for Ireland.

I have also specified at some length the iniquitous defects of that Bill.

Why then do I introduce a second time the restricted franchise and the restricted municipal reform? For two reasons.

The first is, that they are evils natural by arising from the Union.

The second is, that it has been asserted that, limited as they are, they still are better than the former system, and therefore are boons conferred on us by the United Parliament. I feel it is my duty to demonstrate the fallacy of that assertion.

The assertion of their being boons conferred on us by the United Parliament is a mere begging of the question. It takes for granted that the Irish Parliament would not have conceded these, or a greater extent of reform.

Now, it is perfectly capable of demonstration that this supposition is totally unfounded in fact. Why? For two reasons—firstly, because the Irish Parliament before the Union had more frequently taken a liberal part than did the British Parliament before that measure; secondly, because this decisive proof was given by the Irish members in the United Parliament of their superior attachment to the principles of Reform. It was this—that when the Reform Bill was introduced by Lord Grey's Government into Parliament, there was a majority of English members against the Bill—there was a majority of Scotch members against the Bill; but the majority of Irish members in its favour outnumbered both the English and Scotch majorities against it, and secured the second reading of the Bill.

The superior liberality of the Irish members is thus established. It cannot be questioned that, as they did so much for England and for Scotland, they would have done more for Ireland. The truth really is that, instead of the Union procuring reform for England and Scotland, on the other hand, the English

and Scotch Reformers showed their usual unaltered injustice to the Irish. They took to their aid the Tories in the House, and, with an ingratitude unexampled, save in the dealings of the English to the Irish, they flung to Ireland mutilated, restricted, and fettered reforms!

Is there any remedy short of the Repeal of the Union? Surely, if there ever was a hope of justice for Ireland from the Imperial Parliament, that man must be mad who entertains such a hope at present.

The eighth and greatest infliction of the Union is the continuance of the ecclesiastical state revenues in the hands of the clergy of a small minority of the Irish people.

“The hatred of the Irish people to tithes is as immortal as their love of justice!” If the Union had not intervened, Catholic Emancipation would have been, without doubt or difficulty, and immediately, followed by a definite appropriation of the tithes. Vested interests would have been respected, but the reversion would have been applied to purposes of education and charity. Long and long since, the name and nature of tithes would have been effaced in Ireland. We owe to the Union their continuance. We shall owe to the Repeal their annihilation.

The ninth infliction of the Union is scarcely of less magnitude. It is this—the enormous and accumulating increase of absenteeism.

Absenteeism has always been the bane of Ireland. It has at every period of her connection with England retarded her prosperity, as the natural result of the system of English misrule.

The surface of Ireland has, with very few exceptions, been confiscated three times over; and many districts much oftener. The distribution of the plunder was generally—indeed, almost universally—made to strangers resident in England.

The Irish Parliament endeavoured to diminish the mischief; and the English monarchs occasionally, with the assistance of that Parliament, resumed their grants. By the statute 28th Henry VIII., your ancestor, my lord, was thus deprived, by

reason of his criminal neglect of Ireland, of a large estate in the county of Wexford. Yet the great evil continued, and received no mitigation, save for the short period of the prevalence of the spirit of 1782, when, for the first time, it received a check.

The Union, however, restored it to its pristine vigour, and daily decreased its enormity. In 1801, the calculation of absentee rents, and pensions payable by Ireland and spent in other countries, amounted to £1,500,000 annually. There is now no doubt that the absentee rents and surplus Irish revenue transmitted to England amount at present to more than six millions per annum, and have done so for more than the last ten years.

Here are for ten years no less than sixty millions raised in Ireland, and every shilling of it transmitted out of Ireland, and spent in foreign lands. In the history of mankind there is no instance of such a withering exhaustion of any country; of such a tribute paid by one country to another.

When you contemplate this fact, are you—can you be surprised at the misery and destitution of Ireland?

There is this bitter aggravation of the mischief—that it is daily augmenting! The tide of absenteeism has set in strongly. There were, first, the natural absentees, as I may call them, who have also estates in England. Next, the Irish peers and commoners. Next, all those—and they are many—who are affected by their example. But why need I enter into details? All the objects of ambition or self-interest, draw crowds to the seat of government. The result is, that scarcely any man of property remains, unless he has some individual tie or obligation on him to remain.

There is this other bitter aggravation of the evils of absenteeism—that it leaves the Irish estates in the hands of, generally speaking, heartless agents—but who at all events have no personal interest beyond the collection of each year's rent; and who therefore have no selfish inducement to look to the permanent prosperity or even the future existence of the tenantry.

Have you heard of the clearance system? of the extermination system? of the multitudinous murders committed on ejected tenants, not by the sword or the bayonet, but by the more tedious but equally criminal process of cold, famine, and disease?—of the hideous assassinations, retaliated in the spirit of the wildest justice of revenge; but not to be excused or palliated for any reason, or on any provocation.

Details are needless. The inevitable effects of an absentee drain of six millions annually, must present themselves to every rational mind. If these six millions were spent in Ireland —

But why should I harrow my soul with the ideal contrast? It is enough to say that Ireland is subject to a tribute—an annual tribute—of six millions!

No country could continue this process of exhaustion; it must come to an end!

There is but one remedy—the restoration of the Irish Parliament!

The tenth evil is that the Union has destroyed the trade and manufactures of Ireland, and filled the land with sorrow, misery, and destitution.

Let me give a few of the many instances of Irish depression consequent upon the Union.

The Irish linen trade flourished before the Union, under the paternal care of a national legislature. The exports of Irish linen amounted in value to more than three millions of pounds sterling by the year. They experienced after the Union a reduction of four-fifths. I believe that they had fallen lower still. Legislative causes could be adduced for the decline—causes which the Irish Parliament would have obviated.

One word only on the history of the Irish linen trade. The woollen manufacture was in a flourishing state at the period of the revolution. It was openly and avowedly crushed to create a monopoly of that manufacture for England.

Oh! how beloved those English ought to be by us wild Irish! The linen manufacture was promoted by way of compensation. It flourished until the annual export of the article

reached three millions sterling. Then came the Union, and struck off four-fifths of the trade. Well—we are a patient people—blessed be God!

The linen trade, too, had this great and decided advantage. The only outlay to foreigners was the price of the flaxseed. All the rest of the value of the article was composed of Irish land and Irish labour. It was a manufacture of health and morals. It employed old as well as young—females as well as males. There was no crowding into pestilential manufactories. There was no depravity by reason of improper association. No. The weaver worked at home in the midst of his family. He combined the health and plenty of agricultural pursuits with his labour as an artisan; and cheerfulness, plenty, and comfort blessed the land when the linen trade flourished.

There had risen since, in the revolutions of trade, a considerable manufacture of linen yarn: but its date has not been long, nor is it likely to be so. Its very existence is threatened by the new tariff of French duties against which it would require the protection of reciprocity of duties which an Irish Parliament alone could give it. At present, it is probable it will be sacrificed to the interests of the cutlers of Sheffield.

But it is not only in the manufactures of the working classes; it is equally in the consumption of luxuries that the withering hand of the Union is to be found.

Before the Union, the annual import of claret into Ireland was 400 tuns. It was reduced to thirty tuns annually, when the last separate account of revenue for Ireland was made out about fifteen years ago. It is probable that it does not exceed twenty tuns annually at present. The drinkers of claret have fled to other countries, and left Ireland in poverty. Their incomes are spent elsewhere.

Before the Union, the woollen trade flourished in Ireland in all the articles of coarser texture. It gave employment to thousands in the various towns of Ireland. At Carrick-on-Suir alone it kept in constant work and wages more than 7,000 persons, where there were lately not fifty employed! In short,

since the Union, the woollen trade of Ireland has literally been annihilated.

Before the Union, the refining of sugar was a prosperous and lucrative business, giving work and wages to thousands. There were in the city of Dublin alone, nineteen sugar bakeries; there is not now a single one remaining! This trade is annihilated.

Before the Union, the glass manufacture was flourishing in Ireland: it is now all but annihilated.

Before the Union, the manufacture of tabinets and silks in Dublin gave bread to thousands. It was lately on the verge of extinction, but has revived in some small degree by the Repeal movement.

Before the Union, the business of printing and bookselling—the manufacture of hats—the working in gold and silver plate—watchmaking, and various other branches of trade were in a prosperous state in Ireland, which are now annihilated or in the last stage of an impoverished existence.

But why should I dwell on minor details, when one astounding fact places in the clearest light the increase of poverty, the accumulation of distress, and the fearful extent to which the privation of the comforts of life has been occasioned by the Union.

The fact I allude to is this: before the Union, Ireland imported annually nearly twice the quantity of sugar she imports at present. But as the population of Ireland has doubled since the Union, it is manifest that this falling off amounts, in point of fact, to nearly three-fourths of the entire.

The more this fact is considered, the more distinctly will it appear to prove the increase of poverty and destitution.

There is not one article, the consumption of which tends more to health and comfort than sugar. Every person who can afford to do so, consumes as much sugar as he conveniently can; and that in one thousand different ways. No person abandons the use of sugar but a person who has not the means of buying it. The consumption of sugar increases with wealth;

its diminution is the most decisive proof of poverty. Yet here is Ireland, with a diminution of consumption amounting to three-fourths of the entire quantity consumed before the Union,

Here is a most conclusive and unequivocal proof of the poverty and destitution of Ireland arising from the Union.

I cannot avoid giving some individual specimens of the withering effect of the Union on Irish trade and manufactures in several localities. I take them from reports made, some in the year 1834, and others in the year 1840.

To begin with Dublin: it is ascertained from authentic documents and returns, that in 1800 there were in Dublin ninety-one master manufacturers in the woollen trade, employing 4,938 persons. In August, 1840, there were only twelve master manufacturers; and only 682 persons employed in this trade.

In the city of Cork, in 1800, there were engaged in the manufacture of woollen goods, forty-one employers, giving constant work to 2,500 persons. That trade is now completely gone. The extensive factory of Mr. Lyons—the last in work—is now converted into a bleach green.

In Limerick, at the Union, there were 1,000 woollen weavers. There are not now seventy!

One more instance in the woollen trade. It is the history of the flannel manufacture in a particular locality; and contains in fact an abstract and brief chronicle of the decay of trade almost all over Ireland. The place is Rathdrum, county of Wicklow. The flannel manufacture flourished there to such an extent, that the late Earl Fitzwilliam was induced to erect, at an expense of £3,500, an extensive market-place called the Flannel Hall. This manufacture gave employment to more than 1,000 looms, and to several thousands of operatives in its various branches. In some years after the Union, the manufacture began rapidly to decline.

It is ascertained that the 1,000 looms had in the year 1823 declined to 400; in 1826 to 300; in 1827 to 200; in 1828 to 150; in 1830 to 100 and in 1832 to 30! And in two years

afterwards, there was not a vestige of this formerly important and remunerative branch of industry!

To revert to Dublin. There were at the time of the Union, engaged in the cotton trade, fifty-five master manufacturers, employing 14,500 persons, at wages of 40s. a week. They have fallen to twelve employers and 625 operatives, and the wages are now only 15s. a week.

At the Union, the hosiery business flourished in Dublin, Balbriggan, Cork, Belfast, Lisburn, Clonmel, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny, Carlow, Portarlington, Maryborough, and several other places. But in all those places, the home manufacture is now so inconsiderable, that this branch of Irish industry may, in the words of the report "for all practical purposes be considered as extinct."

To enter into these particulars may appear to weaken the effect of the general failure of trade, but they mark more strongly its effects. It is, however, useful to review the entire manufactures of Ireland; for thus it appears, that at the period of the Union the number of persons directly deriving employment from the woollen, cotton, and silk manufactures in Ireland, exceeded one hundred and fifty thousand in a population of about four millions. At the present day, the entire number employed in these manufactures throughout the kingdom, in a population of eight millions, does not exceed eight thousand.

So much for that Union you have well described as being "abortive of good and prolific of evil."

Before I close my brief sketch of the miseries of which the Union has been so "prolific" to Ireland, let us look into the Poor Inquiry Reports. For the state of the agricultural labourers, I must be content with a few samples. But I will give them in the touching language of the peasantry themselves, taken almost at random from the Reports of the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry. The first shall be from the county of Galway. The witnesses speak thus:—

“**COUNTY OF GALWAY.**—In summer, when unemployed, we live on cabbage and green herbs, with a few potatoes. We live for three days on the quantity of potatoes which we would, if we could afford it, use in one.

“This is the case every summer; there were two hundred families so in this parish last summer. Those who have a plot of early potatoes dig them before they are half grown. Eating these unripe potatoes causes sickness. Many men are put into their graves by this bad food.”

I next extract the following evidence on the state of the poor in Mayo:—

“You would see labourers in summer eating boiled cabbage, and a little meal shaken through it, without a potato to eat along with it. Maybe the women spent two days in spinning a pound of flax, and went another day five miles to the market of Ballinasloe to sell it, and had by it the twopence that bought the meal; many a shift they make; all struggling to hold a grip of life.

“In the mountains of the parish of Cong, when the potatoes fail them, they bleed their cattle, and eat the boiled blood, sometimes mixed with meal, but often without it. The same beast has been known to bleed three times in one season.”

A witness says—

“He knew a family this last summer (1834) to have during three days but one substantial meal of potatoes.”

He says—

“They kept life in them by picking up shell-fish on the strand.”

“They fast all the summer.”

When the Commissioners questioned what the witness meant by fasting, he said—

“I count it equal to fasting when a man and his wife and four children had to live on a quart of meal or a stone of potatoes for twenty-four hours; and I have known them to live on that.”

The next that strikes my eye is a description of the state of the labouring peasantry during the scarce months, as they are called, in the county of Longford—

“They go through the fields and gather the wild weeds; they boil them with salt, and they live on them, without even a potato to eat along with them.”

The Rev. Mr. O'Brien knew, this summer (1834)—

“Two families of labourers to remain in bed all day, as they said, ‘to stifle the hunger.’ They told me that ‘several of the neighbours did the same.’”

The next is from the county of Kildare—

“We are often obliged to eat the ‘prassagh,’ when the blossom is on it—that is, when it is thought most unwholesome. I declare to my God, I know several men who never tasted food for forty-eight hours.”

The next is from the county of Meath—

“The only periods in which employment is to be calculated on are, a month in spring, planting potatoes, a month in harvest and a month in autumn digging potatoes; and during other times the labourers are often without one meal of potatoes in the day.”

“During the unemployed season there are many who cannot get food for twenty-four hours; and if it was not for an odd bit the Almighty sends from a neighbour, would have died through the mere dint of starvation.”

My next instances are from the county of Clare; in answer to whether labourers became old and disabled before other people—

“We are worked harder and worse treated than the slaves in the colonies.

“I understand that they are taken care of by their masters when they are sick or old.

“When we are sick we must die on the road, if the neighbours do not help us.

“When we are old we must go out to beg, if the young ones cannot help us; and that will soon happen with us all. We are getting worse and worse every day, and the landlords are kicking us out of every little holding we have. This last May twenty-eight families were put out, and next May I am sure there will be as many again within five miles of Kilkea. If something is not done for those who are turned out upon the world, without a rag upon their backs, God knows what will happen this country.

“When we suffer all these hardships, is it wonderful our spirits should be broken down?”

“Many is the man who thinks himself well off with one meal a day.”

I may add three extracts more from the counties of Cork,

Donegal, and Tipperary, as being the shortest specimens of the state of those counties, but not the less emphatic upon that account. County of Cork—

“Many farmers are driven by distress to work themselves, and make their sons work, who would have formerly employed labourers. Such persons often make their children work, who would otherwise be sent to school.

“The labourers are frequently unable to work for want of sufficient food. It often happens that a labourer has no dinner to go home to.”

My next is from the county of Donegal—

“In June, July, and August, and after the harvest, they are reduced to fewer and scantier meals in the day.”

I give the following from the county of Tipperary—

“There is not much work for the labouring classes from May to August; at this time labourers and even tradesmen can scarcely get one full meal in the day; besides they will often collect cornkail, rape, and nettles, and eat them.”

The state of the people as to clothing is represented throughout the evidence in equally distressing terms. To multiply extracts would be fatiguing—

“Many have no blankets, but make use of the clothes which they wear during the day for night covering.

“Their clothes, or rather rags, are entirely insufficient to protect them from the cold.

“Their children are all in rags,” &c.

I presume, my lord, that these are they who, you tell us, “would live in a happy ignorance of the evils of which you think they too loudly complain, if they were less instructed in their grievances.”

If I had the keeping of your conscience, I would inflict on you, by way of penance and for atonement, the attentive perusal of the Report of the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry, signed, amongst others, with the revered name of Most Rev. Dr. Murray, and containing one thousand instances of deep suffering and destitution, of which the scanty extracts above copied contain but a faint specimen.

My lord, I attribute all these evils—the decay of trade, the suppression of manufactures, the poverty and squalid want of the operatives, the destitution of the agricultural labourers—all, all to misrule as their principal and abundant source; the misrule of a foreign and ungenial legislature, ignorant of our wants, and without any sympathy for our sufferings.

It is not possible for you, at least, to deny that the mass of our legislators are totally ignorant of the real afflictions of the Irish people, when you exhibit the strange instance of a man who, in 1828, thoroughly knew and eloquently described the miseries of the wretched Irish; and who yet, in 1841, totally forgot your former knowledge on the subject, declaring that those evils were purely imaginary, and those grievances the mere creations of fanciful description!

What a sage legislator have not the exertions of the Irish Catholics placed in the aristocratic senate!

Tell me not that the Poor Laws afford a remedy. They have been fairly tried in two localities, and they are found to be a total failure.

Besides, they were calculated to relieve only 80,000 persons. How then can they relieve three millions? They have thrown a burden unendurable in our poverty upon all. We are too poor for Poor Laws. The establishment for administering them costs more than the food and clothing given to the destitute. The machinery for relief is more expensive than the relief itself.

The great burden of the poor-rates falls upon the occupying inhabitants, thus creating more destitution than you relieve. In 1830, I, in a letter then published, foretold what was coming on. These were my words: "The landed proprietors of Ireland are reduced to this dilemma; they must either have a Repeal of the Union or Poor Laws. To one or other of these they must come, Poor Laws or a Repeal of the Union. Beyond this alternative there is nothing—the Repeal of the Union or Poor Laws."

Such was my prophetic warning in 1830. The landed

gentry then refused to join me in sufficient numbers to obtain a Repeal of the Union. My prophecy was verified—they have got Poor Laws.

Let me now prophesy again; and I do so with a mournful conviction upon my mind, that, if the Union be not repealed, the burden of the Poor Laws alone upon the occupiers of land and of houses in towns, will drive the people into a sanguinary and, perhaps, a successful insurrection.

May the great God of heaven forbid that it should occur! But it will occur, unless good men now calmly and dispassionately join with me to obviate so dreadful an occurrence, by taking away its cause.

Nothing will answer these purposes but a Repeal of the Union.

Let me return. I repeat, that I attribute all the evils of Ireland to the misrule occasioned by the Union; the annihilation of trade and commerce; the poverty, the destitution, the misery, the starvation. What else can we attribute them to? Ireland has a soil fertile to a proverb; capable of producing abundant sustenance for four times her present population. She has a genial climate, never parched into barrenness by the summer's sun; never chilled into sterility by the winter's cold. Her perennial greenness shows a perpetual impulse of vegetation. Nature and nature's God have bestowed on her many other good gifts. She is most favourably situated to be the entrepôt of the commerce of the European and American worlds. Situate at the western extremity of Europe, she is the nearest eastern land to the Americas. She is indented with spacious bays and safe harbours, open at every hour of the tide, and secure from every wind that blows. She is intersected with navigable rivers and estuaries, easily bringing her shipping in various directions almost to the centre of the island. Her perennial streams, in the fulness and rapidity of their waters, are capable of turning all the wheels of the machinery of the British empire. Her abundant produce consists of all the prime necessities of life, and of many of its luxuries.

Stand out, Earl Shrewsbury, and tell me how you account for such a country being filled with wailing and woe; with signs of sorrow, and the reality of poverty, destitution, and starvation? The curse of man has blighted the blessing of heaven.

Recollect this truth: we did not govern our own country.

But, perhaps, these evils might occur from the depravity of the people? No, my lord, no. A thousand times, no! Our people have, it is now avowed, a physical superiority amongst the nations of the earth. Scotch philosophy, so often sneered at, deserves immortality for this demonstration. The Irish people are brave as the bravest; they are generous as the most generous. With them all the ties of domestic life are knit together by fidelity and affection. Their domestic morals are exemplary, and lauded even by their enemies. They are industrious and patient of labour, and search for wages in every region of the earth. They are moral, they are temperate, blessed be God! The public-houses are deserted, and the altar rails are thronged. But, above all, and before all, they are religious. Their religious fidelity has no parallel on the face of the globe. They have endured revilings and torturings, impoverishment and imprisonment, chains, blows, and death! But they have not apostatised, nor ceased to be faithful to "the faith their fathers held to God."

Stand forth, Saxon and stranger! and tell me why the blessings of Providence have been blighted? Why such a people have been afflicted? Why such a country has been cursed with poverty, destitution, and starvation?

We did not govern our own country, Earl of Shrewsbury!

I must draw to a close. I am a Repealer, as you once were; and Repeal, believe me, is not remote nor difficult. In spite of your Tory allies, faction is intrinsically fading in Ireland, and party designations are beginning to give way to the national denomination of Irishmen. Determined as they are upon peaceable, legal, and constitutional courses, and no others; without infringing any law of man, or violating any command of

gentry then refused to join me in sufficient numbers to obtain a Repeal of the Union. My prophecy was verified—they have got Poor Laws.

Let me now prophesy again; and I do so with a mournful conviction upon my mind, that, if the Union be not repealed, the burden of the Poor Laws alone upon the occupiers of land and of houses in towns, will drive the people into a sanguinary and, perhaps, a successful insurrection.

May the great God of heaven forbid that it should occur! But it will occur, unless good men now calmly and dispassionately join with me to obviate so dreadful an occurrence, by taking away its cause.

Nothing will answer these purposes but a Repeal of the Union.

Let me return. I repeat, that I attribute all the evils of Ireland to the misrule occasioned by the Union; the annihilation of trade and commerce; the poverty, the destitution, the misery, the starvation. What else can we attribute them to? Ireland has a soil fertile to a proverb; capable of producing abundant sustenance for four times her present population. She has a genial climate, never parched into barrenness by the summer's sun; never chilled into sterility by the winter's cold. Her perennial greenness shows a perpetual impulse of vegetation. Nature and nature's God have bestowed on her many other good gifts. She is most favourably situated to be the entrepôt of the commerce of the European and American worlds. Situate at the western extremity of Europe, she is the nearest eastern land to the Americas. She is indented with spacious bays and safe harbours, open at every hour of the tide, and secure from every wind that blows. She is intersected with navigable rivers and estuaries, easily bringing her shipping in various directions almost to the centre of the island. Her perennial streams, in the fulness and rapidity of their waters, are capable of turning all the wheels of the machinery of the British empire. Her abundant produce consists of all the prime necessities of life, and of many of its luxuries.

Stand out, Earl Shrewsbury, and tell me how you account for such a country being filled with wailing and woe; with signs of sorrow, and the reality of poverty, destitution, and starvation? The curse of man has blighted the blessing of heaven.

Recollect this truth: we did not govern our own country.

But, perhaps, these evils might occur from the depravity of the people? No, my lord, no. A thousand times, no! Our people have, it is now avowed, a physical superiority amongst the nations of the earth. Scotch philosophy, so often sneered at, deserves immortality for this demonstration. The Irish people are brave as the bravest; they are generous as the most generous. With them all the ties of domestic life are knit together by fidelity and affection. Their domestic morals are exemplary, and lauded even by their enemies. They are industrious and patient of labour, and search for wages in every region of the earth. They are moral, they are temperate, blessed be God! The public-houses are deserted, and the altar rails are thronged. But, above all, and before all, they are religious. Their religious fidelity has no parallel on the face of the globe. They have endured revilings and torturings, impoverishment and imprisonment, chains, blows, and death! But they have not apostatised, nor ceased to be faithful to "the faith their fathers held to God."

Stand forth, Saxon and stranger! and tell me why the blessings of Providence have been blighted? Why such a people have been afflicted? Why such a country has been cursed with poverty, destitution, and starvation?

We did not govern our own country, Earl of Shrewsbury!

I must draw to a close. I am a Repealer, as you once were; and Repeal, believe me, is not remote nor difficult. In spite of your Tory allies, faction is intrinsically fading in Ireland, and party designations are beginning to give way to the national denomination of Irishmen. Determined as they are upon peaceable, legal, and constitutional courses, and no others; without infringing any law of man, or violating any command of

God ; in the abhorrence of any violation of property ; and in the determination never to shed one drop of blood in our contest, we still "bide our time," and watch our opportunity. Attached to the Throne by the tie of duty, and of affectionate veneration for the Sovereign, we still know that the period cannot be remote when England will, for her own safety, want the heart as well as the arm of Ireland. And she shall have that heart and that arm. But Ireland shall have her own native Parliament once again.

A wise minister may easily advise the exercise of the royal prerogative ; and the Parliament of Ireland which "is not dead, but only sleepeth," may easily awaken in more than pristine majesty, and more than bygone utility.

Grattan declared that he had watched at the cradle of Ireland, and followed her hearse. He is reckoned amongst the illustrious dead. I live to sound the trumpet of her resurrection.

DANIEL O'CONNELL,

Lord Mayor of Dublin.

LETTER TO THE REV. ROBERT DALY.

Parson Daly was a type of character now happily almost-extinct. His perseverant iteration of the most absurd calumnies against Catholic faith and practice at last provoked O'Connell's pen. To argue with such men is simply useless; they are either intellectually or morally incapable of argument.

It is one thing to disbelieve a certain doctrine which is received by an opponent as of faith, and it is quite another matter to invent a doctrine which an opponent does not believe, and emphatically denies believing, and then to turn on him and accuse him of being a blasphemer and idolator. There is an absurdity about such a line of conduct which must be patent to every one who is not a victim to it.

O'Connell's clear logical mind revolted against slams with an intensesness which led him to knock them down somewhat roughly.

Merrion Square, 22nd of May, 1826.

PARSON DALY,

You are not polite. You commence your letter to me by a very considerable incivility, as our neighbours the Americans call it. You cull the choicest flowers of vituperation; you use the lowest slang of Orange violence; you apply to the Catholic priesthood epithets which are selected by you, simply because they are supposed to be insulting and calculated to irritate; and you close your inelegant epistle, by giving me a pleasing choice between being a hypocrite or an idolator. *Indeed you are not polite.*

Parson Daly *you are not discreet.* You play your game badly. You should have chosen the language of affected meekness and hypocritical modesty. That was your cue. You should have been as mild in expression as you are malignant of purpose, and you should have cloaked the rage and rancour of your disposition in the sweet and soft accents of pretended charity; you should not have disclosed the irascibility of your temper. You should have assumed a grace though you have it not, and even amidst the sourness of your most discordant theology you should have made the world believe that you were possessed of the manners of a gentleman.

In truth, you are not discreet. I repeat, it Parson Daly; *you are not discreet.* You should have entrenched yourself behind the courtesies of civilized society. But you have rushed at once into the politico-theological arena, flourishing your shillelagh with fierce and vulgar effrontery, forgetting that you are yourself obnoxious to many a hard blow. You are admitted to be a very vain man, but your egregious vanity cannot altogether blind you to the unhappy certainty that you are vulnerable in many points. Therefore, you should not have used plain and blunt virulence of language; for it is quite true (however reluctant you may be to believe the fact) that plain and blunt language may be quite as well used in favour of justice and liberality as it is employed by you in promoting bigotry and circulating calumny.

Parson Daly, *you are not wise.* You have no tact, no distinct perception of passing events. Anxious as you are to wade through every species of religious mire to-a mitre, you do not perceive that the season of success for adventurers of your description has gone by. The abuse of Catholics collectively and individually, the foulest calumnies upon the Catholic clergy and Catholic religion no longer insure promotion in your Church. You came too late. The traffic by which many have thriven is almost at an end. Nay, still better times appear to be approaching, and you and I may both live to see the period when the greatest spiritual rascality shall go without any reward, and when a man may play the malignant hypocrite for years without any increase to his temporal gains. If that period shall arrive, as arrive I certainly think it will, what then will become of the M'Kittricks, the Murlough O'Sullivans, the O'Phelans, the O'Dalys, and all the rest of the miserable group of that day, who may be ready to sell their souls to perdition for a mess of the sugared pottage of the Establishment. Well-a-day! the renegade will then have no cash bidder for his crime; the calumniator will then have no hope of being recompensed in tithes and oblations for his falsehoods; the well-paid lie will become not only out of fashion, but out of use; and journeys to Edinburgh and London, to circulate

untruths and stimulate uncharitableness, will no more be thought of than journeys to the moon and seven stars.

As to yourself, personally, even in the present time, my own opinion is, that unless your *liberal*, your very *liberal* brother, the member for the county of Galway, does something for you in the way of a ministerial bargain, you never will be a bishop. I am sorry to announce to you so doleful a prophecy, but it is indeed my serious opinion.

Having thus given a short summary of your negative qualifications, I shall now, with due deference, proceed to canvass your affirmative demerits.

In the first place then, Parson Daly, you are well known to be —; but, no, no, I will not imitate your example, or adopt your vile phraseology. I will treat you much better than you deserve, and I will describe you thus: Parson Daly, you are perfectly well known to be a very imaginative person; your vivid imagination deludes you; it makes you adopt pure inventions for plain truths. I do not, you perceive, accuse you of wilful falsehoods; but it is perfectly notorious that there is no relying upon any statement of facts that comes from you. You make more mistakes in mere matter of fact than any other living polemic or layman. Whoever is curious to ascertain the quality and nature of your *mistakes in mere matter of fact*, may refer to the pamphlet lately published by the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, of Carlow. It will be there found that although your assertions were often refuted, and your inaccuracies (I use a gentle phrase for choice) often exposed, yet you never had the candour to acknowledge your error, although you had sometimes the modesty not to repeat a detested untruth. It is, I hope, the morbid constitution of your mind rather than deliberate intent to violate truth, that has led you on. Indeed some persons imagine that you do not so much misstate by design as that you are, by the disordered propensities of your nature, incapable of announcing a truth, even by accident.

For my own part I shall not incline to this latter opinion, but that your letter to me affords such melancholy, but decisive

evidence, that this, your moral malady has not decreased. You still talk of the *riot of Carlow*. Yes, after the confutation of your assertion by the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, *you talk of the riot at Carlow*. Yes! after the contradiction of your assertion by the solemn evidence of the respected Chairman of the meeting, Colonel Rochford, you still talk of the *riot at Carlow*. After the publication of that evidence by the House of Commons has made the falsehood known to the entire empire, you still talk of the *riot of Carlow*. Oh shame! shame! but you are alas! incapable of a blush, or you would not repeat the assertion. Oh! how true it is that never was there a rat so fond of rhodium, as you are, at least, of this untruth.

Having thus settled, I trust, in an amicable way, the preliminaries of our future discussions, I come to the pith and marrow of your letter to me.

Your letter is naturally divisible into two topics, of almost equal magnitude in your estimate, but of very unequal importance in point of common sense and religion.

In the first, you seek to vindicate yourself from the charge of having carried to Edinburgh your Carlow propensity to the *falsification of facts*.

In the second, you introduce with indecent and virulent ribaldry, some awful subjects connected with Divine truths.

I intend to follow you through both these topics; and, as to the first, I shall treat with a smile of quiet contempt the unfounded, but haughty, insolence of your style and manner.

And, as to the second, I shall discuss it with an unaffected, but melancholy, sentiment of compassion for your interested attachment to errors of which it is vain to hope to cure you, and I have not the means, if I had the inclination, to *buy* you from your selfish connection with these errors.

The charge against you at Edinburgh was, after all, a light one, considering that *you* were the person accused; it was in your catalogue a mere minor offence; a species of petty larceny in biblical falsifications; it consisted only of the *suppressio veri*, and did not, like the "Riot at Carlow," amount to the positive

suggestio falsi. It was simply this: that you detailed to the Scotch Assembly the calumny of Butterworth's Irish minion, of the name of M'Govern, against the Catholic clergy, whilst you suppressed the fact, that an investigation was publicly demanded by the Catholic priest particularly alluded to; that such an investigation took place publicly, and that the inventors of the calumny were thus publicly branded with disgrace.

The charge against you was supported by the evidence of a respectable young gentleman, Mr. M'Carthy, a student of medicine in Edinburgh, and who gave his name to the public as a pledge for his veracity.

Now, how do you answer this charge? Why, by a most improbable statement, a statement of that which may be true, but which is the most unlikely thing in the world to have occurred. You say that the subject of M'Govern's calumny was introduced by a Catholic, a Mr. Mulholland, and that you only read an affidavit of M'Govern's, made in reply to the public vindication of the Catholic priest.

I confess that I cannot bring myself to believe that a Catholic would be the first to introduce the business of M'Govern at *such a meeting*. For what purpose should he do so? With what rational intent could he introduce it at such a meeting? It is quite true, that if anybody else introduced it in order to calumniate the Catholic body, any Catholic might, and would be bound (if permitted) to dispel that calumny. But it is grossly absurd to suppose that a Catholic would be the first to introduce that subject at such a meeting. I repeat again—Why should he do so?

Your defence, therefore, is totally destitute of probability; and when your noted character for inattention to fact is taken into consideration, there will be very few, if any, tempted to acquit you.

The matter stands thus: Mr. M'Carthy makes against you a positive and very probable charge; your reply puts forward a most improbable version of the story. I know both parties; that is, I know Mr. M'Carthy to be a young gentleman of

truth and honour. I know you by character—that is enough. Under these circumstances, you may sneer at the name Timothy M'Carthy; but it is a question of credit between Timothy M'Carthy and Robert Daly, and I confess I must believe the former. This may be very bad taste; but it is, I am convinced, sound judgment.

I really do not know what, under these untoward circumstances, I could suggest to you in a friendly way. Perhaps, you could procure from your brother Biblicals of "The Irish Society," a forged signature or two, or a false affidavit or so; they have plenty of the commodity at your special service; or there are the aides-de-camp of Archbishop Magee now quite disengaged—the Rev. Murtough O'Sullivan and O'Phelan. They are just the boys to prove "process and case." Their testimony you can readily command; and even their support may be of use to him who has become a proverb and a by-word for inaccuracy in mere matter of fact.

But let me cease this trifling, and return to your letter. The next topic I notice in it is the manifest complacency with which you speak of your comrade in saintly virulence—Mr. Townley; and whom you are pleased to designate as Dr. Townley. Why, was it not Townley, the preacher of the Unitarian Calvinists in Munster, who was your associate? If so, he of course denies the Divinity of Christ. I presume you believe in it; and, yet, whether it was such individual or somebody else of the same name that aided your efforts in the Scottish capital, there is one thing certain, that you associate with many Unitarians in the pious work of destroying Popery.

Nothing comes amiss in so holy a warfare; difference of opinion (for yours is mere *opinion*, not *faith*), difference of opinion upon such a subject as the Divinity of the eternal Son of God does not interfere to prevent you from forming a Holy Alliance with the unbeliever, in order to battle against the ancient faith of Christendom.

I beg to know whether it was because Townley disbelieves the Divinity of our most sacred and adorable Redeemer that you

have dubbed him with the title of Doctor? It is like enough. Suffer me now to suggest another topic. The London Bible Society, to which you belong, have, it seems, quarrelled amongst themselves; the most important results have been produced by this quarrel. The funds of the Bible Society have been diminished by a sum of £10,000 in one year! You who are probably indifferent to a difference amongst Biblicals on the trivial subject of religion, are sufficiently alive to a difference on the very important point of money; there is a deficiency of £10,000 in one year, resulting from your biblical dispute.

The question which has divided your pious forces is stated in the Report to be—"Whether or not the Apocryphal books should be circulated by the Society with the other Scriptures?" Observe, if you please, that this involves another question namely, "What books are Apocryphal?"

The one upon no less awful a subject than the Divinity of our adorable Redeemer.

Another upon the quantity of the Apocryphal books.

A third, again, upon the propriety of circulating these books.

If Dr. Townley be the man I take him for, then he is bound, or at all events several others of your colleagues, being Unitarians, are bound upon your own principles to treat you, Parson Daly, as involved in guilt of the *nature of idolatry*—I mean in the guilt of adoring a mere human being; that is, always supposing that you really believe what you are paid for asserting you do believe.

Now, how are these questions to be decided between you and your colleagues? But who is to decide? or are these divisions to endure as long as human passions, human interests, and human folly continue?

Alas! there is no other hope of a termination. What unity, then, can ever subsist between you and your late or present associates? an unity of mischief to assail and calumniate others; but no *Unity* or *Faith* can ever subsist amongst yourselves.

Parson Daly, you have no living tribunal to which these questions could be submitted; each of you founds his own

opinions on the Scriptures. The Scriptures alone cannot therefore decide the controversy.

I now ask you, in the name of common sense, do you not feel the necessity of some tribunal, clothed with sufficient power and endowed with sufficient intelligence, to pronounce a final decision between these jarring parties, and so terminate contention? Are you so destitute of common honesty as to deny that such a tribunal would at least be *desirable*? Are you so destitute of veracity as to deny that it would be *wise*, if it were *possible* to institute such a tribunal? Can you dare deny that God is *wise*, or will you say that it is not, and was not *possible* for Him to establish such a tribunal?

To me, who most humbly and fervently bow beneath the consciousness of the perfect wisdom and omnipotent power of the Eternal Creator of the universe—whose holy Name be ever praised and blessed!—to me, the existence of such a tribunal is as plain as its necessity. I see it; I recognise it; I know it in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, founded by my Divine Redeemer on the imperishable foundation of the Rock, St. Peter, and continued in unbroken succession to this hour.

You taunt me with submission to priests. You again seek to delude. I do not submit to this, that, or the other priest; but I do submit readily and at once to the voice of the Universal Church communicated to me by her ministers.

This is not a vain or idle distinction. I will bring it at once to the test: Suppose any one priest, or several priests were to announce to me doctrines different from those of the Universal Catholic Church, or tenets repugnant to what has been believed in that Church, *semper ubique, et ab omnibus*, you would then, Parson Daly, find me reject with unaffected abhorrence such doctrines and tenets. I would fling them from me as I would the *spiritual*, although not inspired, rhapsodies of Brimstone Cooper, or the ribald declamations of Master Robert Daly.

The next matter in your letter contains a double delusion. You accuse the meek and modest, but zealous parish priest of Bray of bigotry, under the elegant *sobriquet* of a *Romish priest*.

And oh, marvellous! you praise yourself for liberality!!! I leave my respected friend, the Rev. Mr. Doyle, to vindicate himself. I am convinced he is perfectly well able to do it; but I also know his modest and retiring nature, and how unwilling he is to appear in print before the public. Yet, indeed, you left him no choice. Your calumny of him is circulating as extensively almost as the English language is known; and, however reluctant he may be to embark in newspaper controversy, he must submit to a most serious imputation, or come forward and give the public such facts as may, and certainly will, vindicate him from your interpretation.

You boast of your liberality. This, indeed, outdoes your own outdoings. You, liberal! You!!! Oh, unfeeling and cruel man, how can you taunt and insult, by such senseless boastings, the misery which surrounds you and desolates your neighbourhood. It is now about twelve years since you got the living of Powerscourt, as it is generally called. When you came to the parish, I am told, the utmost cordiality prevailed between the Catholics and Protestants. Catholic servants served Protestant masters with fidelity and gratitude; Catholic children were educated by Catholic teachers, at the expense of Protestant proprietors; Catholic tenants supported in comfort their Catholic families upon the estates of Protestant landlords, and evinced their attachment to Protestant landlords by the regularity of their payments and the propriety of their conduct; and, above all, a native spirit of kindness and goodness of heart governing the demeanour of one or two noble families (who shall now be nameless), served to give a mellow sentiment of respect on the one hand, and affection on the other, to the universal peace and good-will of the neighbourhood.

Biblical Parson Daly, is this the scene now? Is there no change? Alas! the Catholic servants have been excluded with an iron hand from the Protestant families, and driven out to starve; or, if a few remained, they have purchased their places at the expense of those smaller apostacies in which a Biblical glories, in default of procuring greater. Apostacies which, by showing their infidelity to duties they deem pleasing to

their Eternal Master, are considered sufficient to warrant their fidelity to their temporal masters! Vain, perhaps, fatal delusion. For the Catholic children, “*cunning craftiness lay in wait to deceive them;*” and to defeat that craftiness, it has become necessary, in general, to remove them from the schools supported by Protestants; and there are now few indeed of the Catholic poor educated at the expense of Protestants. Out of their own poverty, the Catholics in your parish are now compelled to find the funds necessary for education. But the mischief does not rest there. The parents of poor Catholic children undergo a cruel persecution to compel them to consent to have their children taught tenets they abhor. How many a wretched labourer has felt the iron enter his very soul beneath this cruel persecution. I appeal on these topics to the Rev. Mr. Doyle, and I call on him, in the name of that God at whose altar he ministers, to announce the whole truth respecting this vile persecution.

Again, in your neighbourhood, are not the Catholic tenants expelled; and persons selected to replace them, merely because they profess a Protestant creed of one fantastic description or other, no matter what?

If these facts exist, and co-exist with your incumbency, what a cruel and hardhearted man you must be to see those scenes daily, and then to talk of your liberality! The persons who carry on these species of persecutions certainly did not, as did the ancient French Calvinists, cut the throats of their Catholic neighbours, simply because it is no longer in their power; but, they evince the genuine spirit of persecution which would, in Spain (if the people had not twice, and authoritatively forbidden), continue the Inquisition; and which, in Ireland, erected the Orange lodges, and still fondly cherishes the embers of that base and bloody faction.

I cannot quit the subject of the persecution which the Catholics endure in your parish without declaring my firm conviction that, if there was in each county in Ireland, one parish where so much virulence and acrimony were exhibited to the Catholic poor, the result would, within six months, be a bloody

and horrible rebellion, of so desperate a character that it may be difficult to calculate on the ultimate consequences, whilst the immediate consequence would certainly be most melancholy and deplorable.

I have written so much, that I feel unwilling to lengthen this letter, and yet the most important part of your epistle remains unanswered; I mean the part purely theological.

It is somewhat strange that you should assail me with theology; I am a mere layman, whose time is abundantly occupied. You may, perhaps, know that my profession gives sufficient occupation for every hour I can devote to labour, and that my moments of relaxation and amusement are consumed by my capacity of an agitator and demagogue; and yet, layman though I be, you come forward and assail me with theological arguments. Now, I like this. There is, in spite of you, some candour in it. You attacked our theologians and divines, and were defeated. It is a pretty clear admission of that defeat, that you now deem yourself only strong enough for a mere layman. Yet a Catholic layman is, perhaps, the just proportion for a religionist of your description. The retailer of a thousand-times-refuted calumny, such as you are; the repeater, such as you are, of ribald argument, the fallacy of which has been a thousand times exposed, had better avoid divines of the ancient Church, and seek to break a spiritual lance only with laymen.

I am a layman, occupied with many cares, and yet I am able, I trust, to give a reason for the hope that is in me, convinced that truth is in its nature one—that only one faith can possibly be true; deeply impressed with the certainty that an eternity of happiness or misery is at stake, and that upon such an important subject, unaffected caution in seeking truth, and the utmost and plainest sincerity in the sight of God, in embracing and adhering to divine truth at the risk and sacrifice of every worldly interest; that such caution and sincerity are essentially necessary. With these sentiments fully fixed in my mind; with all the faculties which I possess (such as they are) habituated to the daily task of weighing evidence and balancing the force of conflicting arguments; with these advantages to

give maturity to my judgment, I can, as I do, declare the certainty with which that judgment humbly but firmly reposes in the faith and doctrines of the Catholic Church.

Nay, I go further; I am perfectly convinced, that any man who will look coolly and dispassionately at the subject, who will divest his mind of individual pride, and fling from him all the allurements of worldly interest, and who will get rid of every angry feeling and bad passion, and who will come coolly and sincerely to the consideration of religion, every such man will easily discover in the Catholic Church those plain and distinct marks of truth and authenticity which will lead him to the obvious and inevitable conclusion that Christianity could not be true and Catholicity false; or, in other words, that Catholicity and Christianity are identical—one and the same.

That men do not, even upon the most awful of all subjects, endeavour to place themselves in such a temper of mind as I have described, is, alas! but too plain. There are many obvious reasons why they do not do so; but there is no reason so powerful as that spirit of persecution of which, indeed, you yourself are so brimful, and which excites so many violent emotions as to prevent the still small voice of conscience from being heard. The voice will never be allowed fair play until the professors of Christianity, of every sect and persuasion, shall agree with me and differ with you in the conviction that one of the greatest crimes which a Christian can commit is to persecute any human being on the score of religion; or to use force or fraud, bribery or punishment, in order to procure proselytism, or to inflict chastisement for what he may deem erroneous opinions.

Let me now come—it is time for me—to the theological part of your letter.

The theological topics you chiefly put forward are two.

The first involves the question relative to the circulation of the Sacred Scriptures.

The second includes some ribaldry, which you call argument on the subject of the Real Presence, or, perhaps more accurately, that of Transubstantiation, which we Catholics believe to be the necessary result of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist.

As to the first, you do, as your fashion, mistake the question between you and the Catholic clergy.

The question is not—and you ought to know it is not—upon the circulation of the sacred writings; it turns upon the interpretations of those writings. The Catholic Church encourages, and has always encouraged, the reading of the Scriptures in a proper spirit and disposition; but that Church has denied, and always will deny, the right of private or individual interpretation.

For myself, in order to satisfy me that it is just and proper to deny the right of private interpretation, it is quite enough to know that the Catholic Church denies that right. I hear and obey the voice of the Church; but there are abundant reasons, exclusive of the authority of the Church, to satisfy any rational man of the mischiefs resulting from the private interpretation of the Scriptures.

First—It necessarily creates sects and divisions and various conflicting opinions and persuasions relative to divine truth. Look at England and her three hundred and more discordant sects, all springing from and founded on the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures. Now, reason tells us, in a manner that cannot be mistaken, that truth cannot be variant and different from itself.

If any one of the three hundred English sects be true, the rest must be false. Private interpretation, therefore, gives just this chance to each sectary—that, out of the three hundred religions, his may be the true one; but then it marks that chance with this irresistible consequence—that the other two hundred and ninety-nine must be false. In other words, there are the frightful odds of 299 to 1 against each particular sectary in England; and the result of this private interpretation is, that on the most serious and important of all subjects, the most absurd and, indeed, insane gambling is introduced and sustained by you and your Biblical allies.

But I will bring this argument more home to you. You and your Unitarian friend, Dr. Townley, probably travelled together in the same carriage through Scotland—at least, you

travelled on the same errand. Now, you believe in the Divinity of Christ. I am sure you do; for you will allow that you will be not only the vilest of hypocrites, if you did not so believe, but the greatest of knaves, for you have received many and many thousands of pounds for preaching that doctrine. But Townley has discovered that you are in error, and that you are in the error to the extent of adoring a mere human being!!! You are—or, at least, ought to be—shocked. Will you inquire how Townley made this discovery? Why, simply, by that easy process, the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures! Here is one frightful consequence of that right brought home to your very door; and yet you encourage the assertion of that very right, instead of cautioning your friend against the evils of blinding pride, and the advantages of dutiful and rational submission to authority.

Secondly—The impropriety of private interpretation is pointed out in the written word of God itself. Indeed, it is expressly forbidden. Look at the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter, c. 1, v. 25, and you will find that “no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation.” Look at the Epistles of St. Paul to the Ephesians, c. 4, especially the 11th and 12th verses, and you will find in the former, the 11th verse, that apostles, and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors, and doctors were given to the Church, and in the latter, the reason of that gift—namely, that we should not be “children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrines by the wickedness of men, by the cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive.” Can you read and not see against what species of men it is that we are warned? Look again at the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter, c. 3, v. 16, where it is said, speaking of the Epistles of St. Paul, “in which are some things hard to be understood, and which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.”

See how consistent with the written word of God is the Catholic doctrine in this as in everything else when soundly construed. That Church knows and teaches that the Scriptures, read with the proper disposition and humble spirit, make men

wise unto salvation ; but that left to be wrested by private interpretation, at the fancy of the unstable and unlearned, may lead to destruction, wrest them as they may.

Thirdly—The right of private interpretation is quite inconsistent with that unity of faith which is so repeatedly commanded in the written word—that there can be but one true faith is the plain dictate of common sense. It is also declared with equal and most emphatic distinctness in the Scriptures. Look at the 10th chapter of St. John, the 15th and 16th verses, after speaking of laying down His life for His sheep, He adds, “and other sheep I have that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and them also shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.” Look at the epistle I have already quoted, St. Paul to the Ephesians, c. 4, the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th verses, where the Apostle bids them be “careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.” Need I cite more? I could fill many pages with references of a similar tendency, but it is unnecessary. Now, let me ask, whether you or your Unitarian colleagues preserve this Unity of Faith? Is your and their faith one? Is your faith and their faith the Arminian, and Calvinist, and Methodist, and Socinian, and Raphael, &c., one; and where has the endless variety of other denominations arisen? Why, from the private interpretations of Scripture. Indeed, I believe that even you will not deny that private individual-interpretation is utterly inconsistent with unity of faith, and productive of the utmost variety in the modes of belief. How consistent that is with the written word of God I leave you, sweet sir, to ruminate upon in charitable and humane leisure.

Fourthly—You call the circulation of the Bible opening the door of heaven to the peasant. Now, sir, I think the Catholic Church right in preventing the circulation of unauthorized versions of the Scriptures, or any version with a view to private interpretation. So far from thinking the circulation a mode to

open a door to heaven, I look to the evidence of facts, and find a melancholy experience of the fatal immorality which has accompanied that circulation in England. I appeal to facts in order to ascertain whether any practical utility has followed the unlimited distribution of the Bible in England. Follow me, I pray you, and mark those facts.

England is the great theatre of Biblical exertions. It has been boasted of, that every man, woman, and child in England had, or could easily procure, a Bible; Lord Liverpool, at the head of a Bible Society, made this boast; and looking to the success of the Bible societies in England for the last twenty-five years, he vauntingly called England a Land of Bibles.

Now mark this Land of Bibles, and let these few facts attest its morality—

First fact—There was a Parliamentary Report on the Poor Laws, about the year 1823, and several Protestant clergymen were examined. I can refer you, if you desire, to the very words of their evidence: but the substance was distinctly this, that in the marriages celebrated amongst the working and poor classes in England, there were at the period of the marriage nineteen of the women out of twenty in a state of pregnancy. And I submit to you that a percentage of five virgins out of every hundred married women is rather small for a Land of Bibles.

Second fact—There have been two pamphlets published recently in England by clergymen of the Established Church relative to the labourers and poor. One of these clergymen resides in Gloucestershire, the other in Norfolk. They both detail the state of the morals of the lower classes in England, and concur in describing the villages in the country parts of England as “dens of thieves and prostitutes.” Blessed Land of Bibles!

Third fact—One of the clergymen I have above alluded to, the Rev. Mr. Brereton, is rector of Walsingham in Norfolk. It appears that his parish is now something less populous than it was at the time of the Reformation!!! Look to the 30th

and 31st pages of this pamphlet; you will find that "in half the cottage families there were cases of bastardy;" and mark, it appears from a reference to the parish registers, for a period of two hundred and seventy years, that the last twenty-five years contain more illegitimate births than the preceding two centuries and a half!!! Compare this with the boasting of Lord Liverpool, and admire the Land of Bibles—and mark the curious coincidence between immorality and fanaticism.

Fourth fact—This same Lord Liverpool, on Tuesday, the 9th of this present month of May, in introducing "the Criminal Justice Imprisonment Bill" into the House of Lords, expressly said "that crime had greatly increased in England within the last seven years, as compared with the seven years preceding." See, then, the value of all these Biblical exertions, which are so much boasted of by you and your allies. Behold England increasing in Bibles and in crime—and Parson Daly calling the circulation of those Bibles the door to heaven.

It will be said that I calumniate the people of England, whilst I merely collect the testimony of their own clergymen and governors. Be it so—I cheerfully submit to the calumny; I use these facts for the purpose of showing that, as both reason and religion concur with the Catholic Church in opposing the undue and improper circulation of the Scriptures, so the evidence of facts demonstrates the wisdom of that Church, to whom it was promised that the Spirit of Wisdom should abide with her for ever.

I now come to the last and most important topic in your letter. It relates to the Real Presence—I say emphatically the Real Presence—because any man who believes in the Real Presence is, in my judgment, inconsistent with himself, unless he also believes in Transubstantiation. I do not know, nor can I conjecture, of what materials your mind may be composed—whether it be, as I suspect, imbued with sour sectarianism, of so bitter and ungenerous a nature that your worship rather resembles the fear-inspired invocation of the demon by the ignorant Indian, than that charitable, but humble hope, which I think Christi-

anity was formed to create and foster. If you have in you any materials for charity, surely you ought, at least, to wish that the doctrines of the Real Presence were true. It places our Adorable Redeemer in so amiable a point of view—it gives to His love for man so active and perpetual an energy—it presents so constant a memorial of all He did and said, and suffered for us—it reminds us so strongly, and even by His own presence, of the bitterness of His passion, and the agony of His death for us—that even those who disbelieve ought to wish that so sweet, so constant, so universal a pledge of divine love was given us. For my humble part, he who would tear this belief from my mind, would rend asunder one of the tenderest and most powerful links that bind my soul in humble and tremulous, but strong hope, to my Father and my God. Oh, how sincerely do I bless His holy name, that as there is no sweeter tenet of Christianity, so there is none founded on more clear, convincing, and indeed, demonstrative arguments.

Let me first rebuke you (I now do it gently) for that sour uncharitableness which makes you accuse of idolatry a mistaken belief in the Real Presence. Even if it were a mistake it would not be idolatrous. My adoration is directed to Christ, true God and true man. In the sacrament I adore nothing but Him—my intention is directed to the adoration of Him. If He were not there it would be a mere mistake of fact and not of intent, and could not therefore be idolatry. If, when Christ was upon earth, a man who did not know his person mistook an unbelieving Jew for Christ, and adored him, thinking it was Christ, would he incur the guilt of idolatry? Certainly not—neither would I be guilty of idolatry even if I were mistaken as to the fact. And your assertion to the contrary is, I hope, a proof only of your ignorance of subjects connected with religion, and not evidence of a spirit unbecoming a clergyman of any persuasion or a Christian of any sect.

But I am not mistaken—the doctrine of the Real Presence is founded on the clearest and most abundant proofs. Listen to the manner in which a mere layman of the Catholic Church,

amidst the pressure of various and urgent occupations, can place those proofs before you.

I believe in the Real Presence for three reasons:—

First—That belief is enjoined by the holy Catholic Church, and both reason and religion combine to assure me that that Church cannot possibly lead me into error.

Reason tells me that, if Christianity were a mere human institution, its founder, if he were not an entire idiot, must have established some tribunal or authority to which all differences of sentiments amongst his followers should be submitted, their disputes and dissensions terminated, and the entire body kept together in peace and unity.

Without some tribunal or authority of this description, no society, body, or community of persons could be kept together for any length of time. Particular occasions and temporary motives might keep them together for a season, but there could be no permanence nor continual peace amongst them, unless they changed their natures, and became more or less than men.

The experience of the present day—the crowds of sectaries which are produced by a rebellion against the tribunal of religion—the marked and most important difference which exists between you and Dr. Townley—the interminable nature of the controversies that arise between those who are out of the pale of the Church; all these feuds add to the force of the strong but obvious reasoning, and convince every judgment, that the Founder of Christianity would not be wise unless he had established such a tribunal.

But that Founder was not only wise but also all-powerful. He therefore was able to endow the tribunal which He did establish with sufficient wisdom to render it impossible for that tribunal to lead into any error whatsoever.

This, of which common sense and reason would alone suffice to convince me, is placed beyond any possibility of doubt by the written testimony of God Himself. I will point your attention to some of that testimony—it is easily brought together, and to every unbiassed mind it must be conclusive.

First—In the fourth chapter of St. John, in those awful moments which immediately preceded His passion, our Divine Redeemer consoles His Apostles with the following promise—see v. 16, 17: “And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth,” &c. ; and in the 26th v., “But the Paraclete—the Holy Ghost—whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things.” Now these promises could not have been made to the Apostles as individuals, because, as individuals, they were not themselves to “abide for ever.” It must, therefore, have been to them and to their successors in the Church to whom the perpetuity could alone belong—and with whom, therefore, it is plain that “the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, teaching all things, abides for ever.”

Second—The Gospel of St. Matthew closes with the equally consolatory promise from our Divine Redeemer Himself, addressed to His Apostles—“Go you, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them,” &c. &c., “and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world.” This promise, too, is like the former, unlimited in point of duration, save by the duration of time itself. Thus, then, have we express promises that the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, and our Adorable Redeemer Himself, would abide and remain for ever with His Church.

Thirdly—I refer to one passage more, and which, indeed, alone is all-sufficient—it is the 18th verse of the 16th chapter of St. Matthew: “And I say unto thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Thus, then, have we the most unbounded certainty that the Church is founded on the most solid foundation—that the gates of hell have not prevailed, and never can prevail against it—and that the eternal Son of God, who is one with the Father, and also the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, for ever abides with that Church. Can it be possible, then, the Church so founded, so supported, so directed and

taught can err? Who shall attempt to say that the gates of hell have prevailed against her; and if they have not so prevailed, how foolish is it to stand in hostility against that Church, and of what value are all the thousands of pounds which you, Mr. Daly, are paid for your hostility to that Church—of what avail are they to you?

For my part, allow me to revere authority thus constituted, and to believe promises the most emphatic and explicit that language can convey. Alas! what a strange creature is man to venture to contradict those solemn promises by paltry and peddling chicanery, and to set up his own individual notions, whether crude or deliberate, against the voice of the Church, which is thus founded and supported. It may and does gratify human pride to shake off authority, and glorify itself in its own miserable conceits, but does it not also exhibit the extent of human folly to see men risk their dearest interests for eternity, upon the precarious presumption that they are wiser than the Church of Christ.

For my part, my first reason—and it would alone to my mind supersede all others—for believing in the Real Presence is, that the doctrine is taught by the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

A second reason for believing it, and one that if I had leisure and ability I would address to every sincere and unbiassed Christian in the universe—no matter to what sect or persuasion he may belong—my second reason for believing in the Real Presence is, that it is most clearly and repeatedly revealed in the written word of God. It would, I believe, be difficult to find any one Christian tenet so clearly and repeatedly announced in Scripture.

The signs and types of the Old Law referred to it. The Pascal Lamb was but a figure of the Holy Eucharist—the priesthood of the order of Melchisedech, to which Christ for ever belongs, typified in the bread and wine, the elements for the service of the altar, by the priesthood of the New Law. Let me, however, pass over these, and come to some of the pas-

sages of the New Testament which relate to this Divine mystery.

Let any unbiassed, candid, and sincere man, unclouded by passion or pride, take up the 6th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, and see whether it be possible, without perversity of some kind, to resist the evidence contained in that chapter.

Let him, however, recollect, first, that the first miracle with which our Redeemer announced His divine authority was a miracle by transubstantiation—it was the changing the substance of water into the substance of wine. Let him, secondly, recollect that one of the miracles which was most frequently repeated by our Saviour was the multiplication of the identity of one and the same substance. Let him then look into the 6th chapter of St. John, and he will find that it begins with precisely a miracle of this nature: five barley loaves and two fishes were found sufficient in the hands of our Saviour to feed about five thousand persons. Nay, we find by the 13th verse, that, after this multitude had been fully fed, the fragments were gathered up, and they “filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above to them that had eaten.” Recollect that twelve baskets were filled with the fragments of five barley loaves. It is so written—which five loaves could of course have been easily carried in one basket, and yet there were “twelve baskets filled with the fragments!” Where is now the reverend, the very reverend Robert Daly, with his question? Why does he not now ask how twelve baskets could be filled with “the fragments” of that which, whole and entire, might be contained in one basket, or at the utmost in two, but let us say in five? Alas for his questioning! Here is the text express against his interrogatories.

One would imagine that the persons who were present at and participated in such a miracle as this, would submit to the authority of Him by whom it was performed. Do we find it so? Do we find that they who were thus miraculously fed,

and saw with their own eyes the fragments exceed, at least nine or tenfold, or probably twelve or twenty times the amount of the original quantity—do we find that they yielded to the Divine authority? No, there were Robert Dalys amongst them, and the miracle was thrown away upon them who were fed by its means: as, alas! it is thrown away upon the disciples and companions of Robert Daly in the present day.

Let, however, the candid and fair men who value their salvation beyond every pecuniary interest or triumph of argument, proceed with the sixth chapter of St. John; they will see that this appears to be just the occasion for the Divine goodness to announce some truth which human self-sufficiency would hesitate to receive, and call a hard saying. Accordingly we find that whilst the multitude were, or at least ought to have been, strongly impressed with this miracle, our Divine Saviour availed Himself of that as the fit moment to announce the doctrine of the Real Presence, as it is now believed, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

I should transcribe the whole chapter, if I were to put forward all that it contains on this most important subject. I only beg the truth-seeking reader to observe that Christ, in the 29th verse, takes care to inform His hearers that “this is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he sent;” and after giving this caution, let the natural and distinct way in which the doctrine of the Real Presence is brought forward be particularly noted—and in particular how strongly and repeatedly the necessity of explicit belief in Him is enforced. Look at the 35th verse, in which He declares Himself to be the Bread of Life; and the ensuing passages, at which the Jews murmured and expressed their doubts—but how are these doubts met? Look at the 47th and the ensuing verses to the 52nd inclusively, which I cannot avoid transcribing—“He that believeth in me hath everlasting life.” “I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which came down from heaven, that if any man eat of it he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from

heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." Nothing certainly can be more distinct and explicit. Accordingly the carnal question-asking Jews revolted at the plain and obvious meaning. The spirit which now animates you, Mr. Daly, was then quite alive amongst the unhappy Jews. The very trick of arguing by question was then, as it is now, the resource of obstinate and misguided error. Thus we find by the 53rd verse that "the Jews strove amongst themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

Now you perceive that those who heard our Saviour understood His words, as they manifestly ought, in their plain and ordinary sense. If that was a misconception it would of course have been rectified. Our Saviour who had shown his tender compassion for their bodily wants and supplied them with corporal food, would certainly have laid no snare for their immortal souls. That charity which brought Him from heaven to die for those unbelievers, and for you and me, would certainly have relieved them from all doubts and difficulties if his words were figurative, or conveyed any other than their obvious meaning. It is impossible, utterly impossible, to suppose that He could have intended to deceive, or that He would leave them in any mistake or error. Attend, therefore, to His reply, and if it does not make your heart burn within you, deplore your misery and seek at the source for true light.

Attend to the reply to the question—"How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

I will mark the verses of that reply :—

54 Now Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say unto you: Except you eat of the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.

55 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood: hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day.

56 For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed:

57 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.

58 As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.

59 This is the bread which cometh down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.

Can any fair or honest man now hesitate to say, that this answer, given to persons who murmured in their doubts, was given to put an end to all doubts, and enforce truth by authority? It of course removed all doubt from the minds of the Jews, who heard our Saviour, and they accordingly with that pert flippancy which even now characterises the writings of Mr. Daly, exclaimed, "This saying is hard, and who can bear it?"

Even the chosen disciples secretly murmured, and their thoughts were read in their inmost souls by our Divine Master, see verse 63. Who will believe that He pretended to deceive them, as well as the Jews? Who will believe that He would leave them in error? It would have been so easy to have undeceived the Jews, if they laboured under any mistake. It would have been so easy to have reconciled the disciples, if they had any misconception; it was only to say, you misunderstood me—that is not my meaning.

But the truth is manifest—they did not misunderstand. It was literally His meaning, that which His words naturally expressed, and accordingly our Saviour appeals to the greatest of His miracles—His ascension into Heaven—to sustain His authority, even with His disciples, that they may unhesitatingly believe Him when He said that He "would give his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink." His reply contained these reproachful words:—"Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before."

This perseverance in the assertion of the doctrine, that I am now, humbly and feebly, but sincerely sustaining, had its natural effect on the proud and credulous spirits by whom I was surrounded. Although they had been fed by His marvellous bounty; although they had heard him appeal to

a still greater and transcendent miracle; yet we find in the 67th verse:—"After this, many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

Let me then close my comment on the chapter, with three verses more, and a few observations:—

68 Then Jesus said to the twelve: Will you also go away?

69 And Simon Peter answered him: Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.

70 And we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ the Son of God.

What course ought we to pursue? Ought we, because there are difficulties in the way of our belief, ought we because we deem these sayings as hard, to go back and walk no more with Him?

Let Mr. Daly take that course if he pleases; for us, we know that Christ has the words of Eternal Life, and we yield implicitly our faith to His words.

I have dwelt long upon the 6th chapter of St. John, but I have by no means exhausted the reasonings which it furnishes. On the contrary, I have sketched only a few obvious arguments, and totally omitted many powerful topics which that chapter furnishes. I wish that every candid and dispassionate man would read it, and would also read the miserable cavils by which the innate force of the testimony borne in that chapter to the doctrine of the Real Presence is sought to be eluded; and unless there was some cause for the blindness or the fatuities of the mind of the person calmly considering that chapter, I do not see how he could avoid discovering the truth.

There are abundant other Scriptural proofs of this doctrine. The institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist itself. The words used on that occasion are so clear, so strong, so distinct, that it requires some effort to bring oneself to believe that any reasonable being can resist the force of the words. I will quote those to be found in St. Matthew, chapter xxvi, verses 26, 27, 28:—

And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye and eat, this is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks: and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins.

It is not possible to use words more distinctly calculated to convey their meaning. How do you resist then? By a very summary, and very easy, but not very reverential mode. It is simply by contradicting our Divine Redeemer directly and without circumlocution. He says, It is my body. You say, It is not. He says, It is my blood. You say, It is not. In that plain and simple way stands the controversy. Let him who believes the Word of God with me believe in the Real Presence. Let those who directly contradict the Word of God join with Mr. Daly in making that belief a subject of ribald jest and paltry buffoonery.

I shall notice the miserable sophistry by which the force of these plain words is sought to be eluded. It is by this sapient discovery, namely, that our Saviour occasionally makes use of metaphors. Why, He certainly does, and so does everybody who speaks any human language. But, in the first place, a metaphor is as easily understood, and is as true in its meaning, as any simple phrase; and, in the next, it is a most gross violation of every rule of common sense and grammar to call this phrase, "This is my body," a metaphor. It is rational, although impious, to say that it is false; but it is nonsensical to say that it is metaphorical.

Perhaps on this subject I should not quote any other text; but there are two passages which bring me in contact with the Protestant version of the Bible, and may therefore be particularly noticed. They are to be met with in the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, chapter xi., verses 27 and 29. In the first of these the words are:—"Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord." Now, in the name of common sense, could anybody be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord unless that body and that blood

were present for men to be guilty of? To what miserable subterfuges are you, Protestants, driven in order to elude a denunciation so plain, so direct, so manifest!!!

The other passage is this:—"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."

Mark well the phrase. Can it be a crime not to discern what is not there? If the body of Christ be not in the Sacrament, can it be a crime not to discern it there? And on the other hand, how can the body of the Lord be discerned, unless it can be actually present in the Sacrament?

Let a fair and reasonable answer be given to these questions. Let the answer come from a candid mind, divested of the spirit of contention, and disposed to embrace truth; the result is obvious. Such a man will answer at once, "The body of Christ must be present, in order to be discerned. The body of Christ must be in the Sacrament, else it could not possibly be a crime not to discern it there."

Let me now, by way of parenthesis, remark that the Protestant version of the Bible contains a gross, glaring, and an admitted, but I believe still an uncorrected falsification of the above-mentioned 27th verse. The word *or* is translated into *and*, and thus, what is disjunctive in the original is copulative in the Protestant version. It is well known that this falsification was intended to answer a particular purpose; and is it not continued till this day? Yet the falsification circulates *this*, too, as the word of God.

Let me also remark that in the 29th verse, the word which the Catholics translate "judgment," is rendered "damnation" in the Protestant version. The meaning of both is so nearly the same, if not the same, that I do not quarrel with, perhaps, the more emphatic translation of the Protestant. But I would respectfully and earnestly solicit every candid Protestant who sincerely wishes to be in the right upon a subject of eternal importance, to reflect seriously on what it is for which his Bible denounces upon him the sentence of damnation. Is it not for

not discerning the body of the Lord in the Sacrament? Let him then return to the Catholic Church, and he will, with us, discern that Blessed and Adorable Body and reverence it in truth and simplicity of heart.

I have thus terminated, for the present, my Scripture quotations to sustain the doctrine of the Real Presence. I have by no means exhausted these quotations. I have omitted many, because there is not space or time remaining to introduce them for the present. I may, and probably will, be sneered at for dwelling too long on subjects of a purely theological nature. I care not. My wish is merely to show you that a Catholic layman, even without leisure, can defend his faith upon grounds which even you ought to respect.

I have now gone through the reasons which sustain the Catholic in his belief of the Real Presence, as founded on the authority of the Church of God, and on that of His written Word. I proceed to another distinct and powerful ground of this belief.

Thirdly—This belief is sustained by the force of the unbroken tradition or unwritten Word of God, preserved by His Church. To a Catholic, who equally reveres the unwritten with the written Word, the testimony of tradition is of a decisive nature. By the Protestants, this is considered as mere human testimony. I will not, at present, enter into the arguments by which that notion of the Protestants has been so often and so ably confuted; but, even as human testimony, it ought to have its weight with every rational man.

Now, the fact is plain, and capable of demonstration, that the doctrine of the Real Presence has been the doctrine of the Church from the Ascension of our Divine Redeemer to the time of the Reformation, and has been continued by the Catholic Church to the present moment. This is a fact of great importance, and it is easily proved by a reference to all the original writers, in every age and country. All these holy men, who have by consent of mankind been called "Fathers of the Church," have devoutly believed the Real

Presence, and unanimously borne testimony to the perpetuity of that belief in the Church, from the days of the Apostles inclusively.

At first, several Protestant writers endeavoured to dispute this fact, and sought, by the most strange sophistry, to distort the obvious meaning of the ancient Fathers; but the attempt was too glaring a fraud to have any permanent success; and, accordingly, all the latter divines have been compelled to abandon to us all the "Fathers of the Church;" all the saints and great men who flourished as the lights of religion, and ornaments of humanity, are all now given up to us, as being full of "rank Popery."

An ignorant man (such as I believe you, Mr. Daly, to be) may not know the fact; but, if you are acquainted with Church history, even you cannot be so audacious as to deny that all the Fathers and ancient writers on Christianity, uniformly, and without exception, sustain (wherever they treat the subject) the belief of the Real Presence.

Thus, then, by the confession I will say of all parties, the belief of the Real Presence has existed since the days of the Apostles. Why do I say by the confession of all? Because all are reduced to silence, or made to expose their folly by proposing a simple question in plain terms. It is thus you say that the doctrine of the Real Presence has not subsisted in the Church since the days of the Apostles, but has been introduced subsequently. Very well. Now, pray tell me when it was introduced, and by whom, by name? This question has been one thousand times asked, but never answered satisfactorily. Some Protestants have, at first, met it directly, and they named the person and the time. But they were soon driven from the post so taken; for the moment any Protestant named a time as that in which this doctrine was introduced, or a person who introduced it, the moment the assertion was put in so tangible a shape, that instant the assertion was refuted, and the Catholics were able to show that the belief in the Real Presence existed prior to the time thus

designated, and to the person thus named. The conclusion is triumphant, that this doctrine must have been introduced by Christ and the Apostles, as it certainly has not been introduced since that time.

Every candid Protestant, who has sufficient leisure, should read upon this subject Arnauld's work, called "*Perpetuite de la Foi.*" It should be read by every man who is capable of admiring the powers of human mind of the first order. It shows a depth of learning almost exceeding credibility, and a force of reasoning and of logical and precise argumentation which even an infidel could not fail to admire; and which ought, I think, carry conviction to every unbiassed and honest mind.

Parson Daly, I have, for the present, done with you. I have written this letter almost as rapidly as any person could read it through; and, although I have exhausted the patience of others, I have not exhausted myself on the subject.

There is, indeed, one topic more, on which I should have particularly wished to have met you. You have assailed my creed with ribaldry. I should like to have attacked your creed by argument; that is, if I could possibly discover what that creed is; if you have not made more scanty, the already scanty belief of the Established Church; if you have not thrown one or two more sacraments overboard, after the other five, which it pleased your saintly Reformers totally to annul, amidst their total abandonment of morality and utter contempt of good works; if you have not condemned the harmless rite of baptism (was it not so called, without reproof, in your presence?); if you have not gone beyond your Church, and reformed, as is the constant practice, every precedent reformation. If this be not so, and that you adhere to the tenets of the Church, "as by law" established, I should, I confess, like to attack, by some argument, its creed of shifts, and compromises, and contradictions. I should like to expose that most melancholy and deplorable system of asserting in Articles of Belief for the mature, and in Catechisms for the young, tenets

which are denied in your pulpits and contradicted by your individual instructions.

Finally, if I had time and opportunity, I think I would satisfy every rational man that, quite independently of the question, whether or not the doctrine of the Catholic Church be true, it is as morally impossible but that the Established Church must be false, as it is that contradictory propositions should co-exist, or that black and white should be one and the same colour.

I am sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

FIRST LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

London, 4th April, 1833.

“ Far dearer the grave or the prison,
Illum'd by one patriot name,
Than the trophies of all who have risen
On Liberty's ruins to fame!”

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—This is the first of a series of letters which I intend to publish on the present state and future prospects of our country, including the best suggestion I can give for regulating your conduct in the manner most calculated to mitigate the evils of the one and to insure the amelioration of the other.

Let it, however, be always recollected that the entire scope and object of my political life now is, to advance and secure the Repeal of the Legislative Union between these two countries, convinced as I am, in the deepest recesses of my conscience, that it is impossible—utterly impossible—to do any permanent or valuable service to Ireland until the restoration of her domestic Parliament.

This conviction has long been floating in my mind, but it is now fixed unalterably and for ever. The manner in which the Anglesey Algernine Bill was received by the British Legislature—the foolish, as well as false, allegation by which it was supported—the enormous majorities by which it was ultimately carried—the shouts of domination and triumph by which the advocates of Irish liberty were insulted, and the unsuppressed spirit of national hostility which guided and animated our enemies have taught me that it is worse than folly to imagine that the affairs of Ireland can be attended to with the requisite knowledge of facts and cordial sincerity of intention in any other than in an Irish Parliament.

I need not dwell on this point. I cannot describe with anything like accuracy the extent of the innate hatred of

Ireland which I have witnessed in many men since my last return to this country. They hate us—and without avowing it, even to themselves, they fear us. We must have a domestic Legislature, or we can never be safe in our properties, our lives, or our liberties.

Nay, more—I am thoroughly persuaded that the only way to prevent the final separation of the two countries is, to attach Ireland to the connection, by giving her the protection from insult and injury of a Parliament of her own.

It is, therefore, my sacred duty to exert every faculty of my mind to bring about that state of the public mind in Ireland, in which every good man will be ready to join with me in the Repeal of the Union, no matter what may be his party, his religion, his prejudice, or his resentments.

The Anglesey Algerine Act—so much worse than the Wellington Algerine Law—has left us no alternative. It silences for ever those who bid us look to the justice and humanity of the British Parliament; the day is gone by for cant and hypocrisy of that description. There does not live a knave so audacious as now to dare to talk of the kindness and care of British legislators for Ireland; and, if such a knave exists, there breathes not a single dolt so brutally stupid as to give even one moment's credence to his assertions.

Argument and reasoning are over. The inevitable conclusion is arrived at. Before the Repeal of the Union no good can be done for Ireland—until the Repeal of the Union Ireland can reap but little benefit from British connection. I repeat that those who oppose the Repeal are blindly and ignorantly, but not the less powerfully or certainly, driving towards separation.

To us, who are not at present separatists, and never will be so if we can help it—to us who honestly seek the restoration of Irish freedom and the establishment of Irish prosperity, but one duty—one great, all-absorbing duty—remains: it is peaceably and legally to effectuate the restoration of an Irish Parliament.

There is but one problem to be solved—that is, the mode of legally and peaceably accomplishing our objects. All we want to know is, the manner of doing the thing. The thing itself is inevitable—indeed, the “Anglesey Algerine Bill,” instead of retarding the progress of the Repeal, has to a demonstration greatly promoted its ultimate and most satisfactory success.

This demonstration I will take up a little later. For the present I content myself with some preliminary topics.

In the first place, it may be a matter of surprise to some that, with all the madness of slavery upon me, I should write with so much of cool calmness. To those persons I readily acknowledge, that an offence has been committed against all the great principles of the constitution, and against the people of Ireland, too deep to be forgotten, and too cruel to be ever forgiven.

The rankling wound caused by national injustice and Whig despotism (oh, the ever odious Whig!) is too excruciating ever to heal. Yet I am cool, and quiet, and deliberate; no bursts of passion sway my soul—no fervid epithets of execration burn in my description of individual venality, profligacy, or folly. No; I console myself, and I am consoled by the certainty that the great measure of national regeneration is advanced by the actions of our worst and most malignant enemies in every part of the British empire. Our friends, and the friends of liberty in Great Britain, are up in heart, courage, and generous sympathy; and the very measure which was intended to crush the agitation of the Repeal, actually makes the Repeal irresistible.

I return to the mode of procuring the Repeal—of procuring it peaceably and without violating any law.

Attend to me, my countrymen—attend to me; you have often listened to my voice and taken my counsel. I can once again proudly, because truly, repeat, that no man ever was sorry for observing my advice in political affairs. My object is now to show how we are to Repeal the Union.

It seems to me that there are these two preliminary measures necessary, before we can arrive at that state of moral and poli-

tical organization (under the now existing law) which is requisite in order to produce the Repeal in the only manner in which we seek it—that is, without crime and without blood.

The first of these measures is the suppression of “Whitefeet” outrages. I use the word because it is the last name assumed by the miscreant wretches who have in so many shapes, and for so many years, plundered various parts of Ireland in horrible crimes against property, and stained our country with the turpitude, the atrocity, and the demoniacal repetition of murder—crimes demanding the vengeance of man, and also bringing down the punishment of God.

Long and long since would Ireland have shaken off the yoke of her worst grievances, but that her friends are disheartened, disgusted, and almost silenced by reason of the commission of “Whitefeet” crimes, whilst every enemy of Ireland is strengthened and fortified by the natural and necessary consequences of that criminality.

The present Anglesey Gagging Bill could never have been introduced—base and worthless as the Whigs are, yet they never could have introduced the present despotic Bill, but for the colour and pretext afforded them by the atrocious murders of the villainous “Whitefeet.”

Our first concern, therefore, is to put down “Whitefeet” outrages. In that sentiment every patriotic Irishman concurs. I will in my future letters develop that organisation of the “Volunteers,” which, without violating the existing “Algerine” Law, must enable us to contribute effectually to terminate the predial crimes now called “Whitefeetism.”

In the meantime it is the duty of every honest Irishman to exert all his faculties and energies to put down “Whitefeetism.” Wherever any of us have influence let it be directed to this object. Let each of us in his own sphere redouble all former exertions to this effect—and, above all, let us impress on the mind of everybody within our reach the impossibility of ever giving freedom to Ireland whilst “Whitefeet” crimes contaminate, degrade, and weaken our native land.

The second preliminary is one of more easy attainment—it is to conciliate all classes and persuasions of Irishmen towards each other. I have the liveliest happiness in being able to state that the approximation of Irishmen—Protestants, Orangemen, and Catholics—towards each other is progressing with a rapidity which exceeds my expectations, and almost equals my ardent wishes for entire and universal conciliation. There are, to be sure, some who continue obdurate and prejudiced, but the number is daily diminishing; and even in the north, the Orangemen are—many of them at least—beginning to perceive that, whilst as Protestants they have nothing to fear, they, as Irishmen, have everything to gain from the establishment of a domestic Legislature in Ireland.

Fellow-Countrymen—These are now your greatest and most paramount duties:—

First—To put down, now and for ever, Whitefeet crimes and outrages.

Second—To reconcile to each other, and to bury in eternal oblivion, the dissensions between Protestants, Catholics, and Orangemen, showing to all that they have a general, as well as an individual and equal interest in the regeneration of our now unhappy, impoverished, and, alas, most grossly insulted and oppressed country.

I now come to the most interesting part of my subject, the mode of continuing, without any violation of the “Anglesey Gagging Bill,” our national exertions to procure the Repeal.

We must not violate the law. We must keep within the strict bounds of the statute. But we can, within these bounds, continue, and even extend, our peaceable exertions for the Repeal.

I know the spirit of Irish patriotism is still “unfading and warm,” and so long as that spirit reigns paramount in the breasts of the honest men of Ireland, I will take care that it shall not want the mode, or the means, of working out the political salvation of the ever-loved, and lovely, land of our birth.

The Volunteers can aid, but they shall not be the only legal body to advance the interests and the rights of Ireland.

However, in order to understand fully the safety and security, as well as the utility of my plans for continuing wholesome agitation under the Algerine law, it is necessary that I should point out briefly some of the mischiefs which that law does *not* perpetrate.

Let it be recollected, that, in this letter, I am treating of the law in districts not proclaimed in a state of disturbance and outrage, that is, not Whitefeet districts.

In all other districts, save those contaminated by Whitefeet, the Algerine bill, as it left the Committee of the House of Commons, and was ultimately passed, has these circumstances of mitigation about it:—

First—It gives no power to the magistracy over meetings of any kind. Understand the magistrates have no authority whatsoever given them under this Act. A magistrate cannot prohibit or suppress any meeting under this Act. He is just where he was before this law was passed.

It is most important to observe this point, because it leaves all meetings, which are not prohibited by an express and notified proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, precisely as legal as they have been hitherto.

It is indeed comfortable, amidst the gloom of discontent, naturally and necessarily created by this most unconstitutional law, to perceive this one gleam of consolation, that all parties in the House disclaimed the Irish magistracy as unfit to be intrusted with any additional powers. Except amongst the extreme Irish Tories this was the universal sentiment of the House. Accordingly, no additional power whatever is given to those unlauded animals, the Irish magistrates.

Secondly—No meeting can be rendered illegal under this Act until it has been proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant, and that proclamation notified to the persons so meeting.

There are, therefore, under this Act, two ingredients necessary to make a patriotic meeting illegal. The first is a

proclamation by the Lord Lieutenant; the second is a notification of that proclamation to the persons intended to be affected by it.

This is clearly a great improvement in this Act over the "Wellington Algerine Act," and I must claim the merit, because I believe it to be mine, of suggesting this improvement.

It is, to be sure, melancholy and heartrending to think that notwithstanding this amendment yet the Lord Lieutenant may, under this most unconstitutional law, prohibit and render illegal, by his notified proclamation, the most useful, the most necessary, nay, the most charitable meeting of Irishmen.

It is, indeed, deplorable, beyond the powers of language to be obliged to confess, that a pseudo-reformed Parliament should have given such a power as this to any Lord Lieutenant; for example, to so unwise a person as Lord Anglesey. It is a power which no lover of liberty would give to the wisest and best of mankind; but the Parliament that gave it is—thank heaven!—sufficiently alien from Ireland.

Thirdly—The power of the Lord Lieutenant is confined to rendering a meeting illegal—observe "a meeting;" I say it emphatically. For example, the Lord Lieutenant may issue a proclamation to prohibit any meeting of the Volunteers. After such proclamation, any meetings of the Volunteers would be illegal, and none such will take place whilst this gagging Bill is law.

But the association of the Volunteers would not, and cannot, thus be rendered illegal. It will be no offence to continue to be a Volunteer, and so will every other member of that body be who does not actually resign. Indeed, I will always boast of being, and continuing, a Volunteer, until I see that body restored to their pristine honour and dignity by Act of Parliament, and empowered by law, to arm themselves and become the unpaid police of Ireland.

I repeat, therefore, that the proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, will of course prevent the Volunteers from meet-

ing ; it will render a meeting of the Volunteers illegal ; but it will leave the association of the Volunteers as legal as they were before the Act ; and, although we do not meet in any assembly, we can co-operate as individuals ; we can direct and regulate our conduct by correspondence, especially through the newspapers, for we have not, and never will have, any secrets. Thus the Volunteers can, one and all, continue their exertions to elucidate the evils Ireland has incurred by, and from, the Union ; to keep alive the genial glow of patriotic ardour for the repeal of that most disastrous and fatal measure, and at the same time to use their best exertions to put down all predial outrages and crimes ; and, lastly, to conciliate and reconcile all classes of their fellow-countrymen, by burying in a generous oblivion all party feuds and religious dissensions amongst Irishmen.

Let my advice be attended to, and the Volunteers will again shine forth in Irish history. Let them obey the law and preserve themselves and their sacred cause for better times. To them is the deposit of Irish liberty especially commended. Let this be their watchword and their motto—

“ Durate et vosmet rebus servate secundis.”

I will in this mode correspond with the Volunteers, and assist them to crush outrages and crimes, and to promote such rational arbitrations amongst the people as may keep them away from the petty and general sessions.

But these are no more than the outskirts of agitation. We must arrange, under the new state of affairs, our future plan for as general a combination as possible, to attain, by legal and constitutional means, a redress of Irish grievances.

It will be my business to bring that plan before the public. I will, in these, my public letters, in order to vindicate the confidence the Volunteers have reposed in me, point out the modes by which the people may be kept from despair, and the enemies of the people prevented from exasperating suffering millions into madness and insurrection.

We must teach the people the paths of peace which alone can conduct them to prosperity and liberty.

I proceed to open my plan for the liberation of Ireland from her present thralldom, and for the restoration of her domestic legislature.

The first element, and the leading principle of that plan is, the proper use of the Elective Franchise.

This is my first position. It is absolutely necessary that the people of Ireland should render the elective franchise as available as possible.

The first step in the new agitation is to organise the elective franchise in every county, city, town, and borough in Ireland.

This species of agitation has these two great recommendations. First—It is perfectly safe. Secondly—It must be eminently useful.

It may be said that we are only in the beginning of a Parliament, and therefore the advantages to be derived from the organization of the elective franchise are remote.

This is not so. There never was a Parliament so likely to be short as the present.

In the first place, the age of the King, and the precarious state of his health—matters to be spoken of with respect and regret—enter as ingredients in our calculation of the duration of this Parliament.

In the second place, the disconnected and heterogeneous materials of which the present ministry are composed, render it next to impossible that they should remain long in office. I anticipate the dissolution of the present ministry, even before the end of the present session.

In the next place, the total abandonment by the present ministry of their old principles; the trampling under foot of all those principles in the Irish Despotism Bill; their sacrifice of the trial by jury, the palladium of the safety and liberty of Englishmen; their sacrifice of the last resource of the wretched the right to complain; their sweeping indemnity to the military,

and subjecting them to no other punishment save by courts-martial; these, the leading features of the Irish Despotism Bill, sink deeply into the minds of the thinking and reasoning part of the British community, and are silently but rapidly producing such sentiments of disgust and abhorrence of the present ministry in the public mind of this country, that it is not possible they should continue long in office.

Add to this, that this ministry has done nothing; is doing nothing; promises nothing to the suffering and overburdened people of England, who were led to expect confidently great relief from the Reform Bill, and are now getting none at all.

But the faults of this ministry are not merely of a negative quality. They have committed actual errors, which the people of England call crimes; they have refused an inquiry into the distress of the people. They have refused an inquiry into the practicability of a plan to relieve productive industry from taxation, by placing taxation upon property alone. They have determined to continue naval and military sinecures; and, lastly, they have totally refused to abolish flogging in the army.

They are the doings of a reforming ministry in the first session of a Reformed Parliament. Well may the people of England ask, "If these things be done in the green wood, what will be done in the dry?"

Believe me, this ministry cannot stand. They will shrink out of office, amidst the shouts of indignation of all parties. This ministry must soon be dissolved. It is impossible to go back to Toryism. We are one hundred years, as years reckon in political life, beyond the possible restoration of Toryism. Let us, then, be prepared for the event. The dissolution of this ministry necessarily leads to the dissolution of the Parliament.

Let us, then, and from this moment, prepare for that event.

This is my first step in the new agitation. I must be the prime agitator myself. Without co-operation, it is, of course, evident that I should be powerless; but, with the aid of a few honest and active men in each locality, the people can, and shall

be ready for a new election—to promote their friends and to punish their enemies.

I think I may pledge myself that I will openly and in the face of the day, organise this “agitation,” without any infringement of the “Algerine Act.” My second letter shall be devoted to the details of my plan; and I, beforehand, invite criticism and remark, friendly or unfriendly. I will weigh well every objection, and yield to those which appear to me to be supported with good reasons or incapable of being obviated.

The conduct of the Irish members, during the discussions on the Gagging Bill, is fresh in every recollection. There has been a faithful band, true to their every engagement and pledge. There have been instances of violation of every duty, which serve to degrade our very nature, that there should have been found human beings capable of such conduct. All these we will weigh in our coolest moments, when irritation has gone by, and when we can calmly calculate the crime that has been committed, and the political punishment which ought to follow.

My first step is, therefore, to organise the means of serving and sustaining friends, and of flinging off enemies.

Let us, then, begin the new agitation with the organisation of the elective franchise. It will require from me minuteness of detail and great perseverance. I promise to bring both to the task.

My next letter will develop those details. In the meantime, the patriotic men who intend to co-operate with me, will commence by procuring an accurate knowledge of the state of the registry in their respective parishes and baronies.

For the present, I say no more on this subject, save this, that I begin with a subject quite safe and more useful. I am convinced I shall receive abundant assistance.

I cannot conclude this my first letter to the people of Ireland, enslaved as they are, by the first Act of a Reformed Parliament, without making a passing remark on more recent events. It is true that we have got rid of Stanley, who was, at least, consistent in his opinions; but, then, we have got

Hobhouse, who has been a ferocious patriot, and is now a complaisant placeman. I do not know that Ireland can have gained much by the change. Hobhouse, however, has one consolation; he cannot possibly be worse to Ireland than Stanley.

I am induced to think the less favourably of Hobhouse, from his speech at the hustings. It is attributed to him, to have been guilty of the inconceivable absurdity of making these two assertions:—

First—“That the Irish people would, within three months, discover that this Bill (meaning the Despotism Bill) was for their good.”

There is a profound statesman for you—for our good; to deprive us of the very first principles of the Constitution! For our good. Poor man! What a wretched exhibition of that species of vulgar assumption of the superiority of the English over Irish intellect does this assertion exhibit. Poor man! For our good; aye, just as the slave-driver in the West Indies uses the lash on the bare back of the expiring negro—for his good.

The second assertion was—“That, within the same three months, he would so redress Irish grievances, as to be the most popular man in that country.”

See what an adequate idea he has of his own powers on the one hand, and of the effects of seven centuries of misgovernment on the other. What a heaven-born statesman we have got amongst us! Within three months, surrounded by Tories, Conservatives, monopolists, and the Attorney-General; having, in addition, Lord Anglesey to manage, and Lord Plunket to satisfy, he is to work miracles of conciliation and kindness by the light of his sweet and gracious countenance. Well done, little Cam!!! as Cobbet calls him. Now, I have as good a right to become “Pastorini” as little Cam has; and I venture to prophesy, that Ireland will not derive any one benefit, or date any one advantage from the secretaryship of Sir John Cam Hobhouse.

But, when the interests of a great nation—its liberties and its prosperity are at stake; when a generous and long-oppressed people, instead of a relief, are afforded only Algerine Acts and Gaggling Bills, it is unpardonable to consume time in commenting on the flies that are whirled round on the wheels of the State-machine, although those flies should imagine that it was they that turned the wheel which merely carries them round.

For the present, I conclude with the repetition of my oft-given advice to the people: No riot; no violence; no crime. But, above all things, no despair. We are eight millions!

I am, and ever shall be, fellow-countrymen,

Your devoted, faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

SECOND LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

London, 12th April, 1833.

“Wert thou all that I wish thee—great, glorious and free,
 First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea,
 I might hail thee with prouder, with happier brow,
 But, oh! could I love thee more deeply than now?”

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—I return to the pleasing task of communing with you again. I return to that which the last Algerine act has made an imperative duty—the cheering you during this, the last night of your bondage, and pointing out to you that amidst the dark hour of unmerited slavery which surrounds you, there are to be seen some of the white streaks of the coming light, which promises, with unerring certainty, a morning of mild brightness, and a noontide of effulgent brilliancy. Yes, we shall—we must bask yet in the full glow of national liberty, and that fervid day-star of freedom, which in other countries has so often scorched into sterility will, in Ireland, shed only genial warmth to invigorate, extend, and mature the full crop of Irish prosperity.

The present Algerine law will, as I not only hope but believe, prove the last act of British injustice towards Ireland. The strange precipitancy with which Lord Anglesey has commenced the exercise of the despotic authority committed to him by this law, excites no small astonishment in this country, where his real characteristics are unknown. It was asserted in both Houses of Parliament, and believed by many that “the Despotism Bill” would be a mere dead letter, held out only *in terrorem*, but never to be carried into practice.

We knew better—we knew Lord Anglesey better. We knew how his pride had been wounded and his vanity mortified, by the overwhelming unpopularity with which the people of Ireland justly rewarded his unfortunate Government. We recollect the old proverb, “Set a beggar on horseback and he will

ride to ——” The rest is familiar. Yes; “The political beggar” has been set on horseback and off he goes. But he has actually proclaimed the city of Kilkenny—the city of Kilkenny!!! He is, indeed, on horseback—and on the backs and faces of the Irish people, too—for I defy any man to give me a justifiable reason or even pretext, for proclaiming the city of Kilkenny. There were no disturbances—no outrages in the city. Oh, this proclamation speaks more powerfully to the people of England, of the folly and injustice of continuing this law than could one thousand regular speeches, or any theoretic arguments whatsoever.

The law must be repealed. The unwise Anglesey must be recalled. Events are crowding upon us—and amongst them is to be found more than hope for Ireland.

Europe is threatened with war—that is one. We are eight millions—that is another. We require no third. Let the people only remember the advice contained in our motto—“*Durate, et cosmet rebus servate secundis.*” The period of this last trial will soon pass away. Even the excesses committed under the “Despotism Bill” will hasten the time when despotism itself will be impossible in Ireland.

I thus briefly notice the audacious measure of outlawing the city of Kilkenny, as one of those which brings with it a salutary reaction. I proceed to the more immediate object of this my second letter.

That object is, the organization of the elective franchise in every county, city, town, and borough in Ireland.

Let it be recollected that my first duty—as concentrating in myself, during the present calamitous suspension of the common law to the powers of the Volunteers of Ireland—is to put the elective franchise in such a stage that the people shall command the return of really honest men to Parliament. This is my first duty; and this letter was intended, principally, to commence the development of my plan, for this purpose—a purpose which, in the present state of the political movement,

not only in these countries but all over Europe, tends directly to the establishment of constitutional freedom.

But I am interrupted. Another proclamation!!! Yes, I rejoice to see the glorious name of the Irish Volunteers so honoured with being the first in the enmity of the legal autocrat of Ireland. Honour also the mighty Pasha!—to the extent to which it is deserved. This is also another boon from Earl Grey's ministry. This is another favour from the British Parliament. Let this proclamation be kept among the records of Irish grievances for the day of legal and constitutional retribution—a day which I believe to be more near than “the million” imagine.

I beg leave thus to return my most cordial thanks, in the name of injured Ireland, to the Volunteers for having continued to meet until this proclamation issued. They will, of course, obey this proclamation—but they did well and wisely to assert the natural freedom of British subjects on their part, and to leave it to the dispensers of despotism to exert the powers of arbitrary and most unconstitutional law on the other part.

This is now part of history—part of Irish history. It stands amongst those annals which tell of England's injustice and of Ireland's sufferings during seven centuries of shame and sorrow. Let us treasure it, then, in our inmost souls, amidst those spirit-stirring incitements to persevere in the paths of peace, and in the absence of crime, but energetically and incessantly, until we attain the sole safeguard of Irish prosperity and Irish freedom—a domestic legislature.

This digression, however natural, has led me from the more immediate object of this letter—the organization of the elective franchise—and tempts me, before I proceed further with that object, to introduce one or two topics of a more pressing and immediate interest. The “elective franchise” can afford a little postponement, and the other topics require speedy attention, in order to tranquillize the public mind upon them.

The first relates to the “pensioning” by the State of the Catholic clergy.

The second—" *longo intervalle* "—relates to the reform of the corporations of Ireland, but in particular of the Corporation of Dublin.

With respect to the first—"The State pensioning" of the Catholic clergy—it can be despatched in a few words, notwithstanding its awful importance to the liberties and to the religion of the people of Ireland.

I therefore simply announce the certainty that there is no danger of any such proposal being brought forward at present—not the most remote. Every person anxious on this subject either from a love of freedom, or from the more serious and solemn respect to religion, may rest in perfect tranquillity. Exclusive of the unalterable confidence reposed in the integrity of the Catholic prelates, there is this additional reason to being secure, that the Cabinet has never agreed even to deliberate upon any such provision.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not mean to deny that hints of such a provision being in contemplation were thrown out by certain individuals connected with the Government in Ireland. I believe they were—but I also believe that those hints were received with so decided and at the same time so quiet a tone of rejection that even if the measure itself had been resolved on by the Cabinet it would have been abandoned.

So far, indeed, from there being any Cabinet scheme of that description, I do not for the present, see the possibility of bringing forward with any chance of success my favourite plan—a plan I can never lose sight of—that is to obtain the legal means "of securing in perpetual succession for each Popish priest in Ireland a manse, or parochial residence, and a suitable glebe." This plan of mine does not involve any public burden or any connection whatsoever between the Catholic clergy and the State.

The second topic upon which the public mind of the people of Dublin requires to be tranquillized relates to the approaching measures of corporate reform.

As I cannot have the pleasure of meeting my constituents

until the close of the session, I cannot sooner explain to them in person the real state of the question of reform in the Corporation. But the moment the session closes I will repair to Dublin, whatever may then be the state of the law, and canvass all the details of that measure, as applicable to the citizens of Dublin. In the meantime, I perceive that very gross misapprehension exists on this subject, and that some of those whom I am exceedingly anxious to serve, imagine that their interests are in danger of being forgotten. I therefore proceed to detail the existing state of the facts and the embryo plan for the reform of the Dublin Corporation. I call it the "embryo" plan because it is no more at present; and before it has assumed form and consistency, my constituents shall have ample opportunity to consider all its details and to remedy its defects.

The facts, as they exist, are these: evidence has been received by the Committee of the House of Commons of the actual state of the Corporation of Dublin. The witnesses were principally members of the Corporation itself—but Mr. Serjeant Perrin, Mr. M. Maley, and Mr. Staines have added some very useful information.

I do not feel myself at liberty to go into the details of the evidence—nor is it necessary. Everybody acquainted with Dublin must know that it is not possible to conceal the facts:

First—That the Corporation of Dublin is a monopoly, even amongst the Protestant inhabitants of that city.

Second—That it is a bigoted monopoly, exclusive in its nature and essence; and to the almost incredible extent of bigotry, that during more than forty years it has not admitted one single Catholic.

Third—That the Corporation of Dublin is thus a double monopoly—first, politically; second, religiously.

Fourth—That this double monopoly is rendered at one and the same time more oppressive and dangerous by its having the appointment of the sheriffs by whom the panels of juries for the superior courts of law in Ireland are made out, and the presenting grand juries nominated.

Fifth—That the local taxation, and the demand and exaction of various emoluments are all in the hands of this odious monopoly.

Sixth—The local courts of justice also belong to this monopoly. Courts of justice—if that be the right term—in which the poorest and most unprotected classes are most interested.

Seventh—That there is the closest connection between this monopoly and the police of the metropolis.

Eighth—That practical bigotry has been carried to this frightful extent that actual pledges of a bigoted principle have been exacted, and may be exacted, from the candidates for the office which, of all others, requires the purest impartiality—that of high sheriffs.

Ninth—That the rights of the minor guilds have been trodden under foot and practically extinguished, and the statute law violated and set at defiance by the existing Corporation.

It will be thus seen, without entering into further details, that if ever a case was made out for reform this is one. It was, indeed, hoped by some persons connected with the Government that the corporators themselves would see the inevitable necessity for remodelling the Corporation, and thus that a Bill might be brought in during the present session for this purpose.

If I could have found, or could still find, a spirit of reasonable concession amongst the corporators, I was and am prepared to meet it half way, or more than half way, and lend my best assistance to prevent the reform from injuring either private individuals or families, or the creditors of the Corporation, as far as I possibly could. But I am sorry to say that I do not perceive any such spirit, and I am therefore prevented from rescuing private families, and, I fear, the creditors of the Corporation from those inconveniences, if not, to speak out, from the ruin which I fear is impending. Let me not be blamed hereafter. I give this solemn and public warning to all the persons who are in the employment of the Corporation, and to their families. I also warn those to whom the Corporation may be indebted. Much may be done for all these parties, if they will come for-

ward at once and insist upon the monopoly party yielding to common decency, and forming a committee empowered to arrange the remodelling of the Corporation, so as to satisfy the citizens at large in such a manner as will do the least possible injury to what may be called—but I must say most untruly called—vested interests.

I am particularly anxious that every person who has a pecuniary interest in the existing state of the Dublin Corporation should understand the precise predicament in which he is placed.

A speedy, that is, an immediate amicable arrangement may be made, which would afford much protection to persons who, I believe, will suffer severely from a sweeping and severe reform—such a reform as must inevitably take place unless my advice be attended to without delay.

I know, by sad experience, that those for whose benefit this advice is intended will pay but little attention to it. My consolation is, that I will have hereafter to refer to it when individual distress will call upon me for that assistance which I could now, but will not then, be able to afford.

Having dismissed those whose sufferings I shall regret, but whom I cannot compel or, I fear, persuade to attend to themselves in time, I proceed to develop the plan for the reform of the Dublin Corporation.

This is the plan as at present suggested :—

The Corporation to be constituted, as at present, of one Lord Mayor.

Twenty-four aldermen.

In all twenty-five aldermen—the present number.

Ninety-six common councilmen, as at present, not including sheriffs' peers.

The aldermen to be elected, as in London, by wards.

For this purpose the city of Dublin to be divided into eight wards.

Each ward, by rotation, to return four aldermen, and each in its turn to have the nomination of a fifth.

The first election of aldermen to take place within six months after the passing of the Bill.

The aldermen to be elected for a term of six years.

Each ward to elect eight members of the common council. This will make sixty-four.

The Guild of Merchants to elect also eight common councilmen. This will bring up the number to seventy-two.

Then each of the other guilds, being twenty-four in number, to elect one member. The twenty-four thus elected, when added to the seventy-two, will make up the number of ninety-six common councilmen, in addition to which will be the senior sheriffs' peers, not exceeding thirty in all the whole.

The Lord Mayor to be elected from the aldermen annually upon the city of London plan.

The sheriffs to be elected annually from the common council. In every other respect the plan of election to be as in the city of London—that is, perfectly popular.

The common council to be elected for three years, as at present.

The electors in the wards to be the ten pound householders.

The guilds to be composed, according to their charters, of persons of the trade of each guild and none other.

The Guild of Merchants to be composed exclusively of merchants resident in Dublin, or, at least, having counting-houses in the city.

Each other guild to be composed of men of the trade. No other right of admission into the minor guilds but an apprenticeship of seven years; but such an apprenticeship to give an absolute right to the freedom.

It will be objected that by this plan the members of the minor guilds will have the double advantage of having double votes—first as ten pound householders in their respective wards; and, secondly, as freemen in their respective guilds; and it is true that many, but by no means all, the regular tradesmen will have this advantage; but as all the householders of the

wards equally contribute to elect the ward member, the right should not be taken away from the tradesmen, the more especially as in their own guilds they can have but one representative for each guild.

I have thus given the outline of a plan which would, in my opinion, make the Corporation of Dublin identical with its citizens, and restore to the citizens the rights which have been filched from them by the monopolists who have reduced the Corporation to its present unjust and illegal state.

Upon this plan I solicit criticism and remark. But I always detest anonymous writers, and, indeed, despise them. I cannot bring myself to place sufficient reliance, even on sensible remarks, made by persons who shrink from giving their names.

I solicit this criticism through two channels—first, through the columns of the *Pilot*, and, secondly, through my friend and secretary, the most invaluable and ill-requited servant of the public, Mr. Edward Dwyer. I am proud to announce that he has consented to act as my individual secretary during the continuance of the despotic law and the reign of the chiefs of the Irish pashalics. Until the dominion of the old law is restored in Ireland, any communication for me may be best addressed to my excellent friend, Mr. Secretary Dwyer, or published with real signatures in the *Pilot*, which I request to give space for such insertion.

If such a reform as I have suggested had taken place, we should then have a Corporation, competent and willing to look into all the frauds committed on the property which ought of right to belong to the citizens for civic purposes, and where the fraud was of too complicated a nature to be unravelled in a Court of Equity; or, if the expense and delay of that Court were too great, the reformed Corporation would be enabled to apply for, and obtain, legislative relief by an Act of Parliament, which would cut the knot of every difficulty, and restore to the citizens all they have been unjustly deprived or swindled out of by means of long continued monopoly. The Metal Main question and the Pipe-water tax would soon be set at rest by

such a reformed Corporation. In short it would contain in itself the power to set to rights all local and municipal grievances, and to punish delinquents and civic plunderers; and the popular control over the Corporate authorities would put that power into rapid motion.

I close this digression with once more assuring my constituents that no step will be taken in this reform without giving them ample time to consider its every detail, to detect errors, correct inaccuracies, suggest improvements, and render the whole as suited as it is practicable to the wants and wishes of the citizens at large, of every class, sect, and persuasion without partiality or unjust disfavour to any class, creed, or individual. Equal rights and equal justice to all, is the sole basis of my plan.

This letter has run into too great length to enable me to return with any effect this day to the "elective franchise." I can for the present do no more than to request that gentlemen willing to work with me for the regeneration of Ireland, will aid me in the following manner:—

First—By sending to Mr. Dwyer, or publishing in the *Pilot*, a list of the baronies in each county.

Second—By, in like manner, sending the name and address of an individual likely to take upon himself the trouble of attending to the franchise in that barony.

We will not interfere with any proclaimed county.

Let me thus have, in the first instance, the baronies of the county of Dublin, and an individual named who will attend to the registry in each barony.

Let me, in the like manner, have the name of each parish in the city of Dublin, and an individual named in each parish willing to look after the registry in that parish.

I must conclude for the present. I am only beginning to break the ground for future constitutional exertions. Ireland shall never again slumber in the oblivious grave of unavailing discontent. We are too enlightened and too strong to sleep in the silence of despair.

We are, it is true, at present a pitiful province; it is but for a passing moment. We will be a great nation, bound to England only by the golden link of the crown, but nationalised and protected by the popular majesty of our own legislature.

I cannot conclude, however, without once again pouring out the vial of my deepest execration of the crimes of the Whitefeet. How ardently do I hope that they will meet due, and, therefore, most severe punishment.

The Whitefeet alone stand between Ireland and constitutional freedom. Let every man aid to bring them to condign punishment. Let there be no riot, no outrage, no violation of the law, and above all, no despair. We are eight millions.

I have the honour to be, fellow-countrymen,

Your very faithful friend and servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

THIRD LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

(From the *Morning Register*, Dublin, May 11, 1833.)

The *True Sun* has published a letter from Mr. O'Connell which no Irish popular journal dare insert without mutilation. It animadverts, in strong and indignant language, upon the prosecutions commenced against the Press, and thus proceeds:—

In this state of things it is that I once again address my fellow-countrymen. There is one consolation—the ministry who introduced and procured the Algerine law for Ireland have lost all their moral weight and moral power of character. They no longer delude any portion of the English people. They have some partizans—selfish expectants and placemen—enjoying either the sweets and profits or the pleasing prospect of office—but they have not one friend, or if they have, that friendship has reduced the character of their friend, whoever he be, to the wretched level of their own.

The present ministry are known—more is not necessary; it is idle to dwell on their inconsistency, their fatuity, their wretched financial and political blundering. They have made them become a laughing-stock and a scorn—they cannot remain long in office—and then, and then, perhaps, the days of impeachment, long disused and almost forgotten, may be revived.

In the meantime, I again address you, fellow-countrymen, on the interesting subject of preparation for the ensuing elections. They may be, and I believe are more near than persons in general suppose. But, at all events, recollect that wise men prepare themselves for action whilst there is time, and that opportunity remains. The fool waits always until it is too late, and so is undone.

There never was a period in history in which it was so necessary for honest men to prepare the franchise so as to be ready to elect better men. Let every county, city, town and borough in Great Britain and Ireland, from this moment, commence preparations for sending adrift the base men in each of these counties

who have betrayed and deceived their constituents. There has been a very base desertion of principle in many instances in England, several in Scotland, and still more in Ireland. In plain truth, there never was an occasion on which the conduct of members of Parliament should be watched with more vigilance and severity.

My plan, you are aware, fellow-countrymen, is to take up each county in Ireland in detail, and to create an electoral organization in each which will render it difficult in any, and impossible in most, for a bad man to get into another Parliament. Should I receive encouragement, I will visit during the vacation after this session many places in England. At all events, I will pay such visits to Ireland, and exert every faculty of my mind to make such preparations for the next Parliamentary campaign as will free us from the servile and the interested, and give us at length a majority of really honest representatives.

This is everybody's business—but as such it is apt to be neglected, until it be too late. I, for one, will stimulate others by example as well as by my exhortations, to exert themselves so as to command the election of honest and active men.

My first object is the county of Dublin. There are nine baronies in that county—I desire to organize the elective force in each of them; I want one or two more to assist me in each of these baronies. I trust I shall be replied to, either by letter to my friend Mr. Edward Dwyer, or preferably by public letters in the *Register*, or *Freeman*, or *Pilot*. Let me have one or two for the barony of Uppercross, a like number for the barony of Nethercross, so for Newcastle, so for Balrothery, a like number for Rathdown. I put forward these five baronies by name in this letter. I hope I shall be answered promptly, and that as well for these as for the other four baronies. I cannot go forward to any other county until the county of Dublin is placed in such a state that every person having any title to vote shall be placed on the registry, and the total force, in the popular interests, shall be ascertained.

The interruption I have met with in executing this plan makes me only the more desirous to carry it into execution all over Ireland.

I pledge myself that it shall not be my fault unless it be fully and effectually executed. We want vigilant and honest men in Parliament—men who will aid the “faithful few” in endeavouring to obtain justice for the people of England as well as for their own countrymen—who would sympathise with the people of England in their sufferings, unite with them in their exertions to obtain the amelioration of their institutions and the diminution of their burdens. Let the popular members for Ireland give their best assistance to the English people to abate every monopoly, to correct every abuse, to encourage industry, to promote manufactures, to lessen taxation, to increase the national resources, and to promote the freedom and prosperity of persons of every creed, caste, colour, and country.

This is what I now desire to effectuate. It is to combine the friends of liberty in England, Ireland, and Scotland in one common cause for the good of the people of every part of the empire. The Whigs and Tories have combined against the people. Upon every occasion upon which the honest and disinterested men in the House of Commons call for the abolition of useless offices, the reduction of expensive and unnecessary establishments, or the extinction of burdensome and oppressive taxation, we are met and defeated. How? Why, by a combination of Whigs and Tories—by the junction of the speculators and oppressors who belonged to the last Administration, with the speculators and oppressors of this Administration. This unholy alliance overpowers us, and the people get no relief. The friends of the people should therefore form, as it were, a species of sacred league, and combine all their exertions and all their numbers to the promotion of the popular cause of free institutions and cheap Government.

The Irish nation is particularly interested that there should be a combination of this description. Ireland has, alas! few friends in the House of Commons, and I grieve to say that there

are some of those who worked their way into that House by the unequivocal professions and pledges of patriotism, who are to be found, as Curran described it, "sleeping in their collars under the ministerial manger," when they should be up and working for Ireland.

In my next and ensuing letters, whilst I pursue my plan of elective organization, I will at the same time point out to each constituency the contrast or consistency of the votes of each Irish member with the promises and pledges which they gave expressly or by implication, to their constituents. I sigh bitterly to perceive that the Tory members have been in all things consistent in their hostility, whilst the popular, and some Repeal members have displayed the most melancholy dereliction of duty, of truth, and of principle. More of this subject hereafter.

The present ministers have promised much to Ireland. It was said that all they wanted was time. "Wait a while" was the cry of ministerial sycophants—"wait a while" and you will see the great things the Whigs will do for Ireland.

Well, they have now been in office since the 20th of November, 1830—two long years and a-half. What have they done for Ireland? Just nothing. What have they left undone against Ireland?

The base Whigs!

They have wrought a Grand Jury Bill; and there were abuses in the grand jury system. Are more abuses corrected by the Whig Bill? Alas! we have now been in committee on that Bill several weeks, and I can safely assure the Irish public that, by the confession of everybody, the bill is utterly worthless—it will do nothing to remedy abuses; but, if it passes at all, it will increase Government patronage extensively. There is a Whig reform for you. It does nothing for the public, or in ease of the people, but it increases Whig patronage considerably.

The base Whigs!

Yet there is still some comfort. The Whigs have treated the people of England almost as contemptuously as the people of Ireland. The former are beginning to arouse themselves.

The Whigs must yield; and a day of popular triumph may be a day of justice to both countries. I trust and hope that the hours of despotism are numbered, and that we shall soon see a Parliament and a ministry devoted to the people, and determined to conciliate Ireland by prompt and extensive relief.

In the meantime our course is clear. We will execrate, as we have ever done, the outrages of the "Whitefeet," and rejoice at their extinction; but, whilst we sedulously keep within the limits of the law and of the constitution, we will not forget that we are eight millions.

I have the honour to be, fellow-countrymen,

Your devoted servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

FIRST LETTER TO HIS CONSTITUENTS.

Derrynane Abbey, September 11th, 1833.

“ For freedom’s battle once begun,
 Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
 Though baffled oft, is ever won.”

The session is closed, the second proclamation of the ministry, called by courtesy a King’s Speech, has appeared—legislation, wholesale and retail, is at an end for the present—the subservient minions of ministerial influence have been sent home with the sound of vain boasting—Ireland has been once more subdued!—positively for the last time of subduing. Curse the slaves that would not spare us that insult; but British insolence has been once again cheered by the voice which has once more but vainly boasted of Irish subjugation.

There is, however, one consolation. Never yet did there appear so poor and so proud a piece of vain boasting as that “King’s Speech”—it is impossible to treat it with all the contempt it merits—it sinks beneath the dignity of vituperation, and is readily confined to the manufactory whence it sprung; a plagiarist—a flat plagiarist, extracted from the brain of one of the hired puffers of Warren’s jet blacking—it covers with ridicule those it praises, and gives a triumph to the objects of its futile attack.

The time for legislation is over—the hour for reflection is come. It is the duty of every honest representative to offer himself and his conduct to the scrutinizing examination of his constituents; it is the sacred duty of every intelligent constituency to examine scrupulously the conduct of their representatives.

I accordingly come before the electors of the city of Dublin—I challenge and demand the closest examination. I add without affectation, that if my constituents are dissatisfied with my conduct I am ready to resign. I will put the matter on a

distinct and tangible footing. Near five thousand electors of the city of Dublin voted for me at the last election; if there can be found one-fifth of these voters who call on me to resign, I will instantly obey that call, and cease to be your representative.

I have not made this offer from consciousness of having deserved your censure. I know not any charge against which I could find it necessary to defend myself. On the contrary, I feel it due to myself, as well as to you, to assert, that I have served you faithfully, disinterestedly, and honestly; and, if I have not served you more efficiently, the defect was occasioned by my want of capacity, not from any want of inclination, of zeal, or of industry.

I stand before you, my constituents, with a firm and perhaps a proud conviction of having performed my duty at least with fidelity, and I enter into an investigation of many of the topics connected with Ireland, upon which my Parliamentary labours have been exerted, with a feeling free from self-reproach, and even with some of the vanity which excites to boasting. This feeling is the more naturally indulged, because I trust, with the assistance of God, that a career of further utility is just opened, and that there is a prospect of yet really and substantially serving Ireland. Besides, I respectfully claim the confidence of my constituents, and in doing so, I am bound to state the grounds on which I rest that claim.

Let this serve for my apology. I am a public servant rendering an account of my stewardship, and it is my duty to bring forward the items of that account, for which I require credit as between me and my constituents. Whatever there be odious in self-exaltation should not be applied to the case of a man circumstanced as I am, who is quite conscious that he was bound by the most sacred duties to perform ten times more than he has done, and who writes with a full conviction that after all he is but an unprofitable servant.

It also seems to me that I should vindicate you, electors of Dublin, to the Irish nation, for having elected me, as you did,

not only without any solicitation on my part, but actually without having obtained my consent to be a candidate. In thus vindicating you I am naturally led to a portion of my conduct in Parliament, which preceded your choice of me, and which, therefore, served to authorise that choice. I am bound to go into lengthened details, and I do so the more readily, because the investigation of them naturally tends to further improvement, and points out the means of securing further or other success.

It is in this view that I begin with one of the first class of my Parliamentary clients—one of the first in whose behalf I had the happiness to be an humble but a zealous instrument of relief. I am not detracting from the merits of others whilst I claim my share, and only my individual share, of the struggle which produced salutary changes. My first claim for conduct is my conduct towards—

The Leather Trade of Dublin.

When I first became the Parliamentary advocate of the tanners and curriers of Dublin, and of Ireland generally, their trade was in the lowest state of depression. The pressure of a heavy tax exhausted the capital of the manufacturers, and diminished consumption. But the vexatious and perpetual interference of the excise laws—the harassing villainy of many of the excise officers—the impossibility of escaping some of the multitudinous meshes of the excise regulations—the power to expose to fines and penalties that the workmen had over their employers, and the outrageous expenses of legal proceedings, had brought the leather trade to the lowest ebb of distress and approaching ruin. Failures multiplied in the trade, and there was no possibility of amelioration without a total change of system.

It was under those circumstances that I felt it my duty to acquire full information of the mischiefs that threatened destruction to the leather trade. It was under those circumstances that I became one of the most active of those who

pressed the state of trade on the Parliament and the then ministry, and who rejoiced at having persuaded that ministry to abolish the tax upon leather, and, above all, to relieve the manufacturers from the vexation of the excise.

I can look with complacency on the comparison between the present highly improved state of the leather trade, giving employment to increased numbers, and affording a due reward to skill, industry, and capital, and what that trade was when first I became its humble advocate. I merely claim my share, whatever it be, in the merit of producing this transition.

My next claim is found on the state of—

The Soap Trade of Dublin.

Twelve months have not elapsed since the soap trade of Ireland was suffering from a very different but an equally injurious oppression, to that which weighed down the trade in leather. The evil arose from that which was most likely to produce mischief in Ireland, namely, that there was no tax, and, of course, no excise, on the manufacture of soap in Ireland, and that there were both one and the other in England. One would imagine that such a state of things must be favourable to Ireland, but those who think so, know nothing of the workings of the Union in its more minute details. The Irish soap-boilers discovered that secret to their cost, and nearly to their ruin. The English duty on soap was intended to be confined to the quantity used in England. There was, therefore, as a matter of course, a drawback on all soap exported. Here the fraud began, and was easily, and I verily believe by the collusion of many excise officers, carried to a vast extent. The English manufacturers obtained, without difficulty, a larger sum for drawback than they paid for duty, and this to an extent varying from 15 to 25 per cent. In other words, there was a clear profit of, at the very least, 15 per cent., not on the article itself, but upon the mere duty. This was enhanced in several towns, as, for example, in Liverpool, where, as one would naturally expect in a place where the grossest political and municipal

corruption prevails, the greatest frauds were committed. In Liverpool, a soap manufacturer contrived not only to make a profit of at least 15 per cent. on the money he paid for duty, but actually acquired capital to carry on his trade out of the public money. Thus—he exported his soap to Dublin the day after it was made; in two days after he was paid the entire-duty as a drawback, but he was not called on for that duty himself for sixty-one days. Suppose he made soap on a Thursday, the duty on which amounted to £100; on Friday he sent that soap by one of the steam vessels to Dublin. The ensuing Monday he received at the Custom-house in Liverpool £115 as drawback; but he had not to pay £100 for sixty-one days—putting by this means £115 of the public money into his pocket, keeping £15 of it altogether, and returning the remaining £100 in two months—of course carrying on his trade with the money in the interval. The consequences were almost total ruin to the Irish soap manufacturers. The English soap could be, and was, sold much cheaper than the Irish in the Irish market. We lost our home market for soap—we lost all power of competition in the foreign market—our soap manufacturers were reduced to dependency—the trade was about to be annihilated in Ireland. Who is it that does not see that it would have been impossible to have produced such a state of things, if we were protected by domestic legislature against such glaring fraud? and we must inevitably have been so protected by an Irish Parliament.

So soon as I made myself fully acquainted with these frauds, I joined others in bringing them before the British Parliament. It was in the session of 1832. We repeatedly urged the ministry to have the abuses corrected, and so to regulate the soap-tax as not to afford a bounty to fraudulent manufacturers of that article. We were promised investigation and redress; but promised in vain.

Here I may state a circumstance which I have been assured is literally true, and which elucidates the species of delusion which prevails at the British Treasury, whenever Irish interests

are concerned. Mr. Spring Rice, I am assured, sent down an excise inspector on a mission to Liverpool, to ascertain whether the frauds we complained of in the soap trade really existed. The inspector went down, called on some of the soap manufacturers (the persons accused), dined with them, was most hospitably treated; then, after dinner, asked them whether it was true that these frauds existed. They declared, upon honour, that it was totally false. The inspector was too polite to seek for other proofs, made his report, exculpating the trade, and thus Treasury grounds were laid to refuse, or, at least, postpone relief.

Justice calls on me to add, that, as far as my experience of the British Treasury goes, this is the mode, or something similar, in which all Irish mercantile complaints have been treated since Mr. Spring Rice has been in office. He is full of fluent words; nothing can be more bland or promising; but I have not known one single instance of any Irish merchant, or person in the Irish trade of any kind, getting any species of actual relief in any case of hardship or grievance since Mr. Spring Rice has been at the Treasury. He seems to me to have the most decided disinclination to do anything favourable to his countrymen of any badly-disposed Irishman I ever met; and that is saying a great deal for him.

However, to return to the Irish soap trade. So soon as I became representative for Dublin, I felt it doubly my duty to look for relief for that trade. I was ably assisted by persons connected with the business, and by many Irish members, without party distinction. We pressed the case over and over again upon the ministry. At length we obtained redress. The English tax has been lessened. The drawback has been put on a less fraudulent footing. For the present, the mischief has disappeared, and the Irish soap trade has already become prosperous. I look, I own, with some complacency on the present increasing and healthy state of this trade, when I contrast that state with its depressed condition when I had first the honour of becoming its humble but zealous advocate.

Addressing my constituents on my Parliamentary career, as a member of Parliament, I feel gratified in introducing next—

The Irish Distillery Trade.

And, upon this head, also, I claim some Parliamentary merit. The frauds committed to an enormous extent in Scotland, by means, principally, of the "malt drawback," enabled the Scotch distillers to undersell the Irish manufacturers of spirits in the Irish market. Labour, and all materials, except coals, were dearer in Scotland than in Ireland. The difference in the price of coals was but small in any part of Ireland; in some places, they were as cheap as in Scotland. How then could the Scotch distillers, with dearer materials, sell cheaper in Ireland, and that, after paying freight, shipping charges, and insurance, than the Irish distillers, who had none of these latter items to pay? It struck me at once that it could be accounted for only in one way—by the frauds on the revenue connived at in Scotland, and the excessive rigour of the excise officers in Ireland. I was one of the most active on the committee that brought these matters to light, and obtained some relief.

Had I not more than enough of topics to address you upon, I could relate some facts which came out on this investigation, highly illustrative of the total want of protection which the Legislative Union has occasioned to the Irish distillers. But, the truth is, that the Irish distillers are a class of men most grossly injured and defrauded by the direct and palpable violation of the Union, exclusive of the indirect operation of that nation-degrading measure, that Union which we are now told is to be preserved "inviolable." Bless the drivellers who tell us so!! The articles of that Union have been for years most grossly violated in the article of Irish spirits, simply and singly because it was for the advantage of the Scotch and English distillers that it should be so. In nothing has the injustice towards Ireland of the Imperial Parliament been more frequently or more clearly demonstrated than in their conduct to the

Irish distillers for many years. I repeat, that the terms of the Union have been grossly, palpably, and directly violated.

I next proceed to the

Sub-letting Act.

The history of this Act is curious. It was actually stolen through the House of Commons during the time of circuit—whilst we, who would have endeavoured to prevent its passing, by exposing its horrid and, indeed, murderous provisions, had our attention taken off from the Parliament. It was ingeniously contrived to get it through the House of Commons, and it passed the Lords *sub silentio*, and, as a matter of course. Thus, like a thief in the night, it was stolen upon the Irish people, and for near six years it exercised its malign influence over them. From the moment that I discovered that such an Act had passed, I assailed it with all my might and main, as a law calculated for the gratification of the sordid avarice of the rich, by entailing the greatest distress and misery upon the poor. I denounced it as a law rendering poverty more destitute, and depriving the labouring classes of the very means of existence.

It was denounced, also, by one of those men of transcendent talent and unaffected piety, with whom it pleases God occasionally to bless His Church and people; a man who, I fervently pray, may be long spared in renovated health and accustomed vigour to that Church and people; need I name the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle? He denounced the emaciating and murderous cruelty of the Sub-letting Act, and exposed all its frightful effects in producing poverty, nakedness, and actual starvation. His evidence before the Committees of the House of Commons demonstrated all these horrors.

And, see how his evidence has been confirmed by the facts that appear on the late Parliamentary returns. The population of Great Britain increased between the years 1821 and 1831, at the rate of more than 15 per cent. The population of Ireland during the same period augmented only about 8 per cent.

Under the natural circumstances of both islands, the increase in Britain being 15 per cent., that in Ireland ought to have been fully 30 per cent. It was, in fact, only 8 per cent. Account for the difference. It is easy to do it. The Sub-letting Act counteracted the natural augmentation of a country capable of supporting four times its present number of people. The desolating Sub-letting Act actually consigned to the grave its hundreds of thousands; and by that, and that alone, can the strange and unexpected phenomenon of the greater increase in Britain be accounted for.

Again, another confirmation of Dr. Doyle's evidence is to be found in the comparative estimate printed for the House of Commons, of the population of the county of Carlow in the years I have mentioned, 1821 and 1831. In forty-two parishes which I enumerated, there were but fifteen in which the population increased; whereas there were twenty-seven out of the forty-two, in which it had actually diminished!!! Mark, in twenty-seven out of forty-two parishes, the population within ten years became considerably less. How little is Ireland known to the English people! How unfit it is to trust the legislation for Ireland to those who know little of us, and, in general, care less.

Again, I recollect distinctly, that there was in one village in the county of Carlow—I do not at present recollect its name, but I pledge myself to prove it from the population return—there was one village in that county which was returned in 1821 as containing more than six hundred inhabitants. In the population return of 1831, there is a distinct statement that the village had ceased to be; that there was not one single house, nor one single inhabitant on the lands occupied by the village; they had all disappeared. Such was the desolating massacre of the poor, inflicted by the Sub-letting Act.

One great reason why I desired to be in Parliament was to urge incessantly the repeal of that most destructive Act. Accordingly, I moved for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal it. I was opposed by most of the Tories, and nearly all the Whigs.

Spring Rice, with his usual hatred of Ireland, opposed me; so did Sir Henry Parnell. It is instructive to add these two things:—First—That in the first division I took upon this subject, I had but seventeen members to support me; even some vapouring Irish *soi-disant* patriots deserted me. I had but seventeen supporters in a full House, and was defeated by an overwhelming majority. Secondly—That, as usual, I persevered, day after day, until at length I have succeeded, I will say it, in driving this Administration to abolish almost all the afflicting provisions of that Act; so that, at present, that which was most destructive, became almost inoffensive, and every man can now sub-let or take a sub-lease without the least impeachment as to its validity.

I am, I own, proud of this success. I claim it as almost exclusively my own. The poor now can procure a habitation and dwell in that habitation without its being in the power of the landlord to treat the poor man as an intruder, and to chase him from the land as if he were a beast of prey. I do claim the principal merit of this change; and I do rest the more tranquilly on the confidence of my constituents for having been the instrument to procure this much of good for the poor people of Ireland.

It is also encouraging to perceive what perseverance will do. On the first division, I had but seventeen supporters. On the second, I had twenty-eight; but before I could bring it on a third time, the ministry found it necessary to take the matter out of my hands, and to bring in a Bill to repeal the provisions of the Sub-letting Act; a Bill which is now law.

With one remark, now, I close this topic. It is this, and to this remark I request the attention of the writers in the patriotic papers of Ireland. By the evidence before the Agricultural Committee, it appears that in England, whilst the landlords and farmers are enduring great distress, the condition of the labourer is improved. But, as to Ireland, the reverse is the result of the evidence; some improvement in the dwellings of the farmers, but the condition of the labourers deteriorated.

It has been inquired why the English labourers should have improved, whilst the condition of the Irish labourers has grown worse.

Mr. Stanton, the proprietor of the *Morning Register*, in one of those admirable and transcendently useful letters in which he developes with arithmetical science and certainty the gross financial frauds practised since the Union on oppressed Ireland, seeks in vain to discover an answer to the question—why the Irish labourers have become more wretched, whilst the English labourers were beginning to improve? Alas! he forgot the Sub-letting Act, plainly; being now repealed, it was no longer in his contemplation. He did not recollect that the Irish labourers are not as yet recovered from the pressure and effects of the misery created by that abominable statute.

I think I can defy any person to dispute with me the merit of being the principal means of abolishing that law.

The next topic to which I call the attention of my constituents is—

The Vestry Cess.

I here also claim the merit of being the principal instrument of procuring the abolition of that most unchristian burden.

Its story also furnishes another curious episode in the history of the crimes committed against the people of Ireland in the name and on behalf of the Protestant Established Church.

The Catholics at the Reformation left the Irish parishes replenished with churches. The Protestant rectors neglected these churches until they fell, or anticipated the hand of time by strewing them in ruins—having converted to their own use all the wealth of the churches and all the funds which kept them in repair. This was injustice the first. The second was that they then taxed the Catholics to rebuild, and then to keep in repair, those very parish churches. The third was, that they excluded the Catholics from any control over, or any account of, their own money. All this was of course to promote religion and piety. What fantastic tricks were played during those

crimes against, and plunderings of, the people, are shown by the Parliamentary returns. In Connaught the Catholics of one parish had to furnish, by vestry cess, the dressing-room and complete toilet of the Protestant bishop. In Wexford the Protestant vestry paid the sexton ten pounds a year for ringing the bell; and the bell having been broken they raised his salary to twenty pounds a year for this facetious reason that he had no longer a bell to ring. In Drogheda the Catholics were assessed one year for wine for communion. For what quantity? For two pipes of port! Only two pipes of port for communion wine. What a strange tale is the story of Ireland's wrongs and sufferings; things that would be incredible, if we had them not on the confession of the delinquents, and on the authority of Parliament, passed over as matters of course in the maintenance of that ascendancy which had so long sat like an incubus on all the energies and all the charities of unhappy Ireland. But "Resurgam" is the watchword; and we will, I trust, live to laugh at the memory of existing evils, as we cheerfully smile at the recollection of those which have passed away.

I need not remind my constituents of my exertions to abolish vestry cess. I need not boast to them of my success, nor of the value of that success. In Peter's parish, alone, we are freed this year from no less than two thousand five hundred pounds.

The next topic in order, and the last in this letter is—

The System of Tithes.

I do claim some merit for my exertions to abolish tithes. I want to have them totally abolished—not in name merely, but in substance and reality—"Delendo est Carthago." This is my maxim as to tithes. They must be abolished or Ireland never will, never can, never ought to be tranquil. The tranquillity of Ireland depends mainly on the total and immediate abolition of the tithe system root and branch—composition and valuation, and all. The tithe system must go, root and branch.

My principle is—the principle of my public life is—that no one Christian should be compelled to contribute to the support of a Church to which he does not belong, or of a religion from which he dissents.

This is the principle to be taken up with order and supported with constancy. Every man to support his own religion—no man to be compelled to support another man's clergyman any more than he is another man's lawyer or doctor.

This principle is gaining ground very fast all over the British dominions. The Dissenters of England, a powerful, intelligent, and most influential body, have adopted this principle, and are about to enforce it with energy and with success. Tithes will clearly be abolished soon in England. In Scotland compulsory assessments for religious purposes are also in jeopardy, being assailed by a people who have always persevered until they have succeeded in extinguishing anything which they felt or deemed to be a grievance.

Ireland, too, has great, very great merits on this score. The passive resistance of the last year was a magnificent spectacle, doing honour to the heads that conceived and the hearts that boldly persevered in that system. The time is however come for more active and energetic measures. The time is come to enable the people of Ireland peacefully, legally, and constitutionally to get rid for ever of the abomination of tithes. We are on the point of victory; if we do not now halt or hesitate, we must succeed. I wish I could rouse every parish in Ireland to the constitutional and legal measures that are necessary to secure the triumph of our great principle. Every experiment has failed to compel an acquiescence in the tithe system by the people of Ireland. Menaces, cajolement, force, horse, foot, artillery—and above all, the resources and chicaneries of law, have miserably failed. You may, to be sure, extort, with the army kept constantly on foot, one or two years' tithes, but the hatred of the system only increases with the increased force which is applied to extort the payment of tithes, and that Government would be neither wise nor even prudent that exhausted the

patience of the Irish people, and made them believe there was no resource save in despair.

Every experiment has signally failed, and it is only matter of astonishment to conceive that any person can be blind to the folly of perseverance. Why, Stanley last year gave the parsons £60,000 of the public money, taking to himself by law all manner of modes of recovering the amount; distress, arrest, imprisonment—executions from the superior courts of law—decrees from the civil bill courts—attachments out of chancery—the lands, the goods, the persons of the people were all made legally responsible, and everything that was summary, expeditious, and efficacious in criminal as well as civil process was combined to recover back the £60,000. Well, what has been the consequences? Why, that of the £60,000 only £12,000 has been recovered—balance to loss £48,000. That is the first loss. Pretty well, to be sure. But, hurrah for the people of Ireland—is that the only loss? In good truth it is not, for you must add to the £48,000 these other losses. First, law costs, estimated early at over £14,000; other expenses under the proclamations, estimated at one time at £25,000; military expenses estimated at £30,000—add these three together, and you will have £69,000. But suppose some of those estimates overrated—let us therefore strike off £9,000 which, perhaps, we ought not to do, because these estimates were more than once asserted in Parliament and never contradicted. But yet we will strike off the £9,000, and instead of £69,000 we will put down only £60,000, which, being added to the £48,000, will leave a clear loss to the British public of £108,000.

Here the system manifestly has failed. The Government have wisely desisted, and indeed have taken a vote of credit for one million to enable them to pacify the parsons, and to protect the people from clerical rapacity.

But the parsons will not be pacified, good sooth. They will not abandon their uttermost penny—they will not abate one shilling of their rapacity. Like *Shylock*, they will have the pound of flesh, and not reduce one grain of the pound; and

then out comes the Rev. Somers Payne, and other clerical magistrates of the county of Cork—and they are to beard the Government and enforce tithes to the last shilling.

Well, well, well—we shall soon know of what metal Lord Wellesley, in his old age, and Mr. Littleton, in the vigour of his manhood, are made of. If the Rev. Somers Payne be not swept out of the commission of the peace—a commission which it would have been better he never held—but if he be not swept away from that commission, Lord Wellesley may, according to the Irish phrase, “Go whistle jigs to milestones,” and make up his mind to follow the ill-omened example of Lord Anglesey, and determine to leave Ireland more discontented than he found it, which, indeed, after the beloved Anglesey, would be rather difficult. Yet I do hope better—I really hope better from the recent change. I may be disappointed in my expectations; but if I see a clerical justice who takes the lead to counteract the benevolence of Government and Parliament now that we have them, as it were, accidentally, and, for once, acting benevolently—I say if I see such a clerical magistrate called to his senses by being deprived of the commission of the peace, I will then auger better for Ireland.

But, hereditary bondsmen, do I say to the people of Ireland, you must, after all, act for yourselves? Would I could trumpet-tongued rouse you to exertion. This is the time to strike the blow, whilst the calm lasts. The Government grant ought to secure us from the tithe exaction for twelve months. Now, now in this lull, this calm, is your time for exertion. “A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull together,” and we shall be free from tithes for ever.

What do I recommend? What plan do I suggest? I abominate every infraction of the law. I despise and denounce every combination of a criminal nature. My plan is peaceable, legal, constitutional; it is part of that general scheme by which I incessantly contemplate the regeneration of Ireland, and her restoration to national dignity from her present provincial degradation, without a crime, without an offence, without a tear,

and, above all, without the possibility of shedding one drop of human blood.

My plan is, that every parish in Ireland shall, without delay, prepare a petition to Parliament for the total abolition of tithes. Those who choose may combine with the tithe petition another for the Repeal of the Union. It would, perhaps, be better to do both at once; but, at all events, let us have prepared in every parish a petition for the abolition of tithes. Each parish can meet (except in the proclaimed districts) for this purpose. Such a meeting, out of the proclaimed districts, is perfectly legal and safe. Let us show Lord Wellesley and his Secretary the earnestness of our desire to have an end put to the odious tithe system. Let us show them how intense and how universal is the anxiety of the Irish people to abolish tithes for ever. I have thus, in this my first letter to my constituents, thrown my conduct upon some interesting topics before them. I challenge investigation of that conduct. I call for co-operation.

There remain many other subjects of great interest, which I will discuss in one or two other letters. The Coercion Bill—the outrageous insult offered to Ireland by that Bill—the horrible, the ever-execrable state in which that Bill was introduced into the Lords by Earl Grey, well demand, and, indeed, arrest attention. The baseness of many of the Irish members on that occasion will receive, I trust, its due reward.

My plan of agitation is this: I will go through the details of the chief measures of the late session, illustrating, as most of them do, the absolute necessity of a domestic Legislature in Ireland. I will then commence, in each county, the organisation of petitions for the Repeal; and, with the aid of more activity, as we approach the session, and with the increasing claims on Protestant sympathy and support, I trust we will be able to place our right to a resident Parliament beyond doubt, and its restoration beyond danger.

I have the honour to be,

Your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

SECOND LETTER TO HIS CONSTITUENTS.

*To my Constituents.**Derrynane Abbey, October 8th, 1833.*

“ Hereditary bondsmen ; know ye not,
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.”

Lord Anglesey is gone. Blessed be God ! One page more is turned over in the sad story of Ireland. One proud satrap more has fretted his hour on the stage of Ireland's disgrace and degradation. For what wants our nation these puny minions of a power that springs not from ourselves, nor is directed for our advantage, the only object being to ascertain how far this lovely and fertile island can be made subservient to the wealth, the power, and the pride of the rulers of Great Britain.

Lord Anglesey is gone ; and never had a more noble opportunity to show the superior mind, the high generosity of spirit, the protecting power, that combination of authority with virtue which would have raised him beyond the common lot of humanity, whilst it cheered and vivified everything with its enlivening influence. Lord Anglesey is gone, after having thrown away all his splendid occasions of utility, of goodness, and of glory. He is gone, covered not merely with the hate and indignation, but with the scorn and contempt of the Irish people ; nay, the jeer and jest of all who think or talk of his miserable Administration ; or, if the laughter ceases, it is only because the horrible overcomes the ridiculous, and that the scent of blood stifles every emotion of merriment.

There was more blood shed in Ireland—there was more human blood shed in Ireland during the two years and a-half of the Anglesey-Stanley Administration than during any other ten years of our wretched story. Take out the year of actual open rebellion, and you will find that more human blood lay on the face of the earth in Ireland during his short government, than

during the government of any other three Lieutenants. Does that blood cry to heaven for vengeance, or shall the earth cover it for ever?

What a strange, and silly, and wayward career has been his. Look back at its commencement; how much of good was anticipated from his supposed regard for Ireland; how soon, how sadly, how completely was every anticipation rendered vain. His appointment of Joy to be Chief Baron—was anything ever so foolish? One Chief Baron was superannuated. Well, Anglesey seeks the foremost ranks of the enemy, to find out nearly, if not altogether, as old a man to fill the place. Why? For what? On what account? For what reason? Simply, because he was an enemy—an old enemy. Could he not, at least, have found some man of Whig, or, at least of modern principles? Easily. Why preferred he the high and bitter orange? Because he was an enemy. O sapient Anglesey! Then he makes a Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. But of this melancholy instance of the party fatuity of Anglesey it is not necessary to speak. He who runs reads its strange folly. If he were to make a tenth-rate man a Chief Justice, why not, at least, select a friendly struggler at the bar? The answer is obvious; because if that were done, it would have been a proof of common sense, and of a consistency far below the high vagaries of the self-sufficient Anglesey.

And then, to select, of all the bar, Blackburne to be his Attorney-General! Look at the present state of the bar patronage.

But, no; my present object is not to write a history of Lord Anglesey's ludicrous, yet ensanguined career. I want to return to the subject of these letters. One reflection more only on his Administration. It has often struck me that the excess of unpopularity which has followed Lord Anglesey's conduct, was not so much produced by his tithe campaigns, his arming the yeomanry, or his fostering his and the people's enemies, as by his fatal and most undignified affection for the chicanery of litigation. There was something so unchivalrous in his love of

indictments; his ardent affection for criminal informations; his overweening and gloating delight at prosecutions, that he became infinitely more distasteful for these propensities than he could have been rendered by the most direct and oppressive cruelties, had he been guilty of them. The prosecuting Lord Lieutenant must be ever odious.

Lord Anglesey was the greatest prosecutor that ever came to Ireland, and the most disliked as a governor of any man that, within my recollection, ruled this unhappy land. There is something so low, there is something so mean, in mere prosecuting; there is something so foreign to the nobler emotions of our nature; something so congenial with the baser portions of our nature in the chicanery of prosecutions, that, of all bad Governments, a prosecuting Government must, of necessity, be the most execrated.

We shall see what course his successor will steer. Are the instruments who deformed and disgraced the last Government to be still confided in and used by the present. We shall see. I expect not much, from what has hitherto happened; but we shall see.

In the meantime, hereditary bondsmen, confide in yourselves. Be up and stirring. Begin the war of Tithe petitions. Prepare for the war of Repeal petitions.

I love the apparent tranquillity and calm of the moment. An idle observer, or any stranger, would suppose that the Tithe question was postponed, and the Repeal question extinguished. How little do they know of Ireland. The sense of recent wrongs creates a calm, which is anything but symptomatic of oblivion. But I must return to the subject of my address to you, my constituents.

I am upon my trial before you. I invite every one of you—I invite my enemies—I invite the enemies of Ireland—I invite the friends of Ireland to investigate my Parliamentary conduct with the most scrutinising eye. I voluntarily place myself at the bar of my country, and challenge investigation.

I have already specified my Parliamentary conduct, and I

will say my Parliamentary services, on the topics connected with the soap trade, the leather trade, the distilleries of Ireland, with the Sub-Letting Act, the Vestry Acts, and last, but not least, with Tithes.

These were all subjects immediately and exclusively connected with Ireland. There were many—very many—others of a similar character. There was in a former session the attempt, which I defeated, to bring a “Mortmain Act” into Ireland; there were the abuses in Corporations—the Grand Jury Laws—the Special Jury Laws—the Poor Laws. There were, besides, the violation of constitutional principle in the Change of Venue Bill, and, before all and beyond all, in point of frightful and portentous magnitude, the Coercion Bill.

Before I enter upon these subjects, I would, however, respectfully submit my conduct to my constituents on other measures of great importance, such as the East India Bill and the Anti-Slavery Bill; there was, besides, my battle with the reporters—a battle of which I acknowledge I am not a little proud. I am, I believe, the only man in Parliament who would have dared to attack the miscreant and mischievous power of the reporting Press. I am, it is certain, the only person who ever succeeded against that power.

These, then, should be the objects of this letter:—

To present to your judgment my conduct on the East India Bill, on the Anti-Slavery Bill, and in my attack on, and victory over, the present very inferior race of persons engaged in Parliamentary reporting,

I begin with—

The East India Bill.

It may appear surprising how little of attention this important measure produced even in England. The destinies of more than one hundred millions of human beings were involved in it. It is impossible to exaggerate its magnitude. We legislated for the peace, prosperity, and happiness of one hundred millions of human beings, and yet the Bill attracted but a small share of

public notice. Much of this inattention was occasioned by the ignorance or gross misconduct, or both, of the reporters. The debates on the East India Bill were all but suppressed. A miserable, inaccurate outline of these debates was all that was given to the public. Discussions of the utmost interest to the people of India were thus, as it were, concealed from view. The professions of the ministry, that their first and greatest object was to prepare the inhabitants of India for self-government, would have done honour to those who uttered such sentiments, and would have been more than consolatory to the Tory-oppressed population of the vast regions under the British sway. Words, in such a case, are things. They operate to give a new station in the social state to those of whom they are uttered. But, alas, the wretched reporters took effectual care to prevent the advantages of the publication of such words. The situation of the native inhabitants of India is deplorable, and yet it has been much improved by the conquest or acquisitions of the British. The new India Bill does not go to the root of the evil. It does little indeed to ameliorate the state of the natives. If that state were understood in England, it would excite much sympathy, and probably, produce some redress.

But the limits of a letter are insufficient to explain the vicious and atrocious conduct of the East India Company towards the natives; the grinding and desolating effects of what is called "the land revenue." It is a system of monstrous and perfect oppression. It combines all the evils of these five mischiefs:—

First—A total uncertainty and precariousness in the tenure and occupation of the land by the inhabitants generally.

Secondly—Rackrents, assessed with some of the forms, but without any of the guarantees, which justice requires.

Thirdly—Absenteeism of the real landlords, and absenteeism in its worst form.

Fourthly—These rents collected by the worst possible species of agents—persons who have not any interest whatso-

ever in the prosperity of the natives, and whose interest it is to extort or collect from the occupiers of the lands the largest possible sums of money in the shortest possible time; these persons are called collectors of the land revenue.

And, fifthly—The most defective and multifarious scheme or plan, or rather hotch-potch, of administration of law. Only conceive, for one moment, all the oppressions of Ireland multiplied by themselves, and then the total inflicted on countless legions. You have thus some idea of the sufferings and degradations of the people of India; and what is the excuse for the commission of this outrageous tyranny? Only this—the precedents set us by the Mahometan powers who conquered a very large portion of India. By the Moslem system of rule, the natives of countries conquered by them were bound to embrace the religion of the conquerors, or to submit to extermination, unless they purchased existence by the payment of one-half the gross produce of their lands, besides other tributes.

We have inherited the dominions of the Mussulmans—we insist on the right to half-produce. Thus our land revenue ought, by the very terms of its payment, to vary from year to year, as the amount of the crop necessarily varies with the difference of seasons and other circumstances. Who is it that does not perceive what an abundant source of exaction and oppression is thus opened for the practically irresponsible collectors of such a revenue.

Even when a more permanent settlement has taken place, as in the districts of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, the condition of the peasantry is little, if at all, alleviated, and nothing can demand more of vigilant compassion than the deplorable state of all the cultivators of the land in a population of about one hundred millions of souls.

There is another strange coincidence between the history of India and the sad story of Ireland. The subjugation of the former was only the enactment on a broader scale of the system of rapacity and deception by which the latter was subjugated.

The support given by the English to the weaker O'Donnell in order to put down his more formidable competitor O'Neill, has been one thousand times imitated in India.

The East India Company in all disputes between the native powers took part uniformly with the weaker party, and generally with the worst title; and when their powerful aid placed on the throne the once weaker competitor, they soon taught him that he reigned not for himself but for his allies, and made him feel the full effects of British venality and British treachery.

There is another point in which a more faint resemblance to Ireland appears in the Indian story. I allude to the state of Catholicity in our Indian possessions. The number of native Catholics is comparatively great. It is calculated as certainly exceeding one million of souls.

If, indeed, any attention had been paid by the British to the extension of Catholicity in India, it is probable that great progress would have been already made in the conversion of the great body of the natives. But the English preferred that the natives should continue in the filthy and horrible superstitions of Gentooism to their becoming Catholics. This is the great impulse unhappily of Protestantism to calumniate and to hate what they call Popery, and to attribute to Catholics the horrible imaginings of their enemies, instead of giving them credit for the tenets we really profess, and then to act towards Catholicity as if it really was what its calumniators describe it. There is a curious illustration of this Protestant propensity to act with abhorrence of Catholicity to be found in the history of the Dutch in Ceylon. They (the Dutch), when they became masters of the sea coasts of Ceylon, found within their territories about half a-million of native Christians, all, of course, Catholics, who had been converted principally by the Jesuits, the companions and successors of the great St. Francis Xavier; but instead of encouraging them, they commenced a most cruel and unrelenting persecution of all the Ceylonese Christians who refused to embrace Calvinism. They invented or adopted part of the Irish penal code, by rendering it impossible for Catholic children to

inherit any of the property of their Catholic parents, besides using more direct force and personal punishment for professing Catholicity; but without being able to extirpate that religion. They, therefore, resorted to another and still more atrocious proceeding.

The species of Gentoicism professed by the native Ceylonese was the religion of Buddha, an obscene and horrid religion, which had organised itself into a faint resemblance of the Christian hierarchy. In fact, that religion could not subsist for any length of time without the regular graduation of orders of their priesthood. Such, however, was the success of the Jesuits and other Catholic missionaries that the hierarchy of these Buddhists in Ceylon was broken up, and the religion itself was nearly extinguished at the period of the Dutch conquest.

What did the Dutch do? When they found they could not put down Catholicity otherwise, they actually entered into an arrangement with the King of Candy, who reigned in the interior of the island, and lent him a frigate and fitted out for him an embassy, which they conveyed to the Isle of Gava for a fresh college of Buddhist priests. They brought these priests back to Ceylon, and thus actually re-established the Buddhist's hierarchy to preserve the natives from Catholicity. Perhaps nothing in the history of man was ever more revolting.

The Indian Catholics in the British dominions have no complaint to make of any such persecution, but they have been shamefully neglected—even the Bill of the present session, which provided three bishops and a regular establishment of subordinate ecclesiastics for some twenty to thirty thousand British Protestants, did nothing for the native Catholics. These Catholics are languishing for want of an educated priesthood, and also of schools and churches. Yet they have been unnoticed by the recent Bill.

It is right I should inform my constituents that I discovered this gross neglect, and complained of it in the House and out of the House. I succeeded thus far, that I got a pledge from the Indian Department of the Government that every possible atten-

tion should in future be paid our Catholic fellow-subjects in the East Indies, and that the first practical opportunity should be seized upon to give them protection and some support. I do not intend that this pledge should remain unredeemed. At least, I hope it will not be my fault if it be unredeemed. Indeed, I saw and heard enough to make me hope that the Indian Catholics will obtain solid and substantial relief.

The present plan of Indian Government is a strange anomaly. It allows the East India Company of Merchants to subsist, but it takes away from them all commercial pursuits. It leaves them the power of electing directors, and permits these directors to exercise a considerable degree of Indian patronage, but it absorbs all the real powers of Government in the Board of Control—that is, in other words, in the minister of the day. It thus most enormously increases ministerial power and influence.

Again, the bargain made with the East India Company was highly unfavourable to the British nation. It has probably added thirty-six millions to the debt, commonly, but erroneously, called the national debt, because, taking into consideration the great probability—nay, the certainty of the recurrence of war in India, there are no resources adequate in such contingency to defray the debt which the Government has at present guaranteed to the creditors of the East India Company.

Again, the Government plan is most absurdly unfavourable to the public in the length of the term of future existence which it has insured to the thing called the East India Company.

I cannot travel with my constituents through the details of these measures; but my votes are upon record. I supported the Government plan wherever I found it tending to promote the two great objects I had in view. These two great objects were—first, the diffusion of Christianity; and, secondly, the establishment of a solid basis for the future liberty and independence of the inhabitants of India. Having these two objects in view, my votes will, I trust, be found consistent with the principles of the party to which I am proud to belong—the avowed and sincere Radicals of the British empire.

Whatever in the East India Bill tended to the emancipation of the Indian people from mental and political despotism had my support. I felt the awful duty imposed on me, and honestly endeavoured to do the best I could for the natives and inhabitants of our East Indian dominions. Would to God that my capacity to be useful had been equal to my inclinations and wishes.

The great defect in the East India Bill is, that it has done nothing directly, and but very little by indirect operation to remedy the evils of uncertain tenures, rack rents, absenteeism, or exacting or oppressive agency. In short, the interests, the comfort, or the prosperity of the people of India have been but little consulted; and yet, with all its defects, the Bill composes one step in the march of civilisation.

The next great measure of the last session was the Bill to abolish negro slavery.

Upon this most important subject so many considerations of all-absorbing interest arise, that they reduce into insignificance the claims of any individual to public gratitude. Yet I do claim the continued confidence of my constituents for the exertions I have made incessantly, for many years, to forward this desirable consummation.

It is, however, necessary to caution the public against believing that, because the battle is won, the fruits of this triumph of humanity are certainly to be reaped. It requires vigilance, care, perseverance, to secure those fruits, and to prevent a barren mockery from being substituted in the place of real freedom.

The Negro Emancipation Bill was carried through under the auspices of that flippant debater, but most unphilosophic and unstatesmanlike being, Stanley—a man whose success in the logomachy of Parliament has puffed up his own natural and exorbitant vanity, and procured for him a reputation and a party in the State, both of which he will either speedily lose or employ to purposes destructive of the best interests of the State. The Bill, indeed, as it ultimately passed into a law, was most essentially different from the plan originally introduced by Stanley. The original plan was one utterly impracticable in its details,

and most unjust had it been practicable. It consisted in a loan of fifteen millions to the planters, to be repaid by the labour of the negroes. This was the first glaring defect in the plan. It was worse—it was a gross iniquity. The principle for which the emancipation contended was, that slavery was, and must be in itself, essentially unjust, that one man could not be the property of another man without a crime. Slavery, according to us, was not a nuisance merely, which might be modified and gradually ameliorated. No, it was and is a crime of enormous magnitude, to be at once unconditionally and for ever abolished.

It was not by but against the negroes that this crime was committed. They were the victims not the authors of the injustice. The injustice was committed against and upon the negroes by the planters, who perpetrated, and by the British Government who tolerated, or even sanctioned, the iniquity. But the redemption money, according to Stanley's plan, was not to be paid by the planters, the agents of the crime, or their accomplices, the British Government, but by the unfortunate negroes. Anything so unjust, so monstrously iniquitous, was never yet heard of—yet such was the morality of the plan of that sublime statesman, Stanley.

But if there was injustice in the principle it was overborne by the ludicrous absurdity of the details. It is right to take them by stages.

First—The negroes, men, women, and children, were all to be forthwith emancipated and declared free, and slavery was to be for ever abolished all over the British dominions.

Nothing could be better—but——

Secondly—All these free negroes were at once to be turned into apprentices, simply because they were free. These apprenticeships were to be—oh! madness—for twelve years. The child of seven and the old woman of seventy were simultaneously to become apprentices at one blow. Society was to be put on a new footing. There was to be a colonial nation, all masters and apprentices! An idea which had never before entered into a human head—a nation all masters or apprentices! No

art, no mystery, no trade to be taught or learned—yet all to be apprentices, save such as were masters.

Thirdly—The apprentice, being thus a freeman, was to be compelled to work four full days in each week without wages—that is, for nothing or next to nothing—namely, for 40s. worth of clothing in the year. For four days, in each week, during twelve long, long years, was Stanley's freemen to work without wages, and under the terror of the magistrate's cutting whip.

Fourthly—The negro, because he was thus to be free, was, in addition to working four days in the week for nothing, to work the remaining two days in each week—for what, think you? To pay off out of wages to be allowed him for each of these days the sum of fifteen millions.

Fifthly—But this was not all. The price of the negro was to be calculated by his master—that is, a gross value was to be set on each negro by the master. This gross value was then to be divided into twelve parts, and then again each twelfth was to be subdivided into one hundred and four parts, and one of these parts, that is, the one-hundredth and fourth part of one-twelfth part of the gross value set upon the negro, was to be his day's wages for his two days in each week—that is, by each day's labour of the negro he was to pay 1-1248th part of his redemption money—but he was to have only two days in the week applicable to this purpose. He could not by this mode of labour redeem himself in less than twelve long years—but from even this remote and almost delusive prospect of ultimate freedom there was one great drawback. If the negro was prevented by sickness or sorrow—by the death of a parent or child—by marriage or mourning—in short, by any cause—from giving six days' labour under a burning sun, the deficiency was to be noted against him, and he was to continue after the twelve years his new servitude, until he should have made up every deficiency. Such was Stanley's plan. It gave the planters nothing. It even diminished their present powers. It gave the negroes nothing solid or substantial. It deluded both—made the ownership of slaves complicated and unmanageable,

and mocked the wretched negro with the semblance only of freedom. But then it should have given to the mortgagees—to the usurious and grinding mortgagees of West Indian property—the fifteen millions of sterling money; and Stanley has, I presume, a similar affection for them that he has for the tithe exactors of Ireland.

Such was Stanley's plan. It would have produced a universal insurrection had it been attempted to be carried into execution. One convulsive explosion must necessarily have rent asunder the social state in our colonies, and deluged its ruins in blood. But its cruel absurdities and utter impracticability rendered its defeat certain. Indeed, it was scouted by universal acclaim.

In the first place, Stanley was compelled to relinquish his twelve years' apprenticeship. We struck off one-half of the term.

The absurdity of unlearning, unteaching apprenticeship remains; but one-half—one full half—of its duration is gone. Six years are still a sad long period to procrastinate freedom and sicken hope—but one can see through the darkness, and the dawn of liberty, as it were, streaks in the horizon with purer light—

“The full moon of freedom shall shine round them yet.”

In the second place, the use of the cutting-whip, as an inducement to labour, is also diminished. It cannot be employed against females at all. I claim, before my constituents, being the originator of this improvement upon Stanley's plan. It is quite true that, some days after I had placed a notice to this effect on the order book of the House of Commons, Stanley declared that he intended to propose it himself; but it is quite certain that he made no intimation of such improvement in the first instance, and indeed, his bill was read twice, and printed, without any such provision. Certainly some other person would have suggested it, if I had not; but that does not deprive me of my right to claim for my constituents, that it was their repre-

sentative with whom originated the exemption of females in all the colonies from the cruel and degrading infliction of the cart whip.

In the next place, the two days in each week which were by Stanley's plan to be attributed to the payment of the loan of fifteen millions, are to be at the absolute and free disposal of the negro. Thus, even during the six years of apprentice-servitude, the negro has one-third of each year at his own disposal. We have thus further mitigated the horrors of Stanley's plan; and, instead of twelve years' servitude with a power and indeed a certainty of an increased duration, we substituted an apprenticeship terminating certainly with the labour of only four years.

Let it not be supposed that I approve of even the reduced number—I only speak of it as a comparative, not an absolute amelioration. I always insisted, and do insist, that the negro was, and is still, entitled to absolute and unconditional freedom, and that no further delay should intervene to the enjoyment of that freedom, save just so much as should be necessary to organise the public police in such mode of activity and effect as to meet the altered relations of public society, and secure peace and good order according to these new arrangements of the social state.

There remains one more most important alteration of Stanley's plan. He began with a loan of fifteen millions. All at once—*Presto*, pass! he substituted a gift of twenty millions—a gift of twenty millions of pounds sterling—what a lump!—one loses breath at the mere thought; twenty millions of the public money flung away as if it were a china orange—and yet the people of England stand by stupified, and appear careless whether they lend fifteen millions, or give away twenty millions. No wonder that the Government Debt—falsely called National—(and by way of parenthesis, I pledge myself to fix the name of Government Debt upon it preparatory to its just reduction)—no wonder, I say, that the Government Debt should be eight hundred millions—indeed, all I wonder at is, that it is not twice as much. Stanley gives away twenty millions of the public

money one fine evening, and "the reformed ministry" concur—and "the reformed Parliament" applaud the gift.

Observe, by way of note and comment, that the same "reformed ministry" equally concurred in the loan only of fifteen millions, and that the same "reformed Parliament" equally applauded the loan and the author of the loan!!! And are the affairs of nations to be for ever consigned to the folly of rulers, and the base subserviency of the minions of, and expectants on, power?

There was one other trait highly characteristic of "the reformed ministry" and "the reformed Parliament;" it was this—Stanley opened the negro emancipation measure with a long speech. It was throughout a violent invective against slavery and slave-owners—it collated and dilated upon the cruelty and political hypocrisy of the planters—it adopted and justified by official authority all the accounts of negro sufferings and of West Indian tyranny, detailed for years in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*—and then, oh most lame and impotent conclusion! it closed with the absurd and unjust plan which I have already commented upon. The "reformed Parliament" loudly cheered the speech, and as decidedly approved of the plan which directly, and in terms, contradicted the entire spirit and meaning of that speech.

I opposed in every stage the gift of twenty millions. I voted against it in every shape, and divided the House against it as often as I could. I now, to you, my constituents, protest against it as a cruel, additional burden on the industrious and working classes in these countries, and as bestowed on men who in no possible way deserved it, or were entitled to it.

They did not desire it by their conduct, because they had perseveringly and audaciously opposed the benevolent spirit of the times, which exhibited from day to day its increased horror of the condition of the negro slave, and with equally audacious pertinacity opposed every effort on the part of Government to ameliorate the condition of the slaves and to prepare them for freedom. On the other hand, the planters are not entitled to

the money as compensation for any loss, because, if they act with common sense and common humanity, the transition of the negroes from slavery to the state of free labourers can be made without any loss of property to the planters; on the contrary, there is abundant and most satisfactory evidence to satisfy every thinking man that the property of the planters, instead of suffering by the transition from slavery to free labour, would be much increased in value thereby, provided a just and generous humanity and benevolence presided over the first workings of that transition. The system of free labour would soon right itself and produce the usual fruits of industry, guided by the natural wants, and regulated by the natural propensities of mankind to procure for themselves comfort, pleasure, and distinction.

Again, these twenty millions are distributable amongst planters, many of whom have distinguished themselves by the most brutal persecution of preachers of Christianity.

But, after all, the greater portion of these twenty millions will go into the pockets of the usurious mortgagees; just the persons on whose behalf it is most insufferable to increase the burdens of the laborious classes in these countries.

I was at my post, as your representative, during the entire of these discussions. I supported every clause that tended to abolish, or even to mitigate, direct slavery, or indirect slavery called apprenticeship. I supported every clause that tended to extend the blessings of education or to promote the knowledge of Christianity. I opposed every restriction on the human mind, or on the human body, and I gave my most decided opposition to the grant of twenty millions of the money of the people of these countries to persons who had, in my solemn judgment, no right or title to one single farthing.

I cannot close this part of my subject without offering the meed of my very sincere and lively gratitude to Lord Hawick, for his conduct during the entire of the discussions on the question of negro emancipation, both in and out of Parliament. He had digested a plan for the abolition of slavery much more

simple and practical than that which won the approbation of the Cabinet under the dictation of the imperious and unreflecting Stanley. He (Lord Hawick) quitted office and responsibility when he found his plan rejected and Stanley's approved of by the Cabinet; approved of, however, only to be scouted with ridicule by the public. In the House, Lord Hawick sustained, with manliness and talent, his views of the subject; and much of the ameliorations which were worked into Stanley's plan is properly attributable to the talents and exertions of Lord Hawick.

This letter has run into greater length than I had intended. I cannot close it without again adverting to the state of Ireland.

I began with my congratulations on the departure of Lord Anglesey; I conclude with expressing a hope—a fervent hope—that the Administration of his successor may have in it something propitious to Ireland. The Corporation inquiry is working well—extremely well. The total dereliction of the principle on which corporations are alone justifiable, namely, the good of the inhabitants of the city or town, has proved to be complete everywhere in Ireland. A sweeping reform of corporate abuses is inevitable.

The franchise will be restored—so much is manifest—to the resident householders. Shall it be to the £10 householders only, or shall it include £5 householders? That is, after all, the only question. It must certainly be as low as £10. Shall it come down to £5? I am quite convinced it ought, and I trust it will. Nay, I deem it the duty of everybody to struggle to extend the franchise to the occupier of every house worth £5 per annum. It is comical to see the zeal with which the present race of corporators contend for raising the franchise under the coming Reform Bill to £20; although the present community consists in the open places of freemen, very many of whom are not householders at all, and amongst whom are to be found the very poorest persons in the country. But thus it is always with the oppressors of the people; they use the poorer-

classes to work their iniquity, when they have that class in their trammels. They exclude the poor when they find that the bad principle is most predominant amongst the more wealthy orders of society.

I do entertain hopes of the present Irish Administration. There is one advantage which it possesses over any recent Government of this kingdom—it is to be found in the unity of purpose of the Lord Lieutenant and his Secretary. If they do ill, it will not be in opposition to each other, but in concert. If they choose to do well, they will have double power to do good deeds. As yet there can be nothing to complain of, and although there is indeed little to applaud, there is still less to censure.

The speeches of Lord Wellesley at the Corporation dinner were not models of absolute wisdom; but still less did they denote anything absolutely hostile to the people of Ireland. Let us, then, hope for better days, and above all things, let us recollect that it is the duty of every one of us to assist the Government in every measure useful to Ireland, and to applaud the Government, as well as to support it, in carrying into effect every such measure.

Lord Wellesley does not seem to understand that there are no longer two parties in Ireland. The divisions which existed between the two denominations of the Irish, when Lord Wellesley was here last, no longer exist. There is no longer a Catholic party opposed to a Protestant party. The Catholics have got all they wanted as a particular body or persuasion. The ascendancy party, however, continues, or rather its ghost walks abroad in the likeness of human existence. There is no second party. The fading remnant of the ascendancy is at the one side; the universal people at the other. The Government cannot stand neutral without deserting its every duty. It should treat the remnant of the faction with exemplary good temper, with every practicable forbearance, but with perfect firmness and decision, whenever there is occasion to act. The Somers Paynes, as well as the Carters, should be taught that

there is no longer impunity for magisterial delinquency. There should be no mock inquiries. No Flinter's restoration acted over again, after getting abundant praise for a dismissal. Words will no longer do. Of these poor Anglesey had, heaven knows, more than enough. We must have deeds.

It may be said that the support given to Government in measures useful to Ireland implies an abandonment of the great question of the "Repeal." There never was a greater or more absurd mistake. On the contrary, nothing can tend more to demonstrate the necessity of the "Repeal" than the little good which the best intentioned Administration can do for Ireland under existing circumstances. The "Repeal" is winning its way securely and irresistibly. Even the North, where our weakness once lay, is adding daily to our strength. There are now, I rejoice to say it, already two newspapers in the North full of patriotism and talent, supporting on principle the "Repeal"—the one at Newry, called the *Examiner*; the other at Belfast, called the *Herald*. Then there is the powerful advocacy of Sharman Crawford; believe me, that, when men of his rank, fortune, talents, and high character, take the lead in seeking for the "Repeal," the national restoration of Ireland is at hand, and we shall achieve national independence, as a portion only of the Irish nation achieved Catholic Emancipation—that is, without violence or crime, without causing one tear to flow, and without incurring the possibility of shedding one drop of blood.

For my own part, I do not want the stimulus of recollecting that every single individual of my constituents would be immediately and personally benefited by the "Repeal." It suffices for me to recollect the passing of the Coercion Bill to declare, that no man can possibly love Ireland who can possibly forgive the haughty, the insolent, the atrocious passing of this Bill. It has passed without one single particle of necessity and without any palliation.

It was the insolent presumption of Stanley, adopted readily towards Ireland by Lords Grey and Brougham. I, for one, will

never forgive that crime until I see the Irish Parliament seated in College-green, and the recurrence of such an atrocity towards Ireland rendered for ever impossible.

In the meantime let us aid the Government in every useful measure, but let us not forget the constitutional agitation necessary to carry the Abolition of Tithes and the Repeal of the Union.

I have the honour to be your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

FIFTH LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

London, July 1, 1838.

“’Twas fate, they’ll say, a wayward fate,
 Your web of discord wove,
 And whilst your tyrants joined in hate,
 You never joined in love.”

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—There is something preposterous in the manner in which the concerns of Ireland are treated by Irishmen. It would be ludicrous if it were not melancholy. There is a disposition to cavil and to unjust imputation which, I know, has deterred many an ardent and generous spirit from devoting his energies to the cause of his country, and which even to me, who have so much of experience of its working, and endured so many, many years of vituperation, sometimes comes over my heart with a sensation of sadness which would drive me for the rest of my life into the shade, did I not reject the temptation, and reanimate my long-upheld spirit of perseverance by the hope that I may yet live to serve Ireland in the restoration of her domestic Legislature.

Upon this point all I claim is seniority. I am the oldest and most continued agitator of the Repeal. I began my public career by opposing the enactment of the Union. The speech I made in 1800 contains my sentiments of the present day. I could wish that those who avail themselves of every adverse gust of wind to insinuate that which they could not openly avow, would read that speech. They would find the great principle of Irish nationality in it, with a generous confidence in our Protestant countrymen—a confidence which subsequent events often diminished, but a confidence which, I rejoice to say, is now returning with renewed vigour, and, indeed, increased with accumulated force by many a cheering Protestant adhesion to the great object of the resurrection of Ireland.

I never deserted the principle of Repeal during the agitation of the Catholic question. I knew full well that there was not the most remote chance of carrying the Repeal until the people of Ireland should be placed on a footing of legal equality. As long as the ascendancy of one portion of Irishmen and the depression of the other prevailed, it was impossible that there could be that community of interest or exertion which alone could afford a prospect of success in seeking the restoration of our domestic Legislature. I, therefore, felt doubly animated to struggle for Catholic Emancipation. "The Repeal" was the great and glorious object which I had in prospective—it always glittered before my eyes, and left Emancipation as a minor good, most valuable in this, that it should be the means of accomplishing my real end and purpose.

Nor did I conceal these my opinions. It was indiscreet to avow them, because that avowal increased and strengthened the British opposition to Emancipation. But, notwithstanding the indiscretion of doing so—an indiscretion for which several of my present calumniators heartily abused me—I did candidly and honestly avow these my sentiments. I acknowledged myself to be an agitator with ulterior views, which views concentrated in the restoration of a domestic Legislature to Ireland.

When Emancipation was conceded I refused to abandon salutary agitation. I took the post I promised to take so soon as that measure should be carried. I stepped out at first almost alone to raise the voice of Repeal. The Leinster declarationists met me on the threshold, and the unwise portion of these silly men were induced by some base designing knaves to pronounce upon themselves a judgment of servility, and upon the unhappy country which had the misfortune to give them birth, a sentence of perpetual and provincial degradation.

But I did not despair. I continued to agitate the question with doubtful success, chilled by the despair of those who thought that Ireland was destined for perennial slavery. The revolution of 1830 shone forth in Paris. The hopes of the friends of liberty all over the globe beat high. Belgium dissolved by

force, and, alas! in blood, her legislative union with Holland. The moment was come to rally the slumbering spirit of "Repeal." I, accordingly, aided to revive that spirit, to reanimate public confidence in the destiny of Ireland, and to organise that peaceable and legal combination of Irishmen of every class and of every persuasion, which must sooner or later result in the regeneration of our native land; soon, if we adopt wise and prudent counsels; late, if any considerable portion of us shall be led astray by honest folly or by the artful machinations of malignant knavery. The Reform Bill arrested our progress. The Tories desired that we should embarrass the ministry whilst that ministry were struggling to extinguish the rotten boroughs. But we were then too wise and too honest to listen to the suggestions of our enemies; although then, as now, aided by the restless murmurs of some honest but mistaken Repealers. We felt also that Ireland owed all her misfortunes and miseries to a Government supported by an unreformed Parliament. It was possible that a reformed and democratic Parliament even in London might cure all the evils inflicted on Ireland by the sordid oligarchy which had preceded them; it was just possible that avowed reformers, although British, might reform all Irish abuses and redress all Irish grievances. It was, to be sure, highly improbable, but as it was possible, and as that possibility would be proclaimed to be a certainty until tried, it became prudent to pause and give the spirit of British reform a fair trial. This course, however, like everything else, had its revilers at the time. But I look back with satisfaction to the course I then advised, and I am quite convinced that we are now much farther advanced towards the Repeal than we could have been had we adopted a different course, and refused to give Reform a fair trial.

That trial did not last long; it soon, indeed, became apparent that it was utterly hopeless of redress.

The malignant genius of Stanley, countenanced as it was by the astounding vanity and unwise egotism of our unwise and Orange-led Lord Lieutenant, prevailed.

The Irish Reform Bill, brought in under their auspices, was not only a grievous injustice to Ireland but a most daring insult to our rights. We were provincialized even in our Reform Bill, and, whilst England and Scotland were cherished, Ireland was treated with restriction and insult. I, for one, flung aside procrastination. We raised again the standard of "Repeal," and under that banner fought all the elections in every county and place where there was no danger of increasing or exciting by an election constant religious animosities between Protestants and Catholics.

We succeeded in almost all the counties in which the popular spirit prevailed. Of such counties Wexford alone gave us not one pledged Repealer, whilst it treated us, for county members, to two determined enemies of constitutional liberty in Ireland. By one of those strange vagaries of the public mind which are apt to disgust inexperienced politicians, it would appear that Wexford—which has not given us even one pledged Repealer—has become more impatient for a fruitless contest on the Repeal question than the counties which did their duty and all their duty to the cause of Repeal.

The present session of Parliament approached under what appeared to be favourable prospects for Ireland. As the then apparent leader of the Repeal, I made my arrangements for an early bringing forward of that measure. My plan was this—I determined to try the reformed Parliament for the redress of the most prominent of our grievances. I accordingly, so soon as the order book of the House of Commons was opened, put upon it notices of motions for bills—

"First—To remedy the evils of our Jury Law in all criminal as well as civil cases, and not only in the superior courts in Dublin, but at the assizes, and in all inferior courts, by introducing the principle of ballot in all cases, and taking away from the Crown all right of challenge, except for cause."

This would have purified the sources of justice.

"Second—To remedy the oppressions of our Grand Jury Law by creating grand juries on the principle of representation—that is, by having the grand jurors elected by the cess-payers in each parish."

“Third—To remedy the scarcely-endurable despotism of our justices of the peace, by making the office of justice of the peace elective, one justice at the least to be elected in each parish to serve for three years only, unless re-elected.”

I need not dwell upon the advantages of this measure. Under my system the magistrates, instead of being the haughty rulers of the people, would be their friends and protectors. Perhaps there is not one point of practical utility which would ensure so much of quiet and comfort to the Irish people as the power to elect their own magistrates.

“Fourth—The extension of the suffrage, and the facility of registration of voters in our towns as well as counties, and an adequate increase in our representation.”

Without a measure of this description our Reform Bill is a mockery.

“Fifth—A thorough and entire reform of all abuses in our corporations, so as to identify the corporate body with the inhabitants, without any religious or political distinction.”

The obvious effect of this measure would be to destroy, at once, the odious domination in our towns and cities of a speculating and besotted monopoly, and to give to every householder his due share in the management of the corporate funds and expenditure, and of all the affairs relative to the good government, to the protection of the poorer and working classes, to the police, peace, and good order of all the inhabitants.

“Sixth—The total and unequivocal extinction of tithes and vestry cess.”

I need not dwell on these measures; they are of that nature without which there cannot be permanent peace or tranquillity in Ireland. But I grow tedious. I will, therefore, only add upon this part of my case, that I had included in my notices the abolition of the remaining part of the Sub-letting Act, so as totally to extinguish that most oppressive and unprincipled statute.

It is, however, beyond my present purpose to proceed further with my projected measures of relief. It is sufficient to say, they were all intended as trials of the spirit and good disposition towards Ireland of this Reformed Parliament. If I had been successful; if that Parliament had given me those measures honestly, substantially, and practically, although I acknowledge it would damp the ardour for Repeal, yet it would have done much good to the people of Ireland. If, on the contrary, those measures were rejected, then the necessity of the Repeal would appear too obvious to be controverted by any honest Irishman. Such was the speculation with which I commenced the present session of Parliament. My experiment would have been complete in a few weeks. I easily anticipated that, in that period, the Reformed Parliament would show itself, and prove its incapacity to redress the evils of Ireland. Alas! it did, indeed, so show itself, not only by refusing to redress our grievances, but by that most astounding act of cruelty and injustice which one country ever exercised over another—the Coercion Bill. I was then satisfied that I had all the argument, all the reasoning with me in favour of the Repeal. One only duty remained: it was, and is, to concert the means of effecting the restoration of the Irish Parliament without bloodshed; my political creed being, that the best possible political revolution is not worth one single drop of human blood.

People of Ireland, this is the capacity in which I now stand before you. I am the oldest, the most continuous and constant, the most solemnly pledged, and, may I add, the most anxious of the honest Repealers belonging to Ireland.

I candidly confess, it may be vanity and weakness, but, at all events, I do confess that I am desirous to be left for some time longer the management of the Repeal question. I am anxious to follow up the plans I have devised to effectuate Repeal. I wish, strongly wish, to be permitted to develop my means of obtaining the concurrence of Irishmen, of every sect and persuasion, to the restoration of Irish nationality and the destruction of the provincial degradation of Ireland.

My only motive for deserving the management and leadership of this great question ought to be, and must be, that is if I am honest, a conviction that in this capacity I can be useful.

I do most solemnly declare that, if I knew any man likely to be more useful to the cause of Repeal; nay, if I knew any man likely, at the present moment, to be equally useful to that cause, I would readily, cheerfully, and gratefully resign into his hands that management and leadership.

But this is the period of the utmost difficulty to that cause. Fettered, gagged, and controlled, as public opinion and public spirit are in Ireland; deprived as we are of the greatest of constitutional rights by the Coercion Bill; with a Lord Lieutenant under the most absolute control of a bigoted and anti-national Attorney-General; at such a moment as this I cannot surrender my station in the cause, without seeing that I am to be replaced by some person more competent than myself to regulate the mode of attaining national freedom for Ireland.

But, if I have lost the confidence of my brother Repealers in Ireland; if men equally honest, truthful, and more wise than myself, deem it right to hand over the conduct of the Repeal cause even to a Repealer of yesterday—even to a man without more talent and with less services than mine—even to one, if he can be found, whose first step in the cause of Repeal may be the creating of dissension and distracting by division—even to one whose proceedings may be cheered by the most bitter and unrelenting enemies of Ireland; still, I repeat it, I am, if the people of Ireland desire it, ready and most willing to resign my pretensions to utility, and to abandon the management of the Repeal cause to him whom the people of Ireland honour, and in whom they think they ought to confide. They are better judges than I am, and in their decision I will, at once, and, I hope, cheerfully acquiesce.

But, in order to enable the people to judge between us, I proceed to state my plan "for procuring the restoration of the domestic Legislature of Ireland, without an offence or a crime, without violence or bloodshed." When I have developed that

plan, I will state as fully as it reached me the counter-project of the new managers.

Let me, by way of preface, just state that, although it may be decided that I am unworthy to manage "the Repeal cause," yet, even that decision shall not diminish my anxiety for the Repeal, nor prevent me from endeavouring, in my individual capacity, to discover and adopt the best means I can to forward that great cause; and, although not confided in by others, I will not be the less unremitting, individually, to look for, and seize on the fit and proper times and modes of attaining the constitutional independence of Ireland. My efforts shall not be relaxed at any suitable occasion to attain that object.

After this preface, I proceed to develop my plan for advancing the cause of "the Repeal":—

First—I propose to procure from as many parishes in Ireland as I possibly can petitions for the Repeal of the Union. This I do intend to be the great work of the ensuing recess. It will require, in the present state of the law, and with the unconstitutional impediments which the Coercion Bill interposes, much and persevering exertions in order to obtain these petitions. It must consume months before they can be all collected. Perhaps I may obtain them from every parish in Ireland. Certainly I shall be able to procure them from the far greater part of the parishes.

Secondly—For this purpose, I intend to take each county in alphabetical order. I have, in Parliamentary Returns, the names of all the parishes in Ireland. I will follow up from parish to parish my exertions for petitions.

There were petitions presented this session for the abolition of negro slavery, signed by about one million three hundred thousand persons. I hope that, before the first day of the next year, there will be petitions signed by two millions of Irishmen for the Repeal of the Union.

Thirdly—My principal study, and that to which I will devote most time and attention, will be the procuring as many Protestants as possible to sign these petitions. There are already

several Protestant Repealers; but we want more; we cannot—I shall go further and say—we ought not succeed in the Repeal of the Union as the work of any one sect or persuasion. It can be done only by a combination between all Irishmen. In fact, at present, it wants nothing but that combination to ensure success. The Protestants of Ireland have it now in their power to restore a domestic Parliament. Let them but join the rest of the Irish people, and the thing is done. No ministry could resist the unanimous prayer of the people of Ireland. We are eight millions.

Fourthly—It is a principal part of my plan to conciliate the Protestant population of Ireland, not by cunning or deceit, which, indeed, would be impossible, but by the gradual disclosure to, and perception by them of this great truth: that whilst as Protestants they have nothing to lose as Irishmen, they have everything to gain by the restoration of a national Legislature, in Ireland.

Fifthly—This part of my plan necessarily requires time to develop it fully and with efficacy. The Bills which are in progress this session, though not in themselves of much value, will, however, destroy much of the delusion under which Irish Protestants labour. Some of them still imagine that it is possible to revive Protestant ascendancy. Cherished as that ascendancy has been for centuries by the British Government, the Irish Protestants of the present generation cannot, as yet, believe their own senses that it is gone, and gone for ever. Many of them still cling to the fond hope of its revival, and it is this delusion which prevents them from becoming Repealers. When they become convinced that they have no chance of advantage, as a faction, all their energies will be combined with ours to obtain benefits as a nation. A little time is all that is now wanting for the purpose.

Sixthly—Even the Church Temporalities Bill, if carried into a law, will aid in bringing many Protestants to become Repealers. That Bill does little indeed for the people, but it tramples under foot many darling prejudices of the Irish Protes-

tants. They never can expect that a Parliament which, at one blow, and, as it were, by a pure fantasy, exterminates two Protestant archbishops and eight Protestant bishops, can be ever brought to dream of re-establishing Protestant ascendancy. This is so plain and palpable that I look upon this Bill as a great stimulant to the Repeal, especially as it never was called for by the Catholics or Dissenters of Ireland. We do not want to put any gratuitous insult on the Protestants of Ireland; what we want is to lessen to the people the intolerable weight of the Protestant establishment in its temporalities. The ministry give a bill which does not, in any useful degree, lessen that weight, but which, to an enormous and impertinent extent, interferes with the spiritual arrangement of the Protestant hierarchy in Ireland. The ministry thus displease one party and do little to gratify the others; but they effectually recruit for the "Repeal" by proving the utter hopelessness of the restoration of "ascendancy." This naturally drives the most inveterate of the Protestants to look for another restoration, in which we are equally interested—the restoration of the Irish Parliament.

Seventhly—My plan embraces the giving time for the working of events; events now inevitable. The steps which the Whigs have taken—slowly, to be sure, and undecidedly, as is the manner of the Whigs—for the destruction of corporate monopoly; the commission about to issue to inquire in both countries into corporate abuses—the irresistible impulse given to the spirit of amelioration in all municipal institutions, leave no rational doubt that the ascendancy monopoly which has hitherto prevailed in the Irish corporations is drawing to a close. This conviction of the approaching termination of the monopoly which subsists in the corporations in Ireland will disengage another considerable class who are detained in the ranks of the anti-Repealers by the advantages derived from that very monopoly which is thus about to be extinguished. Before the next session we, Repealers, will thus procure a considerable accession to our numbers of active and intelligent

Protestants, kept from us at present only by a selfish because purely personal interest.

Eightly—My plan thus embraces every means, between this and the next session, of increasing the number of Repealers, and then, as early as possible in that session, the making a demand on the Legislature in the name of universal Ireland of the restoration of our domestic Legislature.

Ninthly—For this purpose I intend to combine the procuring of parochial petitions, with the ascertainment of the number of voters or persons capable of becoming voters in each parish; and the procuring every such voter to pledge himself not to support any but a Repeal candidate of tried integrity.

Tenthly—According to my plan a full and complete opportunity will be ensured for a deliberate discussion of the great national question. I intend to bring it on at that period of the session when there will be no excuse to refuse sufficient time for fully considering a measure of such vital importance. It will, of course, require four or five days' debate for this purpose; I must, therefore, have everything arranged to bring on that debate early in the session. I know, by experience, that it is more difficult to get a discussion of five hours in the closing part of a session than five days in the commencement. It is in human nature that it should be so.

Eleventhly—Part of my plan includes arrangements to have a full report of the debate on "The Repeal" in some English papers. Some expense must be gone to for this purpose. The English newspapers have no interest in reporting matters purely Irish. The reporters either are directed not to report them, or their reports are cut down into nonsense, or converted into falsehood by the editors. I am as well treated, when I speak on English business, as any man of my calibre in the house; but it is quite ludicrous to see how I am treated when my topics are Irish. I will give two instances. The one of the grossest neglect; it is this. The most persuasive speech I made in the present session—and, I believe, what indeed was not difficult, the best—was upon the subject of Poor Laws for Ireland. I am

convinced, from what I saw and heard, that I made an impression on the House, and I was deeply anxious that speech should have been fully reported. Well, it was completely burked. A speech of an hour was despatched in half a dozen lines. The other instance is more recent, and exceedingly absurd. The newspapers during the last week have actually gone the length of making me say that I am not pledged to the Repeal of the Union.

Only think!—me—the most pledged man that ever was pledged to a national measure—made to say that I am not pledged to the Repeal.

After this I need not add how necessary it will be for us to have a complete arrangement made with ~~one or two~~ English newspapers, ~~so that a~~ full report of the debate on the Repeal may be given—an arrangement which will require time and money.

Twelfthly—Care must be taken, and I intend to take care to prepare the popular mind, in England and Scotland, for the discussion of the Repeal, by showing them that Repeal does not mean separation, but directly the reverse; Repeal being in truth and in fact the only means of preventing a fatal and sanguinary struggle, which in the present state of the world must necessarily terminate in a separation ruinous to both countries. They should also be shown that the people—I say, emphatically, the people—in the agricultural, manufacturing, and industrious classes in Great Britain are, if possible, more injured by the emaciating effects of the Union than the people of Ireland. Irish labour, owing to the poverty of Ireland, created by the Union, can be had so very cheap, that it brings down in the English and Scotch markets the wages of the English and Scotch operatives, in manufactures as well as in husbandry. If, by having a domestic Legislature in Ireland the Irish labourers were employed—as they would be employed—at home, their claim would diminish, and the British operatives would have still greater reason to bless “the Repeal,” than the Irish themselves.

Protestants, kept from us at present only by a selfish because purely personal interest.

Eightly—My plan thus embraces every means, between this and the next session, of increasing the number of Repealers, and then, as early as possible in that session, the making a demand on the Legislature in the name of universal Ireland of the restoration of our domestic Legislature.

Ninthly—For this purpose I intend to combine the procuring of parochial petitions, with the ascertainment of the number of voters or persons capable of becoming voters in each parish; and the procuring every such voter to pledge himself not to support any but a Repeal candidate of tried integrity.

Tenthly—According to my plan a full and complete opportunity will be ensured for a deliberate discussion of the great national question. I intend to bring it on at that period of the session when there will be no excuse to refuse sufficient time for fully considering a measure of such vital importance. It will, of course, require four or five days' debate for this purpose; I must, therefore, have everything arranged to bring on that debate early in the session. I know, by experience, that it is more difficult to get a discussion of five hours in the closing part of a session than five days in the commencement. It is in human nature that it should be so.

Eleventhly—Part of my plan includes arrangements to have a full report of the debate on "The Repeal" in some English papers. Some expense must be gone to for this purpose. The English newspapers have no interest in reporting matters purely Irish. The reporters either are directed not to report them, or their reports are cut down into nonsense, or converted into falsehood by the editors. I am as well treated, when I speak on English business, as any man of my calibre in the house; but it is quite ludicrous to see how I am treated when my topics are Irish. I will give two instances. The one of the grossest neglect; it is this. The most persuasive speech I made in the present session—and, I believe, what indeed was not difficult, the best—was upon the subject of Poor Laws for Ireland. I am

convinced, from what I saw and heard, that I made an impression on the House, and I was deeply anxious that speech should have been fully reported. Well, it was completely burked. A speech of an hour was despatched in half a dozen lines. The other instance is more recent, and exceedingly absurd. The newspapers during the last week have actually gone the length of making me say that I am not pledged to the Repeal of the Union.

Only think!—me—the most pledged man that ever was pledged to a national measure—made to say that I am not pledged to the Repeal.

After this I need not add how necessary it will be for us to have a complete arrangement made with one or two English newspapers, so that a full report of the debate on the Repeal may be given—an arrangement which will require time and money.

Twelfthly—Care must be taken, and I intend to take care to prepare the popular mind, in England and Scotland, for the discussion of the Repeal, by showing them that Repeal does not mean separation, but directly the reverse; Repeal being in truth and in fact the only means of preventing a fatal and sanguinary struggle, which in the present state of the world must necessarily terminate in a separation ruinous to both countries. They should also be shown that the people—I say, emphatically, the people—in the agricultural, manufacturing, and industrious classes in Great Britain are, if possible, more injured by the emaciating effects of the Union than the people of Ireland. Irish labour, owing to the poverty of Ireland, created by the Union, can be had so very cheap, that it brings down in the English and Scotch markets the wages of the English and Scotch operatives, in manufactures as well as in husbandry. If, by having a domestic Legislature in Ireland the Irish labourers were employed—as they would be employed—at home, their claim would diminish, and the British operatives would have still greater reason to bless “the Repeal,” than the Irish themselves.

It is my intention to spend some weeks in a tour through Scotland and England, immediately before the next session commences, explaining and inculcating these matters, and procuring as many British petitions as I can in favour of a measure which I do, in my conscience, believe to be essential for the preservation of these realms in the high, exalted, and happy station which they ought to occupy amongst the nations of the earth.

Such, fellow-countrymen, is the outline of my plan. It includes the conciliation of, and combination with, Irishmen of every sect, party, and persuasion. It embraces the strengthening of our cause by the good sense and patriotism of Great Britain. It may not succeed in one session; but I have persuaded myself that it will lay in a rational, dignified, and well-considered manner, the sure foundation upon which the superstructure of the democratic and constitutional liberty of both countries can speedily and securely be raised.

Such are my plans, fellow-countrymen. Whether will you aid or baffle me in giving them a fair trial? They are too important to be mixed up with paltry or personal squabbles; they concern the rights and liberties of millions; and if acted upon with the energy and the perseverance which I intend to bring to them, will, I think, enable me to write my name proudly on the page of Irish History, as one of the restorers of the national and constitutional independence of my native land.

In my next letter I will trace and assail the project of those who deem themselves better qualified to manage the workings of this cause than I can be. Probably they are so; and that even the vanity which blinds me to my own deficiencies prevents me from fully appreciating the talents, and, above all, the judgment of others.

But the project does not require much ingenuity to discover. It is nothing more than this—to insist on a discussion, on this, the closing period of the present session. That is the entire of the sapient plan; it has neither preliminary means nor subse-

quent resources. It is the unwise man's bolt in one respect; it is soon shot off once and for aye.

I will assail it in my next letter and show its inutility—indeed utter hopelessness, and I must say its absurdity. I sincerely give credit for the best of motives and the most pure intentions to those who urge it, but I do not think it the less unwise on that account.

Every man who believes me to be an honest Repealer will give me credit for this: that if I thought the Repeal cause could be promoted by any further discussion this session, I would most heartily and most readily join in bringing it on.

Nay, if I were not convinced that any attempt to discuss in this session that great measure with deliberation or calmness must be utterly unavailing, and, indeed, that such attempt, besides being fruitless, would be actually mischievous, I should certainly bring it on without any delay.

But, confining myself in this letter to the announcement of my plans, I will reserve for the next my view of the inutility which seems obvious, and the mischiefs which are likely to flow from the vain attempt to discuss, in the manner it ought to be discussed, this great national question, in the few, the crowded, the hurried, I may say the overwhelmed days which remain of this session, amidst impatience, lassitude, and pre-occupied minds.

Do you, my countrymen, decide. For my part I do not despair; on the contrary, my heart swells high with hope for the future destinies of Ireland. I may be thwarted for a moment in my views of serving my country, but, with the natural elasticity of my disposition, I will return to the charge. I will devote all the faculties of my mind, all the energies of my soul to make Ireland a nation once again—once again and for ever.

I fondly anticipate that her hour of trial and degradation is fast passing away, and that the period of her freedom and prosperity is fast approaching. She won the constitution of 1782 without a drop of blood or a tear—she won the extinction of tithes without a crime on her part. Her sense of justice has

triumphed over that odious system, and tithes are no more. The cloud of despotism settles now on her brow, but it is a passing cloud—

“The nations have fallen, but thou still art young,
Thy star is but rising, whilst others have set,
And though slavery's gloom round thy morning hath hung,
The full moon of freedom shall beam round thee yet.”

I have the honour to be, fellow-countrymen,

Your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

LETTER TO THE CITIZENS OF CORK.

(*From the Cork Chronicle.*)

September 9, 1833.

The following answer to a letter, inviting him to a public dinner in this city, was received Thursday afternoon from the Liberator.

Mr. O'Connell's reply has been submitted to the dinner committee, and we understand that they have left the time to his own choice, only requesting of him to name as early a day in November as will suit his convenience. Come when he will, he is welcome; and we are satisfied the reception he shall meet with here will be a gratifying proof of our increasing regard and unabated confidence:—

Derrynane Abbey.

SIR—I beg leave respectfully to acknowledge the invitation to a public dinner, which a meeting of the citizens of Cork have done me the honour to transmit to me through you their chairman.

If anything could enhance the value of such a compliment it is the channel through which it has been communicated. But, in plain truth, nothing can increase to my mind its importance. I receive that invitation not only with pride and pleasure, but with sentiments of, I trust, a more exalted and patriotic nature.

I accept it as a proof that the patriotic and independent citizens of Cork sympathise with me in the exertions that I have humbly but zealously made not only to advance the best interests of our beloved native land, but also to protect her from the wanton and unnatural injury and debasing insult of being deprived of the first and greatest of all constitutional rights, at the atrocious caprice of the mock Reformers, ministerial and legislative.

Your invitation proves that you concur with me in the just

and inextinguishable indignation that every lover of liberty and of Ireland must feel at this, the greatest and, I trust, the last outrage that has been perpetrated upon unhappy Ireland by the insolence of British power, combined with British falsehood and folly. The shouts of barbaric domination with which the Coercion Bill was cheered still ring in my ears and enliven my determination to render a repetition of such a scene impossible, by that which alone can secure the liberty of Irishmen and the constitutional connection of the two countries—the restoration of our domestic Legislature.

I accept, therefore, your invitation, containing as it does the evidence of your hearty concurrence with me in the deep conviction that Ireland can never expect safety for her liberties, encouragement for her commerce, the stimulant and universal advantage of a domestic market and a domestic consumption for her agriculture and manufactures, and; greater than all, freedom from paltry and vile insult, without a peaceable, a constitutional, but a complete Repeal of the Union.

But, although I must accept your invitation as I would obey an honoured command, yet I trust you will allow me to name a distant day for that purpose.

After nearly seven months of the most close and unremitting labour, I want the calm and quiet of my loved native hills—the bracing air, purified as it comes over “the World of Waters.” The cheerful exercise, the majestic scenery of these awful mountains, whose wildest and most romantic glens are awakened by the enlivening cry of my merry beagles, whose deep notes, multiplied one million of times by the echoes, speak to my senses, as if it were the voice of magic powers, commingling as it does with the eternal roar of the mighty Atlantic that breaks and foams with impotent rage at the foot of our stupendous cliffs. Oh! these are scenes to revive all the forces of natural strength—to give new energy to the human mind, to raise the thoughts above the grovelling strife of individual interests, to elevate the sense of family affection into the purest, the most refined, and the most constant love of country, and even to exalt the soul to

the contemplation of the wisdom and mercy of the all-seeing and good God, who has been pleased to afflict Ireland with centuries of misrule and misery, but seems now to have in store for her a coming harvest of generous retribution.

Permit me, then, to postpone for some—shall I say considerable—time the day on which I am to meet my friends and the friends of Ireland in Cork. Do not tear me from this loved spot until I have enjoyed some of its renovating effects. If you think I deserve the sweets of this loved retreat, give me time to taste them more at leisure after my fatigues and vexations; and allow me to mention a distant day for that on which I am to meet you at the festive board, consecrated in my humble name to the welfare of Ireland.

Believe me, it is with regret I seek this postponement. I prize the patriotism of the citizens of Cork as of the highest importance. There is this in your patriotism that makes it of inestimable value—namely, that it is not confined to one sect or party. You have not only patriotic Catholics, as elsewhere, but you have what is wanted, alas! in too many places, patriotic Protestants of several religious denominations, who rival the best friends of Ireland in the energy, the intelligence, and the pure sincerity of their love of country.

Would that the Protestants of the rest of Ireland would imitate the patriotic ardour of so many highly distinguished, respectable, and religious Protestants in Cork. Then, indeed, Ireland would be too strong for oppression; and peace, prosperity, and freedom would flourish under the protecting influence of a domestic Legislature.

I cannot conclude without again expressing to you my gratitude for the kind manner in which you have conveyed to me this proud invitation.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your very obedient, faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

TO THE PATIENT AND BRAVE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

“ Hereditary bondsmen, know you not,
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.”

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—I dedicate these letters to you; they were written to assert your rights, and to expose your enemy.

It was one object of mine to show the British nation how much we are wronged. It was, and is, another object of mine, that every one of you should know and feel that a majority in the Imperial Parliament are ready to treat Ireland with injustice and insult.

Convinced as I am of the value of the connection between both countries, and of the necessity of re-establishing that connection on the basis of separate Legislatures, in order to make it permanent, I have felt it my duty to demonstrate, by the irresistible evidence of facts, how alien from Irish rights, and regardless of Irish interests, a foreign Parliament must inevitably be. This is certainly the fittest moment to make the conclusive experiment; because this, in the first place, is a reforming Parliament—a Parliament warm in the pursuits of political justice. In the second place, all Reformers in this country must admit that a debt of gratitude is due by them to their Irish fellow-labourers. In the third place, the House of Lords, who are supposed to entertain an hereditary hatred to Ireland, were never so weak and impotent as they are at this moment. They have dragged their honours through the mire with a dexterity of filthiness which has exceeded the hopes of their worst enemies. They were never less capable of resisting, although many of them may be as ready as ever to resist a popular and beneficial measure for Ireland.

This, then, is the time to demonstrate the truth of my theory:—“That the British Parliament, even under the most

favourable circumstances, is incompetent—utterly incompetent—to do justice to Ireland.”

They are, I repeat, utterly incompetent. Intrigues at Court; old jealousies of Ireland newly revived; the natural distaste of the Peers to look on us in any other point of view than that which combines hatred with contempt; and even in the House of Commons, almost a total want of sympathy, save from one generous spirit here, and another there, thinly scattered through the House. But, without entering into further details, I again pronounce the moral incompetency of the British Parliament to do us justice.

I hold the proof of it in my hands—the Irish Reform Bill. Here it is, with its paltry endeavour to keep from the people of Ireland all participation in the franchise of the British Constitution. Here it is, perpetuating, in the name of Reform and concentrating all the foul injustice of the Peel-Wellington disfranchising measure, and giving us a machinery of registration, almost too audacious for the bold, bad men who perpetrated, as they imagined, the total annihilation of the popular spirit in Ireland—a machinery rendered still worse by the Reform Bill!!!

I have not written these letters with the vain and foolish hope of obtaining justice for Ireland; I totally disclaim that folly.

But I did write them to prove my candour, to show that I would not employ the insulting insufficiency of the Irish Reform Bill as an argument for the Repeal of the Union, without first emphatically warning those who now have our destinies in their hands, that, unless they deprive me of that argument, it will be my sacred duty to use it with all the energy of my mind, and all the earnestness and perseverance of a character which has been formed by love for that country in whose cause I have already contributed, in some degree, to the achievement of a bloodless, stainless, but most important victory.

Surely, after it shall have been, by the adoption of this

Reform Bill, demonstrated that the Parliament in this country is not in a position to do us justice, there will not be found one Irishman who has ever professed patriotic feeling, so recreant to his country's cause as not to join me in seeking, by all legal and constitutional means, for the Repeal of the Union.

People of Ireland! you have passed through a gloomy period of oppression. Your business now is, to be reconciled, the one to the other. Party feuds—religious dissensions—ancient animosities—modern quarrels—should all be buried in one common oblivion.

The time is come when we should no longer divide from each other, under any nicknames or peculiar appellations. We have one common country—we have one common interest—the peace, prosperity, and freedom of that country. These cannot be attained, save by, and through, a resident Legislature.

The moment is fast approaching when we will forget our reciprocal injuries and injustices to each other—and, at that moment, our constitutional independence must be restored; and no longer the serf or the bond slave of Britain, but combined with her in interest and affections, and united only by the golden and cherished link of the Crown, we shall be the best customer and consumer of Britain in peace, and her firmest support, and ready partner, in the dangers and victories of war.

Let no despair come over your minds. It is well that this proof should be given of the impossibility of obtaining justice for Ireland in this Parliament. This will secure a combination and community of exertion in Ireland, and place us, Repealers, beyond the reproach of the wise and good in this country.

There were many men who told me that they would not look for the Repeal of the Union, because they believed that a reformed Parliament would attend to the wants and wishes of the people of Ireland. This class of persons would now see

that not only was their expectations unfounded on any known fact or circumstance, but that Ireland is actually refused anything approaching, in the most remote degree, to common justice. She is, in truth, refused a Reform Bill, because the name does not constitute the thing. She gets one in name—she is refused it in reality.

I am just informed, by authority of a very high description, that care has been taken by the Commissioners of Division in Ireland to manage matters so that the Duke of Devonshire is to have no less than three close boroughs—Dungarvan, Youghal, and Bandon; and, mark this particularly—Stanley has not, up to this moment, published the details of the population returns in Ireland, nor the maps of the new boundaries of boroughs—and yet, to-morrow, we are to go into Committee on this very Bill!!!

Men of Ireland—Catholics!—Protestants!—Presbyterians!—and Dissenters of every Christian denomination!—this Bill is insulting and injurious to us all—we are all its victims. A haughty and contemptuous perseverance by the ministry in wrong includes and involves us all in one common contumely. The struggle to hand over to an absentee oligarchy the representation of Ireland equally oppresses the inhabitants of Ireland, of every class and of every creed. Irishmen of every class and creed, hoard this injustice in your inmost souls; and recollect that you have only to will the remedy, in order to be certain of attaining it.

We are eight millions.

I have the honour to be, fellow-countrymen,

Your most devoted, faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

*Parliament-street, London,
12th June, 1832.*

TO THE REFORMERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

LETTER I.

London, May 22, 1832.

BROTHER REFORMERS—I appeal to you from the contemplated injustice of the Irish Department of the British Ministry. I respectfully solicit your aid to prevent another act of gross iniquity, another vile insult from being inflicted on the people of Ireland.

My cause of complaint is this:—the Reform Bill prepared for Ireland by the present Administration is defective, partial, oligarchical, unjust, and daringly insulting.

My object is twofold:—first, to prove the truth of these assertions; and, secondly, to solicit your assistance, in order to prevent the consummation of this iniquity.

But, as a preliminary, you have a right to know what species of Reform Bill I require for Ireland. I do not hesitate one moment to give you that information. I ask, in the name of the Irish people, for just such a Reform Bill for Ireland as you have obtained for England—that is all. Is my demand unfair or unjust? I anticipate a universal reply in the negative.

I ask, then, for Ireland, a Reform Bill which shall be identical with the English Bill, wherever an identity of institutions and other circumstances allows it to be identical. I then demand that the Reform Bill for Ireland should as closely resemble as possible the English Act—that it should be as similar in its provisions as possible, and that the extent of Reform in Ireland should be equivalent to, and equally satisfactory with, that in England.

I ask for the people of Ireland the same measure of Reform which the people of England receive. I will not be—I ought

not to be—content with less. In other words, I look for as complete an equality of Reform in both countries as possible.

But the Ministerial Bill for Ireland is directly the reverse. It is, I repeat it, partial, restricted, unjust, and insulting. It is constituted to sacrifice the Irish Reformers to the Irish Tories—who, by the by, constitute the very worst class of Tories in existence.

I proceed to point out the principal particulars in which the Irish Reform Bill differs from the English. They are these :—

First—The English Bill greatly enlarges the elective franchise in the counties of England. The Irish Bill, on the whole, diminishes the number of voters in the Irish counties. The Bill for Scotland exceedingly increases the number of voters in Scotch counties. The Irish Reform Bill diminishes the number.

Secondly—The Irish Bill creates too high and too aristocratic a franchise in the Irish towns and cities; it alters the present law to the prejudice of the people and in favour of the oligarchy.

Thirdly—Although the Irish Reform Bill destroys the individual and direct power of nomination in sixteen boroughs, it substitutes so exceedingly narrow a basis of franchise as effectually to render those boroughs close boroughs, and to make them liable to the most gross and profligate corruption.

Fourthly—It renders the registration of a vote almost impossible for any but a rich man, and thus deprives the middle and poorer classes of their votes. This is effectuated by complication of detail in the registry, and by the pressure of great delay and enormous expense.

Fifthly—It leaves the registry of the votes to a set of persons, who, taken in the aggregate, are, from want of sufficient aptitude, and also by reason of their zealous Tory principles, the most unfit to have that power.

Sixthly—It continues all the enormous expense of delays of contested elections; which in England, under your Reform

Bill, must be over in two or three days—but in Ireland, by our Reform Bill, may last full fifteen days as before.

Seventhly—The Irish Reform Bill does not give Ireland her due and fair proportion of representatives in Parliament.

Eightly—The Irish Reform Bill glaringly, and I may say gratuitously, insults the people of Ireland by giving an addition of only five members to all Ireland, while it allocates one out of the five to a single college—the College of Dublin; a College having already one member, without any adequate or just right to any representation.

Upon the whole, my decided and deliberate conviction is, that, with the exception of throwing open the representation of Belfast, Cork, Galway, and Dublin, the Irish Reform Bill will make matters worse than they are at present in Ireland with regard to the right and power of the people to choose representatives. In short, that it should be entitled, “An Act to restore the power of the Orange Ascendency in Ireland, and to enable that faction to trample with impunity on the friends of Reform and of constitutional freedom.”

Such is the plan matured at a third attempt by Mr. Stanley, for the Reform in Ireland. He is, I know, determined to persevere in his measure. I also know that he will be supported by all the Tories in the House, and by a vast and overpowering majority of the Whigs. Indeed, I have greatly to complain of the total disregard to Ireland—I believe I ought to call it contempt for Ireland—exhibited by the English Whigs and Reformers in Parliament, with some, and but few exceptions.

I proceed now to prove the truth of my assertion. I take up my eight heads of complaint *seriatim*; and if the Reformers of England and Scotland will condescend to read these Letters—for I must extend them to at least three or four—I pledge myself satisfactorily to demonstrate that every one of my objections is well-founded, and that the Irish Reform Bill is a Reform Bill only in name—that it is a practical blunder, such as Irishmen never commit—that while it purports to reform, it renders matters worse; and, in short, that it is one of those base

delusions which could originate only in the brazen audacity and cold heart of an English Tory, who found himself placed in the attitude of an English Whig, with control over the present fortunes of unfortunate, long oppressed, much insulted, but, thank heaven, no longer weak or powerless Ireland.

My first complaint is, "that Stanley's Reform Bill for Ireland ought to augment, but will, in fact, diminish the number of voters in Irish counties."

Now the great principle of the English Reform, as, indeed, of all reforms is, "enfranchisement"—that is, to increase the number of voters. The principle of the Irish Reform Bill is disfranchisement—that is, to diminish the number of voters. This principle of disfranchisement, I must say, is not confined to counties. I shall show, before I have done, that it applies to some of our boroughs.

This complaint is still more strong than any Englishman not acquainted with the details of Irish affairs could possibly conceive; and for this reason—when the veracious Wellington and candid Peel were compelled by the people of Ireland to concede religious freedom to the Protestant Dissenters of England and Catholics of Ireland, they exerted a vicious ingenuity to make that concession as little valuable to popular liberty as possible. Accordingly, they annihilated—they totally annihilated the 40s. franchise in Ireland, not only where it depended on a freehold of a life or lives subject to a heavy rent, and therefore capable of being abused, but also where it arose from a fee-simple estate, not subject to any rent whatsoever.

This was not all: they raised the franchise to what is an enormously high valuation in a poor country—that is, to ten pounds annual value over rent and charges; and that, I repeat, in a very poor country, where ten pounds a year is certainly of three times the importance of that sum in this country. But even this was not all: they rendered actual residence and occupation of the entire freehold—mark, of the entire freehold—necessary to constitute a vote. But even this was not all: they super-added a most tedious, vexatious, expensive, and, in many

instances, totally impracticable mode of registry of voters, as a preliminary to the right of voting.

I wish to dwell upon this point, that the British Reformers may clearly comprehend how outrageously unjust it is still to augment the difficulties in the way of the right to vote in Ireland; and still further, positively and directly, to diminish the number of Irish voters in Irish counties.

I will illustrate the atrocious working of the Peel-Wellington Disfranchising Bill by some instances of its practical operation. Most of these instances are taken from the counties in which the Orange interest prevails. For example:—

In Armagh there were 8,419 voters on 40s. franchise. These were replaced by 1,087 £10 voters—that is, seven-eighths were annihilated. In Cavan, 5,195 replaced by 781; in Down 10,775 replaced by 1,902; in Donegal, 2,310 replaced by only 66; in Dublin county, the metropolitan county, 2,490 replaced by 109; in Londonderry, 4,457 replaced by 839; in Monaghan, 12,452 replaced by 946; in Mayo, 23,672 replaced by 335; Roscommon, 7,777 replaced by 470; Sligo, 4,551 replaced by 303; in Tyrone, 6,468 replaced by 701; in Galway, 3,205 replaced by 1,812.

I need not continue the catalogue. These numbers show that the Peel-Wellington measure took, in twelve counties in Ireland, their votes from 110,612 voters, and replaced them by only 9,351. Thus, in little more than one-third of that country, destroying the franchise to the extent of more than 100,000 voters. The results of the lists of voters in the remaining counties would be found not to differ materially from those I have above enumerated.

I now appeal to every honest and candid Reformer in Great Britain, whether the first step to a real and not mock or delusive Reform in Ireland should not be to increase, not diminish, the franchise. Many of our counties were reduced to the station of close boroughs. The popular rights were nearly destroyed. If Stanley intended to give us Reform—real Reform, honest Reform—would not his first effort be to increase the franchise,

to augment the voters, and to give, at least, a reasonable portion of the people a voice in the choice of representatives?

Judge, then, honest and manly Reformers of Great Britain, of the grief and indignation with which your equally honest and determined brother Reformers in Ireland receive the Stanley Reform Bill, the operation of which is not to augment, but still further to diminish the number of our county voters.

Reflect on this, which is the literal and plain fact, that the Tories contrived, under the shadow of the Catholic Relief Bill, to render as oligarchical, as close, and, of course, as corrupt as they possibly could all the Irish counties, and that the only county reform to be given us by Stanley is to make those counties more oligarchical, more close, and, therefore, more liable to corruption.

Let any one of you after this ask, why is Ireland discontented? Why is Ireland disturbed? Alas! do you not perceive the principle on which Whigs and Tories, with indiscriminate recklessness, govern Ireland?—the principle of never doing us, in any instance, justice, lest we should become so strong as to be able to put an end to our other oppressions.

What I assert, and insist on, is—that the Irish Reform Bill ought to augment the franchise and increase the number of voters in our counties, as the English and Scotch Reform Bills have augmented the one and increased the other. It would be unjust to leave us stationary when the other parts of the empire increase the quantity of human freedom. It is doubly unjust to leave us stationary while we are suffering under a recent and most iniquitous diminution of our franchise, and when there is an increase in the other divisions of the empire. But it transcends in injustice, when the other parts of the empire are augmented in franchise, to have an actual diminution take place in Ireland. No country in the world was ever treated so badly by an unnative Government as Ireland has been by the Government of England. I could demonstrate that Poland had never so much reason to complain of Russia, nor Greece of the Turks but I confess that the conduct of this reforming Administration

towards Ireland fills me with more of resentment than all the past.

Reformers of Great Britain, you have no interest in Ireland being ill-governed. On the contrary, your interest is, that we should be well-governed and prosperous. I, therefore, but much more readily, relying on your generous sympathies, appeal to you from the injustice and insult now offered us.

Recollect that there will be by your Reform Bill the following rights of suffrage—the following franchises established in England:—

1. The franchise of 40s. freeholders for a life or lives. This franchise requires occupation of the freehold by the freeholder.

2. The franchise of 40s. freeholders in fee-simple. This franchise is to continue in England, and does not require actual occupation.

3. The franchise of £10, clear yearly value for any freehold estate, whether for life or in fee. This franchise does not require actual occupation by the freeholder.

4. The franchise of similar value to copyholders. This franchise is, for the first time, given by the English Reform Bill, and introduces a numerous class of new voters.

5. The original lessee, or the assignee of a term originally of at least sixty years, of the clear yearly value of £10. This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

6. The original lessee, or the assignee of a term originally of at least twenty years, of the clear yearly value of £50. This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

7. The sub-lessee or assignee of a sub-lease of a term not less, originally, than sixty years, with a clear profit of £10. This is a new franchise, but requires actual occupation. It is the first franchise in England which is enumbered by the necessity of actual occupation.

8. The sub-lessee or assignee of a sub-lease of a term not less, originally, than twenty years, of the clear annual value of £50. This is a new franchise, but it requires actual occupation:

9. Any tenant whatsoever, liable to a *bona fide* rent of £50 a-year. This is a new franchise, and requires actual occupation.

Such is to be the state of the elective franchise in England. It consists altogether of nine different classes of voters, and is an augmentation of former rights by no less than seven classes, and some of these classes are multitudinous in their nature—that is, capable of giving rights of voting to many individuals out of one property. How melancholy and miserable is the contrast which the state of Ireland is destined to afford.

In Ireland we are to have but four classes of voters:—

First—The existing one, a freehold of £10, clear annual value. This franchise requires actual occupation.

Second—The existing right of freehold of £20, clear annual value. This does not require actual occupation.

Third—The lessee or assignee of a term of originally not less than fourteen years, of the clear yearly value of £20. This is a new franchise, and does not require actual occupation.

Fourth—The sub-lessee or assignee of a sub-lease of a term of not less, originally, than fourteen years, of the clear annual value of £20. This is a new franchise, and requires actual occupation.

These are all; and thus England has at present two franchises, and acquires by the Reform Bill seven additional franchises. Ireland has at present two franchises, and acquires by the Reform Bill only two more.

England, a rich country, has two franchises of 40s., multitudinous in their nature, and only one requiring actual occupation; four franchises of £10, one only of which requires actual occupation; besides two franchises of £50 annual value, one only of which requires actual occupation; and one franchise of mere payment of £50 a-year rent.

Mark the contrast with Ireland: Ireland, a poor country has no 40s. franchise, has only one £10 franchise, and even that franchise requires actual occupation. Ireland has then but three franchises of the enormous value to us of £20 annual value, and one of these three requires actual occupation.

To put this matter in a still more clear point of view: let me take in England a single estate worth £50 a-year, and in the hands of an occupying tenant who pays that rent for it. Now, such a property as that could, in England, qualify no less than twenty-six persons to vote; while, in Ireland, such a property could not possibly qualify more than three persons to vote.

Thus, then, the English are to have the advantage, and I heartily rejoice at it, of seven new classes of voters; of nine classes in all. Ireland is to have but four classes, two only being new classes—that is, in new classes, the English Bill is to the Irish as seven to two; in classes generally, as nine to four. But this approximation in the general classes, is proved to be quite delusive when you recollect that, in point of valued property, England has an advantage equal to twenty-six against three, or more than eight to one.

Thus, in new franchise, the English Bill is seven to two better than the Irish. In popular character, as arising from property, it is more than eight, very nearly nine, to one better than the Irish Bill; and, let it always be recollected, that this difference is enormously aggravated by the fact, that Ireland is beyond comparison the less wealthy country.

Let me not be misunderstood—I do not in the least desire to diminish the advantages which England possesses. On the contrary, I say it with the utmost sincerity, my ardent desire would be to augment these advantages. I am a Radical Reformer, and, on principle, think every Englishman ought to have a right to vote. I quote, therefore, the advantages of the English Reform Bill, and they are very great, only to show how defectively the Irish Bill is, as I firmly believe, wilfully and designedly, made.

This letter has run into such length, that I must pause, and reserve the residue of this my first complaint for another letter.

I have hitherto confined my attention to show the necessity that exists to augment the number of voters in our counties, and to prove that no sensible augmentation can take place under

the Irish Reform Bill. I have shown that, to us, insulting contrast of the increase of franchises and of voters given to England. In my next letter I will prove that the practical effect of the Irish Bill will be to diminish the number of voters, although an increase is so imperatively required by every principle of justice and common sense.

Reformers of Great Britain, recollect that we have honestly and zealously stood by you in the contest for Reform. When your Reform Bill was in danger, we flung overboard our own grievances and our first resentments—nay, more: had Wellington found any set of men mad enough to join him in attempting to govern the country to the exclusion of Earl Grey, and had a resort been made to Polignac ordinances instead of Acts of Parliament, you would have found your constitutional liberties supported by one million of Irishmen in arms, true to your sacred cause to the last of their blood and their breath. British Reformers, do not we deserve your peaceable but determined assistance to compel the Administration and to induce the Parliament to give us a Reform Bill equally satisfactory with that of England or Scotland?

I have the honour to be,

Your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

TO THE REFORMERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

LETTER II.

"This is essentially a Conservative measure."—*Speech of Crampton, Solicitor-General for Ireland, on the Second Reading of the Irish Reform Bill.*

London, May 20, 1832.

BROTHER REFORMERS—Look to my motto—see how it has verified my worst fears. The candid, but indiscreet, avowel of the Irish law officer, by whose hand the Irish Reform Bill was drawn up, placed beyond a doubt the real intentions of the Irish Government, and the real nature of the Irish Reform Bill.

It is a "Conservative measure," English Reformers; mark that, I must earnestly implore you. If you have any sympathy for Ireland; if you regret her wrongs, and the complicated injustice which she has for centuries endured at the hands of the British Government, and which she never endured with more of harshness and of contumely than from the Anglesey-Stanley Administration, now inflicted on that unhappy country; if, I repeat, you have sympathy for her sufferings, or indignation at the injustice done and intended towards Ireland, rouse, I entreat you, now, and rescue us from the fatal effects of this "Conservative measure." How I thank the Solicitor-General for the word!!!

Shall I despair of co-operation from the British Reformers? Alas, I fear that the complaints of the miseries inflicted on Ireland, and of the insults now offered her, will fall on the dull, cold ear of British apathy, as the complaints and groans of former periods have wasted themselves in useless attempts to rouse attention and to procure redress.

I, however, shall have done my duty; and although I may

do it here in vain, I am not without resources ; nor shall any sickness of the heart come over me. I am one of those who have taught the "hereditary bondsmen" of Ireland, that they who contend for freedom must principally rely on their own exertions.

I return with heaviness and sorrow to the Irish Reform Bill, and proceed to justify Mr. Crampton, and to show how well that Bill merits the appellation he gave it of a "Conservative measure."

In my first letter, after stating the eight distinct topics of great magnitude on which the Irish Reform Bill falls glaringly short of the rights and privileges which Reform will give to England and to Scotland, I proceeded to develop the first of them—that which related to the most important of all—namely, the extension of the elective franchise.

It will be recollected, that I insisted that Ireland had peculiar claims for a great extension of franchise, on account, principally, of the gross injustice inflicted on her, in the spoliation of that right by the Wellington-Peel Administration.

Let me remind my readers that I showed, by a reference to twelve counties only, that the votes in these counties were diminished by the Wellington-Peel measure, from 110,613 to the comparatively small number of 9,351. I produced the details, in order to justify the conclusion that the reduction of voters was equally great all over the entire country. I owe to myself to add that Mr. Stanley, in his speech on the second reading of the Irish Reform Bill, has shown that I have understated the argument and underrated the calculation of my own prejudice ; for he distinctly admitted that the £10 voters who replaced the 40s. freeholders did not exceed 20,000.

Now, the 40s. freeholders were admitted to be more than 200,000.

This, therefore, may be taken as a conceded and undoubted truth, that we come to the consideration of the Irish Reform Bill with the fact unquestioned and unquestionable that Ireland has recently suffered this injustice—namely, that

her voters have been diminished from 200,000 to 20,000—a sacrifice at once of no less a number than 180,000 voters!!!

Add to this, that England, where the voters are not for the present diminished in anything—I mean in counties—gets seven additional classes of voters, and Ireland gets only two classes.

I refer to my former letter for these details. I mention them now only to show how imperative it is in point of justice, honesty, and common sense, to give Ireland an increase of franchise.

I have, however, asserted, and I will soon proceed to prove that the Irish Reform Bill, instead of increasing, as it plainly ought, our county electors, actually diminishes their number!!!

Let me, before I go into that proof, place the injustice done to Ireland in another and, I think, a striking point of view.. I complain with the more bitterness of lessening our county voters, because England gets a very great addition to her county voters, and Scotland gets an enormous increase to hers.

England, as I have already shown, in addition to her present two classes of voters, gets seven multitudinous new classes. Scotland profits still more extensively in the change. Her present county voters do not exceed 1,100; her new county constituency will exceed 30,000. This fact I have from the men in Scotland best suited to ascertain its perfect accuracy. I do not hesitate, therefore, to pledge myself to its truth. Scotland multiplies her county voters by nearly thirty times her present number. She has 1,100; she gets more than 30,000.

But, if such be the case of England, as it certainly is, with her voters multiplied by at least four, and if such be the case of Scotland, with her voters multiplied by thirty, what ought to be the case of Ireland? I ask whether I am unreasonable when I say that Ireland ought to have her voters multiplied, not by thirty—I do not ask that—but at least by four. I do ask and insist on that addition.

But, in point of fact, the number of county votes is to be diminished by the Irish Reform Bill. I proceed to prove the truth of this assertion.

I take up, in order to avoid all cavil or dispute, the calculations made by Mr. Stanley himself. I will do nothing more than correct these calculations where they are manifestly and beyond controversy mistaken—mistaken, not wilfully, on his part, but by reason of his ignorance of the details.

Mr. Stanley calculated the Irish voters thus : £50 freeholders at 22,000, and he is borne out by the Parliamentary returns ; £20 freeholders at 9,000, and he is also borne out by the Parliamentary returns ; and £10 freeholders at 20,000, and he is borne out by the Parliamentary returns.

This would give for Ireland 52,000 voters, and so Mr. Stanley stated it. But 52,000, in a population of eight millions, is exceedingly small. However, I do not rest for the present on this point. I proceed to show the error in Mr. Stanley's calculations, though it is drawn, I admit, from Parliamentary returns.

Let me just allow that the calculation of £10 freeholders is accurate ; there are of them 20,000 in round numbers. But the returns show the £50 freeholders to be 22,000 in round numbers, and the £20 freeholders to be 9,000, making together 31,000.

Here lies Mr. Stanley's mistake ; he did not know that the reason of the accuracy of the return of the £10 voters is, that it comprises a space of only three years, and, therefore, that the list of casualties is small ; few have died off in that period ; few have disposed of their freeholds. But the return of the £50 freeholders comprises the space of forty-one years, beginning so long ago as the year 1790, and including grandfathers and fathers, as well as persons of the present generation ; in short, including many who were dead ten, twenty, thirty, and more years.

The return of £20 freeholders is pretty much in the same predicament ; it goes back in all cases eight years, and in many to the year 1795. It includes a multitude of persons who have been dead many years. The practical result of the late elections has been, that the £50 and £20 voters have never been found to equal one-sixth of the number of names on the registry-roll ; not near one-sixth, in many cases ; perhaps, not one-ninth. I,

who have been elected for three counties, can speak with confidence on this subject. We shall now see what the amount of voters in Ireland is by taking up Mr. Stanley's calculations, corrected only where his ignorance of Irish subjects makes that correction necessary :

The ultimate and accurate result will be thus:—	
Of £10 freeholders,	20,000.
Of £50 and £20, less than one-sixth of 31,000;	
say one-sixth of 30,000,	5,000.
25,000	

Total registered voters in Ireland, 25,000

But to this is to be added a formidable list of voters of another description—namely, the clergymen of the Established Church, who have a right to vote out of their benefices. They amount to, at the lowest computation, 1,100; but, as I take everything in the most unfavourable way to my argument, I will write them down only 1,000; making altogether for Ireland, 26,000 voters; of whom, however, four per cent. are parsons—men who, with very, very few exceptions, vote for anti-Reformers, Tories and Orangeists.

This, then, is the state of Ireland at present. There are 26,000 voters, of whom 1,000 are violent enemies of popular rights and liberties.

These 26,000 are all that are entitled to vote out of a population of seven millions. I will show presently why I say seven millions.

When the Union was established between England and Ireland, the representation of the latter was based on a franchise which was, in 1829, found to comprise near 220,000 voters of all classes. If Ireland now got, as England gets, seven new classes of voters, surely our voters ought to be 370,000, at the least. Lord Althorpe has repeatedly declared that the new franchise given to England would bring in half-a-million of new voters. Of these, take but 300,000 for the counties; then the case would stand thus:—The English counties, as compared with the Irish, in point of population, appear, by the returns of

1821, to be as twelve to seven, but take them to be as twelve to six. Observe, now, I sink and diminish the case of Ireland in every instance, that no man should by possibility say I am unreasonable; but taking it to be six to twelve, instead of seven to twelve, yet England getting 300,000 new votes in her counties, Ireland ought to get 150,000, which being added to her former 220,000, on the basis of the Union, would give her 370,000 county voters.

Mark, British Reformer!—honest British Reformer!—that Ireland has but 26,000 voters instead of 370,000, an injustice to the extent of 344,000 voters. But what ought to be my sensations of disgust and indignation, when I know, as I shall prove, that the 26,000 existing voters, instead of being increased by the Reform Bill, are to be actually diminished?

Take this injustice in another point of view: Scotland, with a population of only 2,365,807, has an agricultural population, certainly not exceeding one million and a-half. The cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow alone have—the former, 162,156, and the latter, 202,426 inhabitants, making together 364,582. I do not, therefore, underrate the agricultural population of Scotland at one million and a-half.

Now, the exceedingly defective and avowedly partial enumeration of Ireland gives a return of 7,734,365 inhabitants.

In the almost total failure of trade and manufactures in Ireland, I am confident no man will accuse me of exaggerating the agricultural population of Ireland at seven millions.

Now, contrast Scotland, under the Reform Bill, with Ireland.

Scotland, for one million and a half of her inhabitants, will have a constituency of 30,000 voters.

Ireland, for seven millions of her inhabitants, will have a constituency not exceeding, as I shall presently show, 25,000 voters. I implore every man who values justice and fair dealing, to look at that picture, and at this: If we were Scotch, we should have 140,000 voters; we are Irish, and we are allowed, in all, only 25,000.

If we were English, we should get 150,000 additional voters

—that is, mark, 150,000 in addition to 220,000. We do not get one additional voter, because we are Irish—not one. Nay, our present number is to be diminished.

Follow me in this last point, and I think I will make it demonstration that this Bill will diminish the votes in our counties. Thus, at present, every qualified person, in twenty-five boroughs, having representatives in Parliament are entitled to vote in county elections; they are so entitled, whether they have votes for the borough representatives or not. These county voters are persons in trade, or of independent means, residing in the towns, and are, beyond any comparison, the most patriotic and liberal portion of the constituency; they were, and are, Whigs and Reformers almost to a man; they are, accordingly, to be struck out of the county constituency by the Conservative measure of the Irish Reform Bill.

Let me, for example, take my own county—the county of Kerry. The £10 registered voters in my county are only 178, and of the voters, more than 80 are in the town of Tralee. These 80 voters will be struck out of the county by the Irish Reform Bill, and thus the county constituency, in its popular shape, will be reduced to 99!!!

In the county of Clare, there will be a loss in the town of Ennis of near 100 voters to the county. In the county of Cork, the county will lose the independent voters of Mallow, Bandon, Kinsale, and Youghal. Tipperary will lose the voters of Cashel and Clonmel. In short, in twenty-five towns, voters, on an average of at least the number of a hundred in each town, will be lost to the independent county interests. I understate the loss of the entire at 2,500 annual voters.

On the other hand, there will of course be some increase, by reason of the two new classes of chattel voters. But taking all Ireland, as it really is, at 25,000 freehold votes, I defy any man seriously to assert, that the chattel voters will, at £20, clear profit (for that is the qualification) amount to 1,250. Yet I will go beyond any possible exaggeration, and I will suppose the chattel voters will amount to 1,500. Yet, as the counties

lose on the borough towns 2,500 voters, as I have already shown, it will have an ultimate loss of county voters, amounting to 1,000, on a total of 26,000, reducing our county constituency to only 25,000.

Of these 25,000, full 1,000 will be beneficed clergymen—leaving all Ireland but 24,000 county voters—and the clergy of the Established Church four per cent. on the entire.

Yes, this is indeed a Conservative measure. It places Ireland in a state of degradation and contumely, not to be thought of without pain and disgust. Scotland changes the county constituency from 1,100 fictitious voters to 30,000 real and substantial voters.

England adds 300,000 to her county voters, whilst Ireland, struck down by Wellington and Peel to 26,000 county voters, receives, for her only consolation, a shifting of scenery, and a real and substantial diminution of 1,000 county voters.

I confess I cannot bear this injustice; it exceeds my endurance; but I will not waste my breath in idle anger. In the first place I appeal to the Reformers of Great Britain. In the House of Commons, the Reformers have little sympathy for us Irish—plenty of lip service; but, upon every division, vote with the ministry for the restriction of the Irish right of suffrage, and against us. We will struggle to the last to obtain for Ireland as good a Bill as is to be immediately the law in England. Against Ireland the ministers will command many, very many, of the Whigs, and all the Tories, to the last man.

In conclusion, I demand those things for Ireland; I refuse to accept, with satisfaction, anything less; I will take any instalment of public liberty, but I will not release one particle of my entire claim.

I ask for the counties of Ireland these franchises:—

First—The restriction of the 40s. franchise in fee, and perpetual freeholder.

I ask this franchise, because it is preserved and made perpetual in England.

Second—I ask for Ireland, that the £10 franchise, on terminable freeholds, should be reduced in Ireland from a £10 qualification to one £7 annual value—£7 in Ireland being a larger qualification relatively to all the necessaries of life than £10 in England.

Thirdly—I demand a similar £7 franchise in Ireland in chattel leases of fourteen years, being the usual occupation tenure on extensive tracts in Ireland, and that term being recognised in the Act relative to the qualification of Deputy Lieutenants in Ireland, and also in the Irish Reform Bill.

Fourthly—I demand that no freeholder in towns should be disfranchised in the counties of which such towns have been and are parts. No town in Ireland gets a member either original or additional. Why should the existing right be taken away? This was one of the principles of representation on which the Union was formed. Why should it now be unjustly, as well as capriciously taken away? The Reform Bill will be both unjust and insulting if it interferes with this right. On behalf of the people of Ireland, I respectfully, but firmly, insist on its continuance.

Reformers of Great Britain, we deserve your co-operation. We seek nothing but what is just and reasonable; we will not be content with less. If Stanley's Conservative measure is carried, the people of Ireland, wounded in their just pride, and affected in their national interest, will feel it necessary to counteract Stanley's plans of oligarchy by increased and continued agitation and excitement. In short, we will not be insulted and done injustice to with impunity.

Reformers of Great Britain, it is not to you, but in aid of your liberties, that we make those declarations, which may be called threats. We ask your aid; we deserve your good will. We have stood by you, and we are ready again to share your battle; but we should not deserve your co-operation, if

Because we Deserve your Aid.

477

we did not feel a confidence of ultimate, and, perhaps, more complete success by our own means, and from our own resources.

Aid us, then, because we deserve your aid.

I have the honour to be, Brother Reformers,

Your most faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

TO THE REFORMERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

LETTER III.

"This is essentially a Conservative measure."—*Crampton, Solicitor-General for Ireland.*

London, May 31, 1832.

BROTHER REFORMERS—I proceed in the painful task of developing the injurious and insulting nature of the Reform Bill intended for Ireland.

Of the eight objections which I stated to that Bill, I have already fully canvassed but one. It was that which related to the franchise in counties at large.

I undertook to show, and I have shown, that—"Whilst the English Reform Bill greatly enlarged the elective franchise in the English counties, and the Scotch Bill exceedingly increased that franchise in Scotch counties, the Irish Reform Bill does not increase the county franchise at all; but, on the contrary, diminishes the number of county voters."

The abstract of my argument is fit to be repeated. It is this: England acquires for her counties at least 300,000 additional voters; Ireland will acquire no increase. Scotland converts her 1,100 fictitious and parchment county voters into 30,000 substantial voters; Ireland actually diminishes the number of her county voters.

I attempted to calculate the amount of diminution. I estimated it at 1,000—that is, Ireland, having at present 26,000 voters, I draw this inference, that there will be a diminution of 1,000. I draw that inference, rather from local knowledge than from Parliamentary documents. Nay, the Parliamentary documents are framed more to weaken my calculation of the precise amount of loss than to confirm it. But the maps which would point out the errors in those documents are not as yet printed.

It is, therefore, impossible for me to be certain as to the intended contents of each of our future boroughs, particularly whether or not they comprise entire parishes, or only portions of parishes.

Under these circumstances, I prefer running a risk of inaccuracy, and I, therefore, abandon the calculation I had made of an absolute loss of 1,000 voters, and leave the amount of the diminution of voters unascertained. It must be large, because no less than twenty-five towns are to be deducted from our county constituency. Yet, as the exact loss is disputatious, I consent to give Mr. Stanley this advantage, namely, that it may be smaller than I have stated it. But, at all events, it must be considerable.

This result, however, is inevitable, that whilst Ireland, with an agricultural population of seven millions, is to have a constituency of only 26,000 voters, Scotland, with an agricultural population of only one million and a-half, is to have a county constituency of 30,000 voters.

Having dismissed the county constituency, I now proceed to that of the cities, towns, and boroughs. My assertion is, and this is my second objection to Stanley's Bill—"That the Irish Reform Bill creates too high and too aristocratic a franchise in the Irish towns and cities. It alters the present law to the prejudice of the people, and in favour of the oligarchy.

I proceed to prove this my second objection. To perceive the force of my proofs, it is necessary to understand the present situation of our boroughs.

They consist of eight cities and towns that are counties of themselves, and twenty-five towns that are now portions of the surrounding counties.

Of these, the eight first are what, under the existing system, may well be called open places. Of the twenty-five boroughs, ten, and only ten, are pure nomination boroughs, by means of their original constitution. Eight more have become nominal boroughs by mere usurpation, having been originally free; and seven are, or rather ought to be, open and free. There is, be-

sides these, one other, the rottenest and worst of the entire—the College of Dublin.

In the open boroughs in Ireland are to be found, at present, a constituency, not exactly the same in all, but between them are to be found a constituency of this description in the following classes :—

1. Freeholders of 40*s.* and upwards in fee.
2. Freeholders of 40*s.* for terminable freeholds.
3. Freemen by birth, servitude, or marriage.
4. Freemen by grace especial.
5. Householders of £5 annual value.

Npw these five classes are to be swept away by the Reform Bill! that is, they are to be allowed to drop off until the entire shall be extinct, and in their place there is to be substituted an immediate and continuous franchise of householders of £10 annual value.

The five classes which belong to the operative and humble classes are to be extinguished, and the higher and more aristocratic right is alone to remain. The £10 franchise, besides, is far too high for our towns. Let any man only think that this £10 qualification is that which is to subsist in London, and also in Portarlington, and also in Ennis. Is it not plain that the class of persons who thus will have a right of voting in London (and nobody rejoices more at the extent to which it is carried in London than I do), but is it not plain that the right in London will extend to the poorer classes, whilst in Portarlington, Ennis, Kinsale, &c., &c., the occupiers of £10 houses excluded the poorer classes, and are, beyond any comparison, of a more wealthy, at least comparatively wealthy class? The £10 house franchise shuts out from the right of voting very few in London. It will shut out from that right nearly four-fifths of the inhabitants of the smaller towns in Ireland.

But why should the £5 householders be disfranchised? Had this been an enfranchising, that is, really a Reform Bill, would it strike off the ancient rights of the £5 householders, to substitute the more narrow right of £10 householders? Why

does this Reform Bill at once double the amount of the qualification? It would operate in directly the reverse manner if it were really a Reform Bill. It is, therefore, idle to call it anything else than a "Conservative"—that is, an Anti-Reform measure.

Alas for Ireland! How little of sympathy or support does she obtain from English Reformers. Here is a Bill purporting to increase our popular privileges. It strikes off five popular rights. It takes the highest of the pecuniary qualifications in these rights, and it doubles that qualification; and then Stanley says that this is a Reform Bill; and the Reformers of England are satisfied with his high and haughty dictation, and leave us to our own fate.

But I persevere—I continue to demonstrate the iniquity of treating Ireland thus. I stop to point out some of the atrocious consequences. Take Downpatrick; the present number of resident voters is 493; the Reform Bill will reduce the number to 220: that is, by way of reforming Downpatrick. Mr. Stanley strikes off at a single blow more than one-half of the resident voters. He strikes off 273, leaving only 220. At Newry, he reduces the resident voters from 935 to 700; only 235 struck off. In Mallow, he finds a constituency of 524, whereupon, by way of reform, he reduces them to 200. In Dungarvan, he finds 871 voters, and he reforms them, by his usual process of reduction, to 210, striking off no less than 661.

Now, this is called a Reform Bill for Ireland!! and it is thus that the honest Irish Reformers are to be treated by the contemptuous iniquity of the Irish side of the British ministry.

Having thus established my second objection, and shown that the Irish Reform Bill is, in our towns and cities, a mere filching of the rights of the humbler classes, in order to vest the power of election in an exclusive and excluding oligarchy, I proceed to my third objection:—

That, although the Irish Reform Bill takes away the direct power of nomination in from ten to eighteen boroughs, yet it substitutes so narrow a basis of representation, as effectually to

render those boroughs close boroughs, liable to the most gross and profligate corruption.

Let it be borne in mind, that the only permanent franchise in our towns is to be the £10 house franchise.

In a poor country, like Ireland, this is an enormously high rate of franchise. I have already observed on the difference between £10 in London and £10 in Tralee. They are, to be sure, the same in nominal and legal amount; but, the man with an income of £10 a-year in London, is next to a pauper. With such an income in Tralee or Ennis, he is in rather comfortable circumstances. But I do not leave the matter in theory, I come to the practical working of the mock Reform Bill.

Under the new Bill, the permanent constituency of Athlone, for instance, is set down in the Parliamentary Return as arising from 220 houses. Now as, amongst the occupiers of such houses, there will be of course women and minors, it is not too little to take off ten per cent., so as to find the actual returns—thus, Athlone will have but 198 voters. Bandon has 240 houses to confer votes; there will, on this scale, be only 226 voters. Cashel, on a similar calculation, will have about 180 voters; Coleraine, 170 voters; Dungannon, only 145 voters; Portarlington, 167 voters!

Let this paucity of voters but be looked at, and then let me ask, whether this is not just the species of constituency most exposed to corruption? In England, fatal experience has shown that the most profligate bribery and corruption have prevailed in boroughs ranging from 150 to 250 voters. This number, however, is to be the Reform constituency in very many towns in Ireland. In such boroughs as these, the briber has only to buy a simple majority. He then commands his return. Three or four thousand pounds will, therefore, command the return after the Reform, as it does under the present system—with this deplorable difference, that at present the transaction of the sale of these boroughs is one of great comparative innocence. It is simply a sale between two individuals: the one merely pays his money, and the other merely

fills up on parchment a return to Parliament duly signed; and so the business closes. There is neither riot, drunkenness, perjury, or other immorality, save the sale of the right of legislation. But in the half open boroughs, it is quite different. The voter must get liquor as well as money. Liquor for weeks, perhaps months, before the election. Then, there is the direct bribery, and then there is the Bribery Oath!

But I will not go further. I will simply taunt the High Church Stanley. I will ask him, is this your Protestantism? Is this your veneration for religion? How can you dare to call that a Reform, which, while it takes away from one individual the unlawful power to name a legislator, throws before one hundred the strongest temptations to make that nomination, through the horrible and God-offending means of drunkenness, bribery and soul-destroying perjury?

Stanley, you are warned. On you there will be the guilt of opening the door of crime, unless you consent honestly to enlarge the town constituency. But there is one way to dissipate the temptation, and to counteract the tendency of this Reform Bill. It is by rousing the higher impulses of patriotism and virtue; and this, I inform Stanley, we will do in Ireland. It will be necessary, to be sure, to continue public excitement, and to increase the resources of patriotic agitation. Excite and agitate we will, because it will be our bounden duty thus to shut out bribery and perjury.

Yet what a statesman is this Stanley, who leaves us no other alternative, but either to submit to the consequences of public corruption, or to keep alive that higher tone of political feeling, which it is often difficult to manage, and oft times dangerous to attempt to control.

Lord Grey ought to understand, that the people of Ireland are as determined to insist on, and to exercise, constitutional privileges, as the people—the triumphant people—of England. Let him reflect on this question—whether it would not be better to allow the Irish to enjoy those privileges in the quietude of the ordinary tide of affairs, rather than to make it

necessary for them to raise the storm of political passions, in order to enforce and secure that enjoyment?

I have now to observe, that in few of the towns in England is there to be any diminution of the existing resident voters. In many of the towns in Ireland there is to be great reduction of resident voters—and this by what is called a Reform Bill!!!

I have next to observe, that in all the borough towns in Scotland an immense increase will take place in the resident voters.

Alas for poor Ireland! Behold the melancholy, the heart-sickening contrast in Ireland—there is in many towns to be a great diminution of resident voters!!!—and this by what is called a Reform Bill!!!

Why—why, in the name of common sense, not send Lord Anglesey as Governor-General to India, and make Stanley Commander-in-Chief of the Army! He is really more fit for that than for Ireland.

I conclude, by stating my demands on behalf of the Irish people, with regard to our cities and towns.

I demand, then, these franchises:—

First—The perpetuation of the franchises of all resident freemen, entitled to their freedom as of right, by birth, servitude, or marriage.

I ask for this franchise because it is in substance preserved in the English borough towns, and is reasonable in itself.

Secondly—I ask that, in our towns and cities, being counties in themselves, the occupying freeholders in fee, or perpetual freeholders of 40s. and upwards, should be preserved as they are in England.

Thirdly—I ask that in such towns and cities—that is, being counties in themselves—the £20 freeholders, though not occupying, should be allowed to vote.

Fourthly—In the towns, not being counties in themselves, occupying freeholders of 40s., seized in fee, or of perpetual freehold, should be allowed to retain, as in England, the elective franchise.

Fifthly—I ask, that the occupiers of houses of £5, annual value, instead of £10, should be allowed to vote. This is the old, long recognised right of householder suffrage in Irish towns. It ought not to be destroyed, or infringed upon; and, least of all, should it be wantonly destroyed by a Bill, purporting to be a Reform Bill.

There is only one alteration more that I seek in this section of the Reform Bill—it is, that it should not annihilate the right of any freeholder in towns, not being counties of themselves, to vote for the county at large. This right at present exists only in occupying freeholds of £10 clear value, and in all freeholders of £20 and upwards, clear value. Why should their rights be destroyed under the pretence—the false pretence—of a Reform?

Reformers of England—recollect that I have thus demonstrated these two things:—

First—Stanley's Reform Bill will keep the constituency of all the counties in Ireland (having an agricultural population of at least seven millions) as low as about 26,000 voters; and this while England greatly increases her county constituency; and Scotland, for a million and a half of agricultural population, will have 30,000 voters—that is, Scotland will have about five times a greater relative number of county voters than Ireland, and England about twenty times a greater number. Is this just? Is this fair? Why are the people of Ireland to be thus insulted and outraged? Is it because Wellington and Peel most unjustly deprived the Irish people of one right, that Stanley shall be empowered by Earl Grey to perpetuate and increase the outrage; and, by contrast with England and Scotland, to add insult to injury?

Must not the Irish perceive—are we so stupid as not to perceive—that the giving an enlarged and liberal Reform to England, and an enlarged and liberal Reform to Scotland, and then flinging to Ireland a stingy, limited, restrictive, and almost mock Reform Bill, can originate only in one of two feelings—either a deliberate judgment that the people of Ireland are unfit

for, or unworthy of, equal constitutional privileges with the people of England and of Scotland; or a deliberate, base, contemptuous, insulting hatred of Ireland and of the Irish people?

Let Earl Grey and Mr. Stanley take their choice of these excuses. It is nearly immaterial to us whether they undervalue or despise us.

We are not disposed to submit to either injustice or contumely; we will not submit to either the one or the other.

Reformers of England, I say it not in vain boasting, much less in the spirit of mere vain threatening, but we are—we are eight millions—eight millions of brave but patient, resolute but combining beings—eight millions who already compelled Wellington and Peel to strike their ascendancy colours, and to liberate the Protestant Dissenters of England as well as the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, and that without violating any law, or injuring either person or property.

We are eight millions, who have again, peaceably and without violating any law, rendered abortive the tithe system, and set the example to Great Britain of each man paying only his own clergyman.

British Reformers, what is it we require? Why, nothing more than an equal measure of reform with England and Scotland. Shame upon the Irishman that would be content with less.

I have the honour to be, brother Reformers,

Your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

TO THE REFORMERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

LETTER IV.

Parliament-street, June 8, 1832.

BROTHER REFORMERS—It is my duty to commence this letter, as I did my last, with a retraction of part of my former letters. I do so with a heavy heart.

I have said, and repeated more than once, that what the people of Ireland demand is a Reform Bill for Ireland, similar in its concessions of popular rights to that obtained by the people of England.

Alas! I was mistaken. I greatly exaggerated the extent of our demands. We do not ask for a Bill equivalent to the English Bill, or anything like it. We do not ask for the English franchises, or for anything near in extent or number to those of England. Ours is a beggarly solicitation of some feeble approach to the English Bill. We, with "bated breath" and humble demeanour, ask only a faint, a distant resemblance to the English Bill.

That Bill passed the House of Commons with great and extensive franchises newly bestowed on the people of England, but those franchises have since been much extended, and the right of voting enormously increased by the House of Lords.

This has been done in two ways—first, by perpetuating the right to vote of 40s. freeholders for terminable interests; and, secondly, by making the pecuniary qualification in almost all the new classes of franchise depend on the value of the estate, not on the income of the voter. Thus, if the freehold estate be of the value of £10 and 5s., there may be at least two voters qualified by that property—the one having an income of 5s., and the other of £10.

In fact, it is almost incalculable to what an extent the right of voting may be carried under the English Reform Bill, in pursuance of the amendments made in it by the House of Lords.

It is certainly somewhat singular that the popular franchises should have been rendered more extensive by the House of Lords than they were by the Commons. I hope it is not to be accounted for by this, that the franchises are rendered by the Lords so extensive and comprehensive as to give room for the creation of very many fictitious and paper voters.

I return from this digression to the Irish Reform Bill. I have already pointed out its gross, glaring, and contumelious defects with reference to the voters in Irish counties, cities, and boroughs. These defects were the subject of my three first objections to that Bill. The three next ensuing objections relate to the mode of registering voters, and of taking the poll in Ireland. I will postpone these for the present, and in this letter take up my seventh objection, and show its accuracy and force.

The seventh objection is, "That the Irish Reform Bill does not give Ireland her due and fair proportion of representatives."

The number of Irish members under the Irish Reform Bill is but one hundred and five, an increase of only five. Now, Wales, with a population of only 805,236, gets an increase of four members. Ireland, with a population of eight millions, gets an increase of only five. That is, in other words, eight hundred thousand Welshmen are within one-fifth of being as valuable as eight millions of Irishmen. We humbly thank the English ministry for this flattering compliment!!! And there are men who believe that the people of Ireland will tranquilly bury in oblivion an insult of this overgrown magnitude.

Again, Scotland, with a population of 2,365,807, gets an increase of eight members; Ireland with a population of eight millions gets an increase of only five. Who will condescend to take the trouble of calculating the exact ratio of insulting preference? Not I, truly. It is written with a pen of fire on hearts of adamant, and it will become legible in its own good time.

But this comparison is still more outrageous, more debasingly insulting, when we look at these relative proportions in another point of view. Wales has already twenty-four members. Wales obtains an additional one to every six. Scotland has already

forty-five members. Scotland obtains an addition of one to every five. Ireland has already one hundred members. Ireland obtains an addition of one to every twenty!!!

Mark—Scotland increases one to five; Wales, one to six; Ireland, one to twenty! And I, an Irishman, live to write all this—and to write it without one particle of hope of present redress.

I may, however, defy any person to point out, in the history of any country in the world, instances of such flagrant injustice—of such deep, studied, malignant contumely—I mean of any country in the world, Ireland alone excepted. But in Ireland, the instances are not few, nor rare, nor far between. They have been oft and oft repeated: from the treacherous massacre of Mullaghmast, where the Irish chieftains were invited to a feast, and assassinated as soon as they had laid aside their good swords, down to that eternal stain on English annals—the profligately disgraceful breach of the Treaty of Limerick. Yes, in the records of English domination in Ireland, there are many and many transactions of equal turpitude. I will not, therefore, accuse Stanley of more than he merits. He is only the administrator *de malis non*—the executor of the stored, and, as yet, unapplied malignant mischief, treasured up for future use by former chief governors, chief secretaries, and English managers of Ireland.

It may be said, that this invidious comparison might be, if not justified, at least palliated, on the ground that the former proportion of Irish members exceeded, or even equalled, what Ireland was fairly and justly entitled to. I do readily admit, that, if Ireland had already a more ample proportion, or even an exact proportion of members with Wales or Scotland, we should have little or no right to complain. But the fact is, unhappily, the other way. Ireland, instead of having a fair proportion of members at present, is already suffering great and unmerited injustice in that respect. The Union did not give her anything like a due number of representatives.

This will appear quite clear, if we look to the manner in which the representation of Ireland was managed at the Union

The parricide Castlereagh, a name ever odious to the Irish ear, settled the proportion of Irish members on a comparative ratio of population—exports, imports, and revenue, with England. The materials of his calculation were naturally exaggerated in favour of England, and understated for Ireland. This was to be expected; but even on his most unfavourable calculation the matter stood thus. He allowed Ireland—

For Population,	202 members
Exports,	100
Imports,	93
Revenue,	39
	—
	434

The mean of those four quantities being 108½.

Such was Castlereagh's calculation, interested as he was to diminish, as much as possible, the rights of Ireland. It will be seen that he left out a most important ingredient, namely, comparative rental.

No matter! Let us take Castlereagh's own calculation. Thus it is—it gave Ireland, after all imaginable reductions of calculations, 108½ members. Now I do not mean to quarrel about the half of an Irishman. But what did Castlereagh do? Why, without any plausible pretext, he at once, and without ceremony, cut down his own proved right, and struck off at once eight members, giving to Ireland only one hundred members. And why?—precisely, because he could and would. Nothing more. It was indeed—*Sic rolo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.*

Mark—British Reformers—if anything Irish can command your attention—mark, I pray you, this fact:—That Ireland was, at the Union, spoliated of eight members, proved by Castlereagh to be her due.

Now, if Stanley, and Lord Althorpe, and Lord John Russell, had one single particle of respect for decency, where Ireland is concerned, they would, at all events, have given us these

eight members. They may now prate about the Union as long as they like; Ireland despises such chattering. Here is the test of their regard for Ireland—the claim to eight members is, in reason, common sense, justice, and decency, irresistible. They condescend to give her five, while they transfer the eight to Scotland, who had no such claim.

Is there any reason in the world why we should not get the eight—the Union eight—the Castlereagh eight?

I have, however, said, that Castlereagh designedly omitted one ingredient, namely, the comparative rental of both countries. His omission was supplied, and the gross perversions by which he diminished the rights of Ireland to an adequate representation, were fully exposed in a valuable book, printed by Mr. Newenham, a gentleman who had been many years a member of the Irish Parliament, an accomplished scholar, and a patriot.

The following was the result of Mr. Newenham's demonstration. It showed that Ireland was, in truth, entitled to representation in the following ratio:—

For the comparative Population,	.	.	228 members.
Exports,	.	.	179
Imports,	.	.	168
Revenue,	.	.	85
Rental,	.	.	186
			846

The mean of these five quantities is $169\frac{1}{2}$. Again I throw off the half—but thus I show that the fair proportion of Ireland was, at the Union, 169 members. We, therefore, did not get two-thirds of our proper proportion of representatives, when the deplorable Union was forced on Ireland by the combination of fraud, bribery, and blood.

We ask at present only 125 members. High as our rights are, we merely ask to be put into a situation of comparative liberality. Perhaps we deserve the neglect we experience from English Reformers, and the contempt with which the ministry

deal with us, for being so mean and pitiful as to accept of less than justice.

But it has been said, and repeated, and re-echoed, that the representation in England has a double basis, namely, population and revenue. This is by no means universally or generally true; but I will consent to take it so. Let us then see what the result of the calculation will be, taking for ingredients nothing more than population and revenue.

I wish to impress this part of the case of Ireland as strongly as I possibly can on the minds of British Reformers; and for this excellent reason: that this has been supposed to be the weakest part of our case; although, in fact and truth, it is quite the strongest and most irresistible.

Recollect, my present basis consists of population and revenue.

I will take care that there shall be no cavil, nor any dispute about the data I go upon, either with respect to population or revenue. I will take the revenue in the most palpably unfavourable way for Ireland, and I will take the population separately, on the returns of 1821 and of 1832. In short, I defy any man to controvert either my endeavour or the certainty of my data.

Now, upon the population returns of 1821, the population of England was, in round numbers, twelve millions; of Ireland, seven millions. But the twelve millions in England have 500 representatives. The seven millions in Ireland are, therefore, on the score of comparative population, entitled to 291 representatives.

However the revenue must be taken into account. I will, in the first place, refer to the report drawn up in 1830, by Mr. Rice, as chairman of the Irish committee, and printed by the House of Commons, in three volumes. It appears by the details of that report, that the Irish pay a full one-seventh of the revenue. Take the principal items of wine, sugar, coffee, and tobacco; the revenue from these articles was, in the preceding year, in England, £11,576,713, while it was in Ireland,

£1,665,718, being more than one-seventh. I am content, however, to take it at one-eighth. It will be seen that this is a most moderate demand. The entire revenue of Great Britain last year was, according to the finance account published by Parliament, £48,325,215, while that attributed to Ireland was only £4,560,897. But this estimate is egregiously and palpably fallacious, because Ireland does not get credit for the far greater part of the duties of customs which are paid by her inhabitants; neither for teas, nor for any other, the produce of the Eastern world, such as silks, spices, drugs, &c., none of which are imported direct into Ireland; neither does she get credit for the amount of duty on timber, sugar, cotton, coffee, paper, glass, wine, and various other articles which are imported into Ireland from England. Now, it is ascertained by the last separate account kept for Ireland, that for teas alone Ireland paid duty to the extent of half-a-million annually; and, as scarcely any one article liable to customs duty is now imported direct into Ireland, surely it is not too much to say, that the inhabitants of Ireland actually contribute on all those articles, exclusive of teas, to the amount of one million sterling. This will bring the amount of comparative revenue to this exact state:—

Revenues credited to Great Britain,	£48,325,215
Deduct teas consumed in Ireland,	£500,000
Deduct for all other customable articles consumed in Ireland,	£1,000,000
	<u>1,500,000</u>
Real revenue of Great Britain,	£46,825,215
Revenue credited to Ireland,	£4,560,897
Add duty on teas consumed in Ireland,	£500,000
Add duties on all other customable articles imported from England,	1,000,000
	<u>1,500,000</u>
Total Irish revenue,	£6,060,897

It is thus plain that Ireland pays more than one-eighth of the revenue paid by Great Britain. Let it not be forgotten, that I make these calculations in so unfavourable a way for Ireland, that I gave England (with her 500 members) credit on the score of revenue for, at least, two millions paid by Scotland. Taking, therefore, the population return of 1821, and this estimate of Irish revenue at one-eighth; the right of Ireland to representation will stand thus:—

For population, on 500,	291
For revenue, on 500 $\frac{1}{2}$	62
	<hr/>
	358
	<hr/>
The one-half as the medium,	176

So that taking the population return of 1821 as giving seven millions in Ireland to twelve millions in England, and the Irish revenue so low as one-eighth of the English, I make a clear case for no less than 176 members for Ireland. But it may be said that there are errors in my estimate of the revenue, and that, therefore, my conclusion is fallacious. This assertion is true only to this extent—that my estimate is erroneous to the loss and disfavour of Ireland, and that my conclusion is fallacious because Ireland is really entitled to many more than 176 members.

However, I defy any person to cavil with another at the last estimate that I shall make on this subject.

I take up the population return of 1832. England has, by that return, a population of thirteen millions; Ireland a population of eight millions. On a representation of 500 members for England on thirteen millions, Ireland would be entitled for her eight millions to, at least, 307 members.

Now, come back to the revenue: Great Britain, £48,325,215; Ireland, £4,560,897. Credit Ireland with the duty on teas alone, Parliamentary evidence shows that to be, at least, half-a-million; add that half million, as you are bound to do, to the

Irish revenue, and you raise it to £5,060,897. You must, at the same time, deduct that half million from the British revenue, and you sink it to £47,825,216, though it will be seen that this deduction is by no means necessary to my argument. All I claim for Ireland is one-tenth of the revenue of Great Britain—that is all.

Look at the foregoing specifications of the revenue, and see whether it be possible for anyone to deny that Ireland pays one-tenth of the revenue—one full tenth. I have shown that she pays much more, but I rest on one-tenth.

Resume with me the calculation, and you will find that Ireland, on the combined basis of population and revenue, has the following rights:—

Population, 8 to 13 on 500, gives	307
Revenue, 1 to 10 on 500, gives	50
	357
One-half as the medium,	178

If justice were done to Ireland, if anything approaching to justice were done to Ireland, she would have 178 members; and the case, on the combined basis of population and revenue, is quite irresistible to the mind of every fair and just man.

It may, perhaps, be amusing to recollect that, on the return of 1821, the proportion of Irish population, capable of bearing arms, was 1,664,437, and that of Great Britain, was 2,928,951. The proportions are still more favourable to Ireland on the last returns, and thus Ireland has a large claim for increased representation, as sustained by physical force.

I recapitulate these points:—

First—According to the vilest of the vile, Castlereagh, Ireland ought to have 108 members. We get but 105. Ireland, therefore, in this, the most abject and degrading view, is defrauded of three members.

Secondly—According to the view of the documents on which Castlereagh made his calculation, as corrected by Newenham, we ought to have 169 members. We get but 105. Ire-

land, is therefore, defrauded, in this view, of no less than sixty-four members.

Thirdly—According to the combined basis of population and revenue—taking the return of 1821—and the revenue of Ireland as one-eighth, Ireland ought to have 176 members. She gets but 105 members. She is, therefore, defrauded to the extent of seventy-one members.

Fourthly—According to the combined basis of population and revenue, taking up the population returns in 1832, and estimating the Irish revenue so very low as one-tenth, Ireland is entitled to 178 members; as we get but 105, we are thus defrauded of no less than seventy-three members.

Thus it will be seen that the most recent and most incontrovertible data give us the highest claim to an increase of members. We are entitled on the basis of population and revenue to 178. We ask only for 125. We give up fifty-three of what we are entitled to, and thereupon we are scouted by the British Legislature—we are neglected and abandoned by the British Reformers, whom we assisted at their need—and we are left to our resources, to our own unconquered and unconquerable determination to obtain justice for Ireland.

Take up the calculation in any way—population, exports, imports, rental, revenue, fighting-men—view it in any way, or in any mode, and the wrong perpetrated in Ireland is the most gross and glaring. Since the world began there never was so unjust a proceeding. The British Minister has a strong majority of real and mock Reformers; and in the plenitude of his strength, it pleases Mr. E. G. Stanley to perpetrate these outrages in Ireland, and they are perpetrated accordingly. I restrain my indignation, my honest indignation, and merely state facts.

In distributing the increase of members in England, the ministers have acted, on the scale of population alone. Now, Ireland, on that scale, would be entitled to no less than 307 members.

But let us go into some details, which will serve to place

the contrast between the favour done to one country, and the injustice done to the other, in a still more striking light.

Mark this enormous preference :—

The county of Cumberland, with a population of only 169,681, gets two additional members—that is, it will in future send four members to Parliament.

The county of Cork, with a population of 807,366 does not get one additional member. It will continue to send two only.

That is just saying, in so many words, 169,681 people in Cumberland are of twice as much value in Parliament as 807,366 in the county of Cork. Ask for a reason: Oh, the smaller number are English—the greater are Irish.—Q. E. D.

Northamptonshire gets two additional members. Another Cabinet Minister sits for it. Its population is only 179,276. It will send four members to Parliament.

Down has a population of 352,571. It gets no increase of members.

Leicestershire has 197,276 inhabitants. It increases its representatives from two to four.

Tipperary has 402,698 inhabitants. It must be content with two members. I, however, doubt much whether Tipperary will be satisfied.

Worcestershire, with a population of 211,356, is to have four representatives.

Galway county, with a population of 427,407 remains with two.

Wiltshire, with only 239,181 inhabitants, is to command four representatives.

Tyrone, with 302,943 inhabitants, is to have but two.

Nottinghamshire has 225,320 for its population, accordingly it is to have four members.

Antrim county has 323,306 for its population, accordingly it is to have but two representatives.

Derbyshire has a population of 237,170—it will have four members. Stanley is at home here, I suppose.

Dublin county has a population of no less than 336,964. Not one additional member—not one!

But why should I pursue the painful, the humiliating contrast? I cannot avoid noticing just one instance more.

Monmouthshire gets a third member, though its population is but 98,130.

Mayo, with 367,953; Limerick, with 300,080; Clare, with 258,862; Kerry, with 219,989; Donegal, with 298,104—not one of them gets any increase—not one!

There is but one county in Ireland, that is the county of Carlow, the population of which is so low as that of Monmouthshire. The population of the other thirty-one counties all exceed Monmouthshire; yet it gets an additional member, and Irish counties, with a population of one and a-half to nine times the population of Monmouthshire, are left without any addition.

Is this fair? Is it just? Is it reasonable? Ought Ireland to be content? Ought the Irish people to be satisfied? Yes, provided they be the very basest of slaves that ever crawled on the face of the globe.

I cannot close without one honest burst of indignation at the injustice, and, I will add, ingratitude of the British Reformers to their fellow-labourers in Ireland.

I have demonstrated the contumelious injuries inflicted on us by this Reform Bill. My letters are long before the public. They have been unrefuted, uncontradicted, in any one of their details. And with this case of atrocious injustice to Ireland placed before the reformers of Britain, what assistance, what sympathy do we receive? Why, I have got some half dozen drivelling letters from political unions, and political characters, asking me whether I advise them to petition or bestir themselves on our behalf! Bah!

Reformers of Great Britain, I do not ask you either to petition or to be silent. I do not advise you to petition, or to do any other act, in favour of the Irish. You will consult your own feelings of justice and generosity, unprovoked by any advice or entreaty of mine.

For my part, I never despaired of Ireland; I do not, I will not, I cannot dare to despair of my beloved country. She has, in my view, obtained freedom of conscience for others as well as for herself. She has shaken off the incubus of tithes, while silly legislation was doling out its folly and its falsehoods. She can and she will obtain for herself justice and constitutional freedom; and although she may sigh at British neglect and ingratitude, there is no sound of despair in that sigh, nor any want of moral energy, on her part, to attain her own rights of peaceable and legal means.

One word more. My fifth and last letter will demonstrate, that all the iniquity of the Irish Reform Bill, in its refusal of franchise, and narrowing of elective rights, sinks into comparative insignificance when compared with the expensive, tedious, vexatious, unjust, and almost impracticable modes of registration of votes prescribed by the Irish Reform Bill. With that letter I will close.

I have the honour to be, Brother Reformers,

Your faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL-

TO THE REFORMERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

LETTER V.

Parliament-street, June 11, 1832.

This letter closes my commentary on the infamous Reform Bill for Ireland. I hope no honest man in England, or in Scotland, will insult the Irish people by including, in their rejoicings, the Irish Bill. Let them, as they ought to do, rejoice heartily, rejoice at the overthrow of the sordid oligarchy in England and in Scotland. Let them rejoice, heartily rejoice, that in England one hundred and twelve Swiss are flung out of Parliament by the magic of the Schedule A, and that all Scotland is put into a similar glorious schedule. This is, indeed, a most just cause of triumph, and the people of Ireland will join in that rejoicing, and will heartily concur in the shouts of triumph at the achievement of English and Scottish liberty.

But I do most earnestly implore of the Reformers of Great Britain to abstain from offering so gross, so unmerited, so provoking an insult to the people of Ireland, as it expresses joy for that which will be to us a cause of the bitterest affliction, the passing of Stanley's mock Reform Bill for Ireland. Let British Reformers recollect, that it is avowed to be a Conservative measure.

I now come to my fourth and fifth objections to the Irish Bill; they relate to the registry of votes—they are these:

Fourth—The Irish Reform Bill continues a mode of registry of voters, complicated in its details, extremely dilatory and expensive, and almost impossible to be complied with by any person but a man of fortune.

Fifth—It leaves the registry of votes in the hands of persons totally irresponsible, and who, taken in the aggregate, are most unfit for that purpose; first, from want of sufficient aptitude; and, secondly, by reason of their zealous Tory principles.

Before I proceed, I wish to state explicitly to the English Reformers, what it is the Irish want in relation to the registry of their votes.

We desire the mode of registry enacted for England, that is the precise amount of our demand. As far as the registry is involved in the Reform measure, our institutions are either precisely the same, or preferable to those of England; we want, therefore, the same machinery for registration of voters, and entitling the voter to vote as is adopted by, and enacted for England.

We want a registry of voters as cheap and as effectual as the English registry—why should this, our reasonable demand, be refused us?

For no other reason than this—that our rulers are determined to disfranchise Ireland, under the name of Reform; and, therefore, they keep on foot, and even aggravate considerably, and seek to perpetuate a system of registry, introduced by the Peel-Wellington Administration, with the undisguised purpose of converting every county in Ireland into a close borough.

I solemnly and conscientiously declare, that if the Irish Reform Bill had given the people of Ireland the same liberal and extensive franchises, which the English Bill preserves for or nearly grants to the people of England, the effect of even so liberal a Bill would be almost totally lost, if the machinery for registry and taking the votes, which is inserted in the Irish Bill, were to become law.

In short, the machinery of the Irish Bill is bad to so extraordinary an extent, that it would neutralize the benefits of a Reform Bill, most liberal in its franchise. Judge, then, what a bill this is—that has only two faults. First, it restricts popular rights; and, secondly, it gives the worst possible machinery!!!

To prove this to demonstration, I will now proceed to point out the details of the registry and mode of voting in the English counties, and then contrast with these the provisions, which I again deliberately call infamous and atrocious, of the mock Reform for Ireland.

In England, the register of persons entitled to vote is to be made out thus:—

First.—The overseers of every parish in England are, on every 20th of June, to affix on all churches, chapels, and public places in the parish, a notice, calling on every person claiming a right to vote to send in his claim in writing.

Secondly.—A full month is given to send in such claim; and if the claim be lodged on the 20th of July, it is quite sufficient; it may be lodged any day during such entire months.

Thirdly.—Each person claiming to vote, has no other trouble than to hand in his notice in his own parish to the overseer, and pay him one shilling. The shilling is the entire expense, and no loss of time is incurred.

Fourthly.—The overseer is then to make out an alphabetical list of the persons so claiming to be voters. He is to put the words, "objected to," opposite the name of any person he has reason to believe not entitled to vote. The list is then to be printed, and published by affixing it on all churches, chapels, and public places, and a copy to be kept by the overseer, which is to be open for public inspection for two weeks, without payment of any fee.

Fifthly.—Any person claiming a right to vote is at liberty to object to the claim of any other person in the list; but he must give notice in writing of his objection, not only to the overseer, but to the person objected to; and a separate list of persons thus objected to is to be printed and published.

Sixthly.—The lists are then to be transmitted, through the high constable, to the Clerk of the Peace; and the lists of the persons objected to, including a statement of their respective residences, are to be transmitted to the registering barrister, in order that he may fix proper places for holding courts to consider the objections.

Seventhly.—Every person not specially objected to by the overseer, or by some other elector, is put on the register, and becomes entitled to vote without more trouble or expense.

Let it be observed that, unless any elector be specially objected to, he thus has his right to vote ascertained, without any consumption of his time, or any expense, save one shilling.

If he be specially objected to, he will have the satisfaction of knowing who it is that objects to his right to vote; and he can, as I shall presently show, examine that person upon oath as to the motives and reason for such objection.

Eightly—A barrister is to be appointed to decide the claims thus objected to; his appointment is to be made thus—the senior judge on each circuit, at the summer assizes, is to name a barrister for each district or locality. Now, this is just as it should be, in point of responsibility. One judge makes the appointment; he is responsible to the public for its fitness; no other person shares that responsibility with him. The trial of the objections is to take place before one barrister. No other person shares that responsibility with him; and it will be seen that this responsibility is not merely formal, but is directly, personal, and, indeed, pecuniary.

Ninthly—The barrister thus appointed is to give notice of the times and places for holding courts to decide the claims objected to. It will be his duty to hold these courts as near the residences of the persons objected to as possible.

Tenthly—The barrister is to decide in favour of the claim of any elector objected to by a third person, unless that third person attend the court by himself or his agent to sustain the objection. The elector in this case is put to no trouble, nor is any investigation gone into of his qualification, unless such third person attend the court.

Eleventhly—It is only in the case of objections made by the overseer, or by a third person who attends the court, that any investigation of the claim of the elector becomes necessary, or takes place. But it then takes place by the barrister calling on the elector simply "to prove his qualification;" these are the words of the act. If the elector proves his qualification, then the barrister is bound to throw upon the objector the proof of

incapacity; and, unless that proof be given, the voter is put on the list or register, and his right to vote is established.

Let it be observed that there is no direction to investigate title, or to produce any deed by or under which the elector claims to vote or derives title.

Twelfthly—The barrister is empowered to examine on oath the overseer as to every matter connected with the list, and with his objections to peculiar persons. This is a most important and valuable power, as it will manifestly deter overseers from making malicious or frivolous objections.

Thirteenthly—The barrister is entitled to correct all mistakes and omissions of name, residence, or description of tenures, and all other errors in the list. He then signs the list, which is to be printed and published; and from that roll the electors are, without further trouble, entitled, without the production of any other document, to vote at each ensuing election. There is great simplicity and certainty in this mode, and it tends to the greatest facility and expedition in polling at a contested election.

Fourteenthly—A barrister is thus annually to revise the list; but an elector once on the list is not bound to give any fresh claim, or to pay a second shilling, or to take any trouble, unless he shall be formally objected to in any one year, and notice of such objection given to him; and the lists are to be printed annually, and sold to any person willing to buy.

Lastly—And this is the most important of all. The responsibility of the barrister is real and substantial, because if it is proved that any overseer, barrister, &c., shall willingly contravene or disobey that Act with respect to any matter or thing which he is thereby required to do, he becomes liable to be sued in an action of debt by any candidate, elector, or other person aggrieved, and a sum of £500 may be recovered against him; and if a verdict be had against him for only one shilling, he will be bound to pay “full cost of suit” also.

This is a clause of inestimable value. It is the surest and most efficient check of misconduct. Where is the barrister who

will venture to misconduct himself, when he knows that a verdict of a jury may punish his delinquency by a heavy penalty and a total loss of character for life?

Such is the plain and simple plan of registry—such is the cheap, expeditious, and well-guarded plan of registry adapted to England. No Englishman can be, by wantonness or folly, deprived of his right as an elector; he cannot be wilfully delayed or postponed for an hour, without having an immediate and easy appeal to a jury, and abundant redress from, and abundant punishment for, the delinquent.

Let us now see what the machinery is under the Irish Bill. It is, however, fit to be observed that this machinery is new—that is, has been in existence only about three years. It was introduced to make the Catholic Relief Bill as valueless as possible to the people of Ireland. It is introduced to exclude from the right to vote as many persons as possible. It, of course, has had that effect; and by means of this machinery and the other enactments of the anti-popular accomplishment to Emancipation, the number of voters in Ireland was brought down from 200,000 to less than 20,000.

Now, if our Irish Reform contrivers had been sincere, they would certainly have, at all events, abolished the machinery of delay, vexation, and expense, invented by the Wellington Administration to punish the Irish people for having extorted Emancipation. The Whigs are continuing that punishment.

I put these questions by themselves:—If our machinery were good, as it had been tried for three years, and its practical effects ascertained, why, instead of inviting new, was not this tried machinery introduced into England? It could be so by the single alteration of a temporary or limited for a general or permanent barrister. Why, I say, if it were good, was it not introduced into England, instead of inventing a new and quite different machinery for England? The reason to me is obvious, because no man would dare to propose such machinery to the people of England.

My next question is—why, as this machinery is so loudly

and universally complained of by all the Irish people, except the Orange or Conservative party—why, I say, is it not got rid of, and the plan in the English Bill, which we demand, conceded to us? Let this also be observed, that all the anti-Reformers of Ireland are zealous advocates of Stanley's Registry plan—all the real Reformers detest it; and we, the Reformers, are at once sacrificed by Stanley, by Lord Althorp, and Lord John Russell, to the wishes of the Irish Tories.

That we most justly complain of the machinery of Stanley's Bill will appear from the following analysis:—

First—No person can register as a voter in Ireland without first giving to the acting Clerk of the Peace a notice in writing of his claim twenty clear days before the first day of each registering session, to be appointed by the assistant-barrister.

Now, observe, that the Irish elector will thus be obliged to travel, or to send a messenger, with the notice some distance, varying in our counties from one mile to fifty or sixty. Twenty miles is not an unreasonable average distance from each voter. Thus, two days are lost in Ireland in merely giving notice of a claim to register; one day going and one day returning. Two minutes will suffice in England. In Ireland, the voter is put to the expense and labour of travelling during two days. In England there is no labour and, of course, no expense of travelling.

Secondly—In Ireland the notice to be served is extremely complicated, and such as will require, as it does require, the aid of an attorney to draw up—an aid not always to be had gratuitously.

In England the notice is extremely simple; any person can draw it from the schedule of the Act. It requires the elector to set out only his name, place of abode, the situation of the freehold or franchise land, and such a description of the property as may serve to identify it. These are the words in the English Act.

In Ireland, on the contrary, besides the elector's name and place of abode, he must also specify "the right in respect of

which he intends to apply, and the nature and particulars of the qualification relied upon by him, as entitling him to be registered; the description of the property, with the names of the barony, townland, or place where situate; the nature of his interest in the property; the date of the deed giving title!!! The parties names thereto!!! and the yearly value!!!! and the yearly rent!!!!”

In England the barrister is entitled to correct, and is bound to correct any mistakes in the notice or list of claims; and so the elector is set right and is entitled to vote, notwithstanding any blunder or mistake in matter of form.

In Ireland, on the contrary, the assistant-barrister has no such power. A mistake in so complicated a notice is a ground of rejection; and the elector, after incurring great trouble and expense, has to begin over again.

Thirdly—The next important step in Ireland is the attendance at the session. The list of claimants is to be read over by the acting Clerk of the Peace. What day? Whatever day or hour the assistant-barrister chooses! The sessions last from three to ten days—the elector may be there from the first to the last day before the list is called over; he may thus be kept absent many days from his business and his family; he has to sustain at least the loss of two, or, indeed, three days, perhaps six; and if he should by accident be out of court when his name is called he loses all his labour, and has to begin over again for a future session.

In Ireland every elector must attend the sessions, I have said already, at an average journey of twenty miles in most counties. Every elector must attend, no matter how well known his right may be.

In England no elector need attend, save an elector especially and by name objected to.

In Ireland the attendance at sessions is the general, indeed, the universal rule.

In England it is only the exception.

In Ireland the place of session is fixed for other purposes,

and without any possible reference to the residence of the elector.

In England it is the duty of the barrister, and he has the power, to bring the court to try the disputed claims as near to the residence of the elector interested in the trial as he possibly can.

Fourthly—In Ireland each elector, so soon as he is named, is called upon to go on, and prove his entire case, although no one objects to his right of voting; he is required to produce his lease, or other title deed, and to show it to be duly stamped!!! A mistake committed in the stamp duty will, after perhaps fifty years' possession, be fatal to him. He must either produce his title deed, and expose it to all possible adverse discoveries, down to the amount of the stamp duty, or lose his right to vote.

I ask, would the people of England submit to such an odious inquisition; and, above all, would they allow any human being to call that a Reform Bill, which required every Englishman to enforce his title, or to forfeit his right to vote? Why, the great objection of the landed interest in England to the measure of a general registry of deeds (the value of which, in the abstract, every rational man must admit)—the great objection to the registry of deeds is, that it would expose men's title deeds to public inspection; and yet you will not allow a single individual in Ireland to establish at sessions his right to vote, without submitting to scrutiny all the muniments of his title; and this is called the Irish Reform Bill!!!

Fifthly—When the deed, or lease, is produced, then the trial commences; the elector is put to prove his case, as if he had brought an ejectment; and, although in possession, an ejectment is actually tried, the assistant-barrister is required to make the elector show the nature of his tenure, and he is to decide on the validity, or invalidity, of the elector's title; and to examine, in support, or in opposition, to his claim; and any person in the community is at liberty to come forward, and, without any previous notice, to controvert, by evidence, the elector's title.

In Ireland, in addition to all these particulars, every elector is bound also to produce evidence of his qualifications in point of value.

Thus, in Ireland, there is a double trial in every individual case of a registry under a Reform Bill—a trial of the title, and a trial upon the value—with liberty to anybody, or everybody, to take the elector by surprise, and give any contradictory evidence he may please, to destroy the title, or lessen the value.

Besides, the unfortunate elector has no process allowed him, to compel the attendance of witnesses, neither can he enforce the production of any of the title deeds of the persons under whom he derives. He is, in short, tied hand and foot, and bound to show the weakness of his title, and disabled from proving his strength, unless, indeed, he be a mere tool in the hands of his landlord, or his agent; and then indeed, he may, with some greater facility, register for them, and not for himself.

Can anybody now be surprised that, in the county of Kerry, with a population of upwards of 240,000 persons, there should be but 178 electors at £10, entitled to vote; that is, in the single popular franchise, only one person out of every one thousand three hundred and forty-eight is entitled to vote!!!

I do venture to ask Lord Althorpe, whether he really thinks it honest to insist on continuing such a system as this; and, next, whether he thinks it consistent with truth, to call the Bill which continues such a system a Reform Bill; and if it be inconsistent with honesty and truth, what shall I call it? Why, something so coarse as to shock "ears polite," but which ill be re-echoed throughout Ireland.

Now, contrast Ireland with England—the Irish with the English plan. In England, no elector is at all called on to prove his qualification, but an elector, specially and particularly objected to in writing. In England, therefore, the case of such an elector is the exception.

In Ireland, on the other hand, every elector must make that proof. It is the general—the universal rule.

Should this be so? Should anybody in Ireland be called on to prove title, and nobody in England called on to prove qualification, save a person specially and particularly objected to?

There are a thousand other forcible points of view in which I could place the contrast in this respect, but I fear to be too tedious; and, besides, the facts speak for themselves, and show that the English system is intelligent and considerate, favourable to the elector, and reasonable, in point of trouble and expense; whilst the Irish system, if intelligible, is only so by reason of its distinct harshness and atrocity. It is inquisitorial and tyrannical to the elector, It is most unreasonable, in point of labour and trouble.

In England no elector has any occasion to employ a professional man to secure his right of voting. It is quite obvious that it would be perfect insanity in any elector in Ireland to trust himself into the Session Court to register a vote, without the aid of a skilful attorney.

This, alone, would create such an expense as to preclude the far greater number of persons from attempting to register their votes but that there are, in most of the counties of Ireland, a class of independent and patriotic attorneys, who volunteer their services in aid of the electors; and thus, in this, as in so many other instances, Irish public spirit counteracts the evils of British misgovernment.

I will pursue the contrast between the Irish and English Bill only in one case more.

Take an English elector, whose right to vote is clear. Suppose an Irish elector of the same class.

The English elector consumes two minutes of his time in drawing up and handing to his parish overseer his notice by claiming a right to vote; he pays one shilling, and there is at once an end to all expense and to all trouble

The Irish elector has an equally clear right to vote, yet he

must either first venture to draw a very intricate notice himself, which will cost him much time, or employ an attorney to draw up that notice, which ought to cost him not less than ten shillings at the very lowest.

Secondly—He must transmit that notice, ten, twenty, thirty, or forty miles, say on an average twenty miles, to the acting Clerk of the Peace. Thus are two days' time, and the expense of near two days' travelling, expended.

Thirdly—He must attend in person at the session. Here is at least a loss of three days, consumed, or spoiled, in going, remaining at session, and returning home. There is also the actual money expenditure during these three days.

Fourthly—He has his title ransacked in open court, and is harassed by, in fact, two trials, of title and of value.

Fifthly—He has next to pay a stamp duty of two shillings and sixpence in order to obtain evidence of his right to vote.

Now all this vexation and expense takes place in every case in Ireland; even in a case most free from doubt or difficulty. The Englishman, for one shilling, and in less than three minutes, completes his title to vote. It will cost the Irishman, at least, five entire days, and, at the lowest possible calculation, one pound in money to complete his title to vote.

But, mark this distinction. The English elector pays one shilling, and no more; he can earn that shilling by half-a-day's labour. He pays no stamp duty.

The Irish elector pays in stamp duty alone two shillings and sixpence; he cannot earn these two shillings and sixpence by less than five days' labour. Thus, what the English elector pays for by half-a-day's labour, the Irish elector must consume five days' labour in tax alone.

But the greatest advantage to the English elector is still unexpressed; it is this: if the barrister in England shall presume to, contravene, or to disobey, in any one particular, the English Reform Bill, the English elector need not complain to any great man, or to any public body. He has a remedy in

his own hands; he brings his action, he appeals to a jury, he obtains compensation, and full costs of suit.

In Ireland, what a melancholy contrast! The Irish elector has no remedy whatsoever against the assistant-barrister, who may harass the elector, who may detain him, and postpone him, and dismiss his claim to register, upon the most idle, the most frivolous, the most vexatious pretext. This the assistant-barrister in Ireland can do with the most perfect impunity; no action lies against him—no compensation can possibly be obtained from him—no recourse to a jury—perfect impunity awaits him.

The barrister, under the English system, is deeply, immediately, personally, and pecuniarily responsible.

The barrister, under the Irish system, is completely irresponsible.

To be sure, if he were fool enough publicly to boast, or to admit that he acted from corrupt motives, he might be punished; but it is in the impossible case of any man being so insane as to make such an avowal alone, that any punishment could follow; yet, even then, the elector could get no compensation.

In England, the rights of the electors are secured, and the performance of the duty of the barrister is insured, by a perfect and complete responsibility.

In Ireland there is no security for the rights of the elector, or for the performance of the duty, because the barrister is perfectly and completely irresponsible.

One more extremely great advantage is possessed by the English elector—the evidence of his right to vote is put upon record—it consists of the county roll. He has only to point out his name on the list, and then his right to vote accrues.

Hitherto, the Irish voter had something of a similar privilege. When an elector succeeded under the present law in getting his vote registered, his affidavit of registry remained among the records of the county; and, at the election, that

affidavit was referred to, as the primary and perfectly sufficient evidence of the elector's right to vote. The elector could thus vote without entering into any controversy or personal altercation with his landlord. The evidence of his right was preserved for him on the public record.

Now this advantage Stanley takes away from the elector by his Reform Bill. It is believed that this flagrant injustice is the contrivance of the very decided and not a little virulent Tory that fills the influential office of Attorney-General in Ireland under the present most liberal and Whig Administration. Who is it could imagine it possible that this advantage should be taken away by Stanley, and that by a Reform Bill? The affidavit is still to be made, and filed, and preserved in the county records, but to no purpose, for no object; because it is no longer the evidence of the voter's right to vote.

The result is this: an elector in Ireland may have the good fortune to go through the gauntlet of the Session Court, through all the trials, all the journeys, and all the expense of registering. His right may have been adjudicated upon in his favour; his name placed in the county book; his affidavit of registry duly signed by the Court of Quarter Session, filed, and preserved on record. All this evidence is forthcoming; under these circumstances, he, as the law now stands, can vote at once, without difficulty.

But here is Stanley's knack at reforming. He, by the new Bill, destroys the force of all this cogent and conclusive evidence. He takes away its cogency—he annihilates its conclusive nature—and, by way of reform, he substitutes for his evidence of record—what? a certificate of registry, signed by the Assistant-Barrister, and by the acting Clerk of the Peace!!! This, indeed, is reforming with a vengeance!

Yet this change, which at first sight seems to be mere folly and absurd drivelling, is not so in reality. It has an object—Stanley, like great Cæsar, “ne'er does wrong without just cause.” He had an excellent reason of his own for this strange alteration. It is simply this: he intends to put into the hands of

the landlord an absolute power of preventing his tenants from voting at all, unless they vote as he pleases.

It cannot be, as he rather unblushingly pretends, to secure the payment of the stamp duty of two shillings and sixpence; because that duty might, with greater propriety, be attached to the affidavit of registry. No, no; his object is purely and simply to take away all self-will from the voter, and to make his vote the property of his landlord.

This he intends to effectuate thus: he knows full well that the Irish landlords have hitherto been in the habit of holding the custody of such certificates as have as yet been used only as an additional mode of facilitating the proof of registry. It is exceedingly difficult for a tenant to register without the aid of his landlord; and he has no chance of keeping his certificate from the custody of his landlord, unless he is prepared to quarrel with his landlord, and to set him at defiance, three, four, or five years, before an election, and at a time when no political excitement may exist—when, at all events, no candidates are, or can be, named—when no interest is roused as to the mode of voting. Stanley knows that thus the landlord will easily get possession of the certificates; they will thus have in their power the evidence on which alone the tenant can vote—the consequences are obvious—the tenant must vote as the landlord chooses, or not vote at all.

I observed very strongly on this piece of trick and dexterity in one of my letters in the Political Union. Stanley, in his last edition of the Irish Bill, has attempted a delusion on this point. He provides for the case of the certificate being withheld from the voter, by allowing him to procure a duplicate—a stamped duplicate—mark that! two shillings and sixpence more, on payment also of a fee of one shilling.

But this is a pure—I should call it, a shabby—delusion, for at what time is the certificate likely to be withheld? Why, at, or immediately before a contested election; and, I ask, where is the assistant-barrister then to be found. An obvious motive of delicacy would remove him from the county during a poli-

tical contest. But we need not give him so high a motive. His personal and professional interest will take him to Dublin when the session is not sitting; the duplicate certificate will be of no value without his signature; and even if a journey to Dublin were to be taken by each voter—rather an expensive thing from the more distant counties—yet the barrister would not be warranted, or least, could not be required, to sign the duplicate certificate without having the county book before him, which he could not have out of the county itself.

This piece of delusion is almost on a par with the introduction of a £10 chattel franchise, on terms of sixty years, in Stanley's Bill after my first letter. But he certainly had the candour to admit, that he made that concession in favour of the Orange counties of the north of Ireland, where alone he alleged he had evidence that tenures of that length of years existed. I retain my natural indignation on this topic. It only proves how truly I described Stanley's Reform Bill as an Orange or Conservative measure, calculated solely to advance the interests and increase the power of the Irish Tories and virulent Anti-Reformers, and to offer every species of injustice, insult, and contumely to the Irish Reformers and the magnanimous Irish people.

British Reformers, I have not described many and many of the defects which the Irish Reform Bill displays. I have, therefore, shown you that its franchises are restricted and aristocratic; its details insulting and injurious; its machinery contrived to annihilate all independence, and to reduce the electors of Ireland to the station of the burgage tenants of your late most rotten boroughs.

I now conclude; I have done this much, and this much only of my duty. British Reformers, what is yours?

I have the honour to be, Brother Reformers,

Your very faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

COERCION BILL, IRELAND.

*British Hotel, Jermyn-street, London,
13th February, 1846.*

MY DEAR SIR—I enclose you the following subscriptions for Repeal Rent for the month of February :—

Daniel O'Connell, M. P.,	..	£1	0	0
Maurice O'Connell, M. P.,	...	1	0	0
John O'Connell, M. P.,	...	1	0	0
Daniel O'Connell, Jun.,	...	1	0	0

I beg to call the immediate attention of the Association to the reports in the newspapers of this day of the alleged proceedings in the House of Lords. You will see that we are menaced with a Coercion Bill. The English Parliament does not dream of converting the parchment Union into the semblance of a real Union, by giving to the Irish nation equal franchises, equal representation, equal rights, equal religious freedom—in short, equal laws with those enjoyed by the people of England. A union, if it means anything distinct, must mean perfect equality between the inhabitants of the united countries. Ours is a servitude, and not a union; yet, there is not the least chance of the British Parliament placing us on a footing of equality with the English and Scotch nations; but they will have little hesitation in depriving Ireland even of the legal and constitutional right she at present possesses.

You will have seen by the papers, the line of conduct attributed to Earl Grey. You will have seen it without any surprise; he naturally vindicates his hereditary right to hold in contempt and unmitigated hatred the people of Ireland. He cheerily rejoices at the very mention of a Coercion Bill, and he offers the Government his ready services in promoting that measure. To be sure, he accompanies that offer with the expression of a demand for some measures of legislative relief to follow the Coercion Act; but all that is mere verbiage and

trash. The Government will readily give the Coercion Bill, but no identification of political rights; and that Government will plead his father's example for treating the people of Ireland as an inferior race, unworthy of political equalisation with the people of England.

It is perfectly true that frightful murders have been committed in Ireland; murders by the people, and murders upon the people; murders which, of course, cannot be justified, and which it is utterly impossible to palliate; murders that deserve the utmost penalty man can inflict; and murders which justly raise the red arm of God's vengeance upon the perpetrators.

There is no law to punish the murders inflicted by the clearance system; the landlords legally claim the right to do what they please with their own, regardless of the moral duties which ought to be necessarily attached to the rights of property. As to the just punishment, of those who commit assassination, there is no legal power wanting to work out that punishment.

What should be sought for and desired most anxiously by everybody is, to discover and firmly to obviate the causes which produce these frightful crimes, by taking away the temptation to commit them. We desire to suppress assassination, by suppressing every motive that may instigate to such a diabolical crime. The law should protect the people, and the people will then obey the law.

Coercion has been tried often enough, and long enough; it may occasionally create a lull for a time, but by tracing the history of Coercion Acts since the Union, you will find that the temporary suspension of Whiteboy outrages has been always followed by a recurrence of crimes of a deeper dye than those perpetrated on former occasions.

Let coercion give way to conciliation; let not the Parliament attempt to re-enact coercion laws, without first doing all that legislation can do to remove the causes of Irish discontent. Relief Bills—not mere temporary shifts and expedients—but political and permanent Relief Bills, what should be called Equalisation Bills—let such Bills precede, if it were even

merely as an experiment, the enactment of any unconstitutional or coercive law. I say to the Parliament: try first—justice, equality, assimilation of political rights; and, above all, repeal all the formidable powers given by the British Parliament to Irish landlords by several statutes passed since the Union. Take the relation of landlord and tenant into immediate consideration; above all, give to the occupier some security of tenure by, at least, allowing the tenant the full benefit of all the capital and labour expended by him in the improvement of the lands, and preventing his being dispossessed until he is recompensed in full for all valuable improvements.

Take up the principle of Lord Stanley's Bill in the last session, disembarassed from its vexatious restrictions and foolish details; let the Parliament, I say, legislate in this spirit for Ireland; let it give a sacredness to the tenant-right, before it dares to touch any of the constitutional rights which the people of Ireland now possess; those rights are not many, but they are valuable and protective. Let no ministry dare to think of infringing them by a Coercion Bill until they have first tried the experiment of justice, equalisation of civil rights, and protection to the honest and improving tenant.

I respectfully submit to the Association, that it ought immediately call on all the Irish Repeal members to attend in their places to meet the Coercion Bill as it comes from the Lords, and to meet it with the most decided and unequivocal hostility. There must be no compromise, no bartering of present rights, either for the promises or for the reality of future political liberties. Let us, if we can, drive the minister to try the only certain or rational preventative of crime, namely, the concession of conciliation, to be limited only by an equalisation with England or Scotland. Let us see the practical effect of such a plan, before we give the slightest assent to any coercive measures. Ours is the only effective plan—try justice before you enact despotism. Above all, I repeat, let there be nothing in the shape of compromise.

What a melancholy exhibition of political depravity it is

that men should be found ready to make any experiment of coercion, and most reluctant to try conciliation to arise from the concession of the equality of civil and religious rights.

I have been under the necessity of postponing my statement respecting the famine and pestilence which menace Ireland until Tuesday next. On that day, I think I may promise to bring the case of Ireland fully before the Parliament and public. We shall, no doubt, get abundance of kind words and warm expressions of solicitude for the people of Ireland; such shall be the words—what will be the deeds? I augur unfavourably. I think the measures necessary to preserve Ireland from the horrors of famine and pestilence, are too bold for the timidity of the ministry and the inclination of the House.

One thing alone is certain, that there is no substantial remedy for Ireland except in the restoration of her domestic Parliament.

Believe me to be, yours truly,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Martin Crean, Esq.,

Acting-Secretary, Loyal National Repeal Association.

*British Hotel, Jermyn-street, London,
Friday, Feb. 27, 1846.*

MY DEAR RAY—I was very much pleased to find that the Association had, under the auspices of Mr. Smith O'Brien, taken the initiative in denouncing and opposing the new Coercion Bill.

It is an atrocious measure. It should be opposed by every means the constitution leaves open. It is, I repeat, a very atrocious measure; and whereas all former Coercion Bills were merely temporary, and held out the consolation that, though they were oppressive and derogatory to constitutional rights, they were in their nature transitory and of short duration; they held out the certainty that the constitution would revive again, and that whatever of political rights and liberties the Union left to Ireland should be once more brought into action, and afford, against lawless invaders, some protection to the people of Ireland.

It is not so with this Algerine Act. It holds out the fiendish intention of being perpetual. It announces distinctly that, as long as the Union statute is law, this Coercion Bill shall be the charter of Irish slavery and degradation. It thus presents abundant reasons why every honest politician in Ireland should become a Repealer. It is the crowning measure of that degradation and injustice which is made to insult and oppress Ireland under the name of a Union. Shame! eternal shame and scorn to those who stand by in base apathy, or baser neglect, and see their countrymen trampled under foot by the hoofs of unconstitutional coercionists.

The first great objection, therefore, to the intended Coercion Bill is its perpetual nature. No minister would dare propose such a Bill for England—no minister would dare propose such a Bill for Scotland. It is only poor, trampled-down, and oppressed Ireland that is obnoxious to measures of this kind.

It is only Ireland, with which it is calculated there will be no sympathy or support. It is only wretched Ireland that can be crushed with perfect impunity.

Gracious Heaven! what a consummation of the Union. Scotland will continue to have a constitutional guarantee for person and property. No man can have his property taxed in Scotland by the capricious will of a single individual chosen by Government. No Scotchman can be arrested or imprisoned without legal process, and legal evidence of crime, nor without the means of legal redress in case of any abuse of the existing laws. Long may the people of Scotland enjoy the benefit of such protection.

England will continue to have a constitutional guarantee for person and property. No man can have his property taxed in England by the capricious will of a single individual chosen by Government—no Englishman can be arrested or imprisoned without legal process and legal evidence of crime, nor without the means of legal redress, in case of any abuse of the existing laws. Long may the people of England enjoy the benefit of such protection.

But, alas! for Ireland, the sacredness of property will exist only at the discretion—that is, the caprice—of Government. Proclamation may issue without cause, with nothing more than the allegation of a pretext—I may say with the allegation of the vicinity of a pretext—and behold at once all the property in the district is at the mercy of a single officer appointed by Government. Such officer may make any rate he thinks fit; he may levy any rate he thinks fit; he may seize on, by way of distraint, all the property of every occupier in the district, and sell off the distress so made to whom he pleases, and at what price he pleases.

Neither is the personal liberty of the Irishman more secure. He may, if this Bill passes into law, be arrested, or held to bail, or sent to and kept in prison at the caprice of every officer, superior, or subordinate. No legal evidence need be adduced—no legal protection is given—no *habeas corpus* can issue, or, if it do,

the "*sic volo, sic jubeo*," of a policeman concludes the question, and leaves the Irishman without relief.

And this is called a Union, and the Irish are to believe they are united to Great Britain. Yes, Lord Byron was right. It is a Union—a Union between the shark and its prey—between the devourer and the devoured.

But to return. I have said that my first objection to the Act was its perpetuity.

My second objection is to the title of the Bill. It is entitled, "A Bill for the better protection of life, and to facilitate the apprehension and detection of persons guilty of certain offences in Ireland."

This title is totally misapplied. It should be entitled, "A Bill to render property and life more insecure in Ireland, and to stimulate the people of that country to the commission of outrages and the perpetration of rebellion."

Should the proper time ever arrive for moving the insertion of the proper title, I would certainly move a title such in substance as I now describe to be prefixed to the Act.

Having thus given my first objection to the Act—namely, its perpetuity; and my second objection—namely, its false title, I proceed to my third objection, which is the miserably slight excuse which would authorise the Lord Lieutenant to place any part or parts of Ireland under the provisions of this Algerine Act. The process by which the country is made subject to the Act is by proclamation, and such proclamation may issue if any person commit murder, or even manslaughter, in any county, or part of a county, or shall shoot at, or stab, or cut, or wound anybody, or shall by any means whatsoever cause any bodily injury dangerous to life. In every such case, wide and extensive as it is, and trivial as may be some of such offences, yet, if any of them be committed, the Lord Lieutenant is by this Bill authorised to proclaim, not only the county where the offence was committed, but also any such part of any adjoining county as he may think fit. And he may then hand over not only the county in which the offence was committed

but also any adjoining innocent county, to as many resident magistrates, to as many sub-inspectors of constabulary, to as many head constables, to as many constables, and to as many sub-constables as he may think proper—all, all of whom are to be supported, clothed, paid, maintained, and provided for at the expense of the occupiers of the districts or counties included in the proclamation.

But still further. It is not necessary that any offence should be committed in or adjoining to any such proclaimed district. A county and an adjoining county may be proclaimed, without any offence having been committed in either; for it is precluded to inquire into the cause or pretext of issuing the proclamation. The people may be able to prove that no offence whatsoever was committed; yet that will not avail; the proclamation is itself, by the fifth section of the Bill, made conclusive evidence of its own validity.

There it is, the absolute and uncontrolled power of a Lord Lieutenant to proclaim any part of Ireland at his will, pleasure, or caprice. No inquiring into the facts he alleges—no proof allowed to prove the untruth of his reasons for acting. He wishes it; he chooses and he does it; the country is outlawed, and his fiat is fate.

If this be not despotism, I know not what is. We used to call these coercion acts "Algerine Acts," but since the French have introduced law and order to parts of Algeria, the name no longer applies.

Let us then, in future, call these Bills Russian ukases, in honour of Nicholas!!!

I cannot conclude my remarks upon this Bill by this post. There are other matters which require my immediate communication with the Association.

Before I proceed, let me remark, and state my thorough conviction, that Ireland cannot have greater enemies than the Whigs among the peers. Nobody can be surprised at the line of conduct adopted by the Marquis of Lansdowne, or by Earl Grey. Some persons expected better from Lord Clanricarde;

but I really do not see that there were the least grounds for such an expectation. He has no claim to be considered an Irishman that I know of.

I am now anxious that the Association should distinctly understand the position we are placed in. The Association is most anxious to have the country free from the horrors of the wholesale murders of the clearance system, and of the often retaliatory and hideous assassinations. The Coercion Bill does not even purport to give any remedy for the crimes of the landlords, and it is more likely to provoke additional assassination than to check the progress of crime, or bring to punishment those who are already stained with the guilt of perpetrating those crimes.

What we allege is this:—

Firstly—That we are more anxious than the Government to prevent the commission of every kind of crime, and above all, the horrible crime of murder, whether perpetrated by landlord or tenant, occupier or proprietor.

Secondly—All former Coercion Acts have, after a short time, lost their force, and become, in truth, stimulants to additional atrocities.

Thirdly—That it is time to reverse the order of proceeding, and to begin with such conciliatory measures and laws as will place Ireland on perfect equality in civil, religious, and political rights with England and Scotland.

Fourthly—That the state of the Irish agricultural population should be taken into immediate consideration, with a view to relief, and to have the system of landlord and tenant ameliorated, so that there should be stability given to the occupation of the tenant, without prejudice to the landlord's right to an adequate rent.

Fifthly—That the emaciating evils arising from the Union, and the consequent absenteeism of our great proprietors, may be mitigated, by allowing to the tenant all the money, and the value of all labour expended by him in the improvement of the land in his occupation.

This, especially, we insist upon—that these measures of justice, conciliation, and peace, shall be carried out in legal and active operation, before any minister of the Crown shall dare bring into the House of Commons any Coercion Bill, or, in more appropriate phrase, any “Russian Ukase,” against Ireland.

It is true, that it has been said, that Sir Robert Peel has pledged himself, in answer to my questions, to bring in Bills on the part of the Government, to extend the franchises, and ameliorate the condition of the people of Ireland.

He has been reproached with this as a crime, by many of his former supporters. He is not guilty of any such crime. He is pledged to no such measures.

What has occurred is this: I gave notice of four questions to be put to Sir Robert Peel, giving him full opportunity to consider his replies. My questions related to Bills to be brought in by the Government.

My first question related to any Bill for the extension of the franchise in Ireland.

Sir Robert Peel’s answer was most unsatisfactory. He said, he hoped that the Government would be able to bring in a Bill regulating the registry of voters in counties in Ireland, and also for altering, in some degree, the franchises. He said nothing of extension of franchise. He said nothing of regulating the registry in towns and cities, where a new regulation is most wanted.

It is quite clear, therefore, that he pledged himself to nothing—not even that he would positively bring in any such Bill this session. But when it is recollected that Lord Stanley’s Bill, which went to annihilate the franchises in Ireland, was entitled, “A Bill to Regulate the Registry of Voters,” it will be seen how very chary Sir Robert Peel was to pledge himself to anything useful to Ireland, or, in fact, to anything definite.

My second question related to an augmentation of Irish members in a just proportion.

To this question he gave no answer; he was totally silent.

My third question related to an equalization of franchise and powers in the municipal corporations.

To this question his answer was nearly satisfactory. As I understood him, he promised a Bill for equalization, with, however, some reservation. What this reservation was to be he did not state. I am, however, afraid of him; the word "reservation," allows him to omit the most material franchise. It may mean much less; but at all events it is an ugly word, and I am afraid of it.

My fourth question related to a Bill to give to the tenants the full value of all their improvements.

To this question his answer was vague and unsatisfactory. He, however, gave a hope of bringing in a Bill on that subject; but his description of the intended Bill would answer such a Bill as Lord Stanley brought into the Lords last year. The tendency of what he said pointed at some such Bill as Lord Stanley's. He said nothing that could in any respect show his intention to bring in a Bill sufficiently extensive in its operations to be satisfactory to the tenants.

Upon the whole, therefore, it will be seen that Sir Robert Peel is guilty of no deceit. He has given no distinct pledge or promise, and what he did say was not by any means satisfactory. But the truth is this—promises, however distinct and emphatic, could not be accepted as any mitigation of, or compensation for a Coercion Bill.

What we reasonably insist on is, before any Coercion Bill should be brought in, that a new system should be actually acted upon. Franchises should be equalized, representation should be made more just and adequate, civil and religious rights should be equalized, and the law of landlord and tenant mitigated, to meet the evils of the Union and of absenteeism.

Let these things be done before any man talks to me of a Coercion Bill. Let no man dare to talk to us of a Coercion Bill until he has tried the experiment of justice. It is quite

clear that, until the causes of the murders are done away with, coercion cannot be a preventative, and can scarcely produce any but unavailing punishment. It will, however, produce more irritation and greater desperation.

But, let the people beware—let them recollect that the rebellion of '98 was got up, and fomented, and fostered into existence, to carry the Union. Let them be convinced that there are enough of evil-disposed persons ready to foment another rebellion, in order to prevent the Repeal of the Union.

There never was a period when it was so incumbent on the people of Ireland to be perfectly peaceable, and to keep within the strictest limits of the law.

It is in our peaceable exertions alone that we can hope to defeat this atrocious measure. The Bill is not as yet law, and we are entitled and bound to denounce it to the opposition and hatred of our country.

There is one comfort: the attempt to continue the government of Ireland by the means of coercion, with a refusal to do us justice, is an additional stimulant to augment the numbers and increase the zeal of the Repealers. The demonstration is complete. There is no peace, no tranquillity, no prosperity for Ireland, save in the Repeal of the Union and the restoration of Irish nationality.

Believe me to be, yours very faithfully,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

T. M. Ray, Esq.

But, to crown all, and, as if it were in utter contempt of the Commons of what is called the United Kingdom, this Bill, with such enormous powers of taxation, is made to originate in the House of Lords, which House, all constitutional authority tells us, has no power whatsoever to originate any taxation.

We say, with sorrowful respect for our masters, Lord St. Germain and others, that they ought not to carry their power of insulting the people of Ireland to quite so great an extent. A little moderation would become them, were it ever so little.

Let me, however, in the exercise of my duty, remind our worthy lords and masters, that Lord Devon's Commission has told the world the astounding fact, that the agricultural population of Ireland, being more than four millions, endure greater privations and suffering than any other people in civilized Europe.

Would it not be better to devote time, attention, and legislation to ameliorate, in some degree, the condition of so miserable a population, instead of devoting time, attention, and legislation to devise modes of unconstitutional coercion for that unhappy people.

There are many other horrible clauses in this Bill which I shall recur to again. But I wish to pause for one moment to call the marked and deliberate attention to the most important and absorbing consideration of one simple fact.

That matter of fact is this—that the entire scope of the Bill treats with indiscriminate and undistinguishing severity the innocent as well as the guilty, and more especially that in the attempt to detect a comparatively small number engaged in crime, punishment is not inflicted alone on the guilty smaller number, but is equally inflicted on the innocent great majority.

Thus, for example, a crime is committed, for it is all the same, in one district or county, and immediately a proclamation may issue of outlawry, not only against the district or county in which the crime was committed, but also any adjoining district or county. The number of criminals in such case

The sixth power enables the Lord Lieutenant to appoint "such person" or "officer"—these are the words of the Act—"as he shall think fit, with full authority to make such rates as the Lord Lieutenant may deem necessary on every occupier whatsoever within the district." There is no limit to the Lord Lieutenant's caprice. The rate may amount to the entire value of the property of each occupier; no matter; a valid rate to the full extent of the last shilling the occupiers are worth may be made, and there is no relief, no remedy, no traverse, no appeal.

Mark, my countrymen, such a Bill as this is called a Bill for the protection of property!

The seventh power which the Lord Lieutenant acquires by his own proclamation is, that of levying and collecting such capricious rate, though it were, as I have said, to the full value of all the property in the district, and such collection or levying is to be made by the constabulary and other force in the district, who are authorised to distrain furniture, goods, chattels, cattle, corn, hay, potatoes, and, in short, all the property of the occupants, and to sell the distress for payment of the rate.

There is then a provision of a most oppressive nature—that is, that the entire rate shall be payable by, and levied on, the actual occupiers; and whereas the rate is based upon the poor rate, yet the Bill contains this provision, that, although persons holding lands under the value of £4 a year are considered too poor to be charged with poor rate, yet these wretched paupers are chargeable to the proclamation rate to be made pursuant to this Bill.

Another provision of the Bill is equally emphatic—it exempts (oh, let this be held in perpetual recollection) the landlords!—that is, the rich, from the payment of any part of the rates, and expressly provides that the tenant or occupier shall not deduct from his landlord any part of the rates.

There have been already many Coercion Bills for Ireland, but none of so unconstitutional a nature as far as relates to levying money off the subjects. In that respect this Bill stands pre-eminent in its unconstitutional atrocity.

Opinion of Lord Devon's Commission.

But, to crown all, and, as if it were in utter contempt of the Commons of what is called the United Kingdom, this Bill, with such enormous powers of taxation, is made to originate in the House of Lords, which House, all constitutional authority tells us, has no power whatsoever to originate any taxation.

We say, with sorrowful respect for our masters, Lord St. Germain and others, that they ought not to carry their power of insulting the people of Ireland to quite so great an extent. A little moderation would become them, were it ever so little.

Let me, however, in the exercise of my duty, remind our worthy lords and masters, that Lord Devon's Commission has told the world the astounding fact, that the agricultural population of Ireland, being more than four millions, endure greater privations and suffering than any other people in civilized Europe.

Would it not be better to devote time, attention, and legislation to ameliorate, in some degree, the condition of so miserable a population, instead of devoting time, attention, and legislation to devise modes of unconstitutional coercion for that unhappy people.

There are many other horrible clauses in this Bill which I shall recur to again. But I wish to pause for one moment to call the marked and deliberate attention to the most important and absorbing consideration of one simple fact.

That matter of fact is this—that the entire scope of the Bill treats with indiscriminate and undistinguishing severity the innocent as well as the guilty, and more especially that in the attempt to detect a comparatively small number engaged in crime, punishment is not inflicted alone on the guilty smaller number, but is equally inflicted on the innocent great majority.

Thus, for example, a crime is committed, for it is all the same, in one district or county, and immediately a proclamation may issue of outlawry, not only against the district or county in which the crime was committed, but also any adjoining district or county. The number of criminals in such case

would, at least, in all probability, not exceed six or eight; the number of persons effectually punished in their property, would amount to ten thousand, twenty thousand, or perhaps, one hundred thousand, or even more.

It is a maxim in our law, and often quoted by the best of our judges, that it is better that one hundred guilty should escape than that one innocent should suffer. This Bill, however, goes on a directly opposite principle. It punishes one hundred innocent, upon the chance of inflicting chastisement upon one guilty.

And all this medley of legislation is facetiously called a Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

I reserve the consideration of the other and most hideous clauses for my next letter.

For the present I have only to observe, that it is reported that Lord St. Germain has graciously condescended to limit the duration of the Act to about four years. I hope and trust the firmness displayed by the Repeal Association has made him shrink from the more atrocious enactment; but the little lord is not to escape in that way. He formed, fostered, and matured the Bill, with all the odious tyranny of a perpetual law. If Ireland shall ever have justice done her, the iniquity of the project will, I trust, be adequately punished.

For my own part, I will not spare him a single observation. What a miserable estimate he must form of our love of constitutional rights. Freedom reckons by the hour—liberty is counted by the day; and he who would acquiesce in one day, one hour of servitude, is as despicable a miscreant as the base tyrant who imposes the chain.

My fifth objection to the Bill is the unlimited power it gives over the persons of the Irish people.

By the 15th and 16th sections, any person who happens to be out of his place of abode, at any time from one hour after sunset until sunrise, may be arrested by any constable or policeman, that is, by anybody, and transported for fifteen years. Mark the offence, and mark the punishment! Gracious

heaven! fifteen years' transportation for being out of a man's house for five minutes.

It is not necessary to give any proof against him but the fact of his being out in the open air. It is not necessary to prove that he was out for any unlawful purpose. I repeat, the only proof, under this Bill, to enable the court, whatever it be, to condemn to fifteen years' transportation, is the mere fact of his being in the open air within the prohibited hours.

The prosecutor in such a case is bound to no proof of guilt; but the unhappy prisoner is told he will be allowed to prove his innocence!!!

See what a total violation of the first principles of our criminal law this is. Our criminal law declares emphatically, in the language of all the judges, that every British subject is to be deemed and taken as innocent until his guilt is proved—proved on the oath of witnesses. But this Bill reverses the maxim, and declares the man guilty unless he is able to prove, on the oath of witnesses, his innocence.

Fifteen years' transportation upon an accusation, unless innocence be proved!!!

I have often spoken harshly of the Emperor Nicholas, but I will do him the justice to say, that I do not believe he ever issued such a ukase as this.

The sixth objection to the Act is another frightful power. It is one enabling the magistrates to issue a warrant to enable any person to break, by force, into any house in which liquor of any kind is sold, in a proclaimed district, and to arrest any person in the house not being an inmate or traveller; and such person, for the mere fact of being in such a house within the prohibited hours, is liable to fifteen years' transportation.

Mark this: a man is found in a house, where liquor is sold, at night, unarmed, defenceless, and for that offence—offence!—he is liable to be transported for fifteen years.

I am sick of this Bill. There is a group of other offences—some not punishable at all at common law, and the others punishable only by fine or imprisonment—which are made

liable, in proclaimed districts, to transportation for fifteen years.

Two topics more, briefly touched, will bring me to a conclusion.

The first relates to the imperative necessity of every Repealer exerting himself to prevail on the people to keep the peace, and not to violate the law. There never was a period when it was so emphatically true—"That whoever commits a crime strengthens the enemy."

The next topic relates to what fills my mind with the bitterest anguish, namely, the hideously mistaken and unconstitutional course that the Ministry adopt in respect to Ireland. We, Repealers, are most anxious to put an end to crime, and to see the country tranquillized. We know that it can be done by adopting the proper course. Let the Irish people be conciliated, instead of Coercion Bills.

Firstly—Bring in Bills to equalize in Ireland the elective franchise with that in England.

Secondly—Give Ireland her equal proportion of representatives in the House of Commons.

Thirdly—Give Ireland equal municipal rights with England, and give them without reservation.

Fourthly—Above all things immediately amend the law of landlord and tenant. Give the landlord his adequate rent, but secure to the tenant possession of the land until he shall be repaid for all actual improvements made by him upon the premises.

Fifthly—Place the law of landlord and tenant upon the same footing with the law respecting all other contracts, and take away all the relics of the feudal superiority of the landlord.

Sixthly—Impose, without delay, a heavy absentee tax in Ireland upon all non-resident landlords, and apply the produce to lighten the burdens of county cess and poor rates on the occupying tenants.

Let the Government do all these things before it presumes to bring into the House of Commons a Bill to trample down all constitutional rights and liberties. They may deem it a

shorter and easier course to abrogate the constitution than to concede constitutional equality.

Is the Parliament of Britain only competent to coerce, and not to equalize, the franchises and rights of both countries? I believe so.

Still there is one course open to them—it is that of abdicating a power which they abuse, and cannot apply to useful purposes.

Let them avow their incapacity, and restore to the people of Ireland their domestic legislature. Let them thus establish tranquillity and prosperity in Ireland, secure the stability of the Throne, and the permanence of the connection between both countries.

Believe me to be, very faithfully yours,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

To T. M. Roy, Esq.

*British Hotel, Jermyn-street, London,
20th March, 1846.*

MY DEAR RAY—The atrocious Bill has been brought into the House of Commons from the House of Lords. This more than Russian ukase is now before us in a still more unconstitutional shape than it assumed when it was brought into the House of Lords.

I have already detailed many prominent objections to the Bill. Objections accumulate, however, as one goes along, and more overpowering disgust is excited and, indeed, required by the additional unconstitutional enactments now contained in the Bill.

One would have supposed that the violation of every constitutional principle was exhausted in the parts of the Bill which I have already commented upon, but that is a mistake. The framers of this Bill have found out another constitutional principle to be violated, and they have taken care to give the Bill a vicious perfection by outraging that principle.

The principle to which I allude is that which prohibits the enactment of an *ex post facto* law, so that no punishment shall be inflicted for any action which was not penal at the time of its being done.

Look to this Bill for an illustration of that rule, and for its gross violation, and you will find the section, now marked No. 2, which was introduced into it for the express purpose of punishing bygone alleged crimes—that is, crimes alleged to have been committed heretofore. Take, for example, the occupiers of land in a particular district. The Lord Lieutenant was empowered by a former statute to proclaim a district, as requiring an additional constabulary force, for being in what he may call a state of disturbance; but the innocent occupiers of that district were not made liable by the then existing law to the enormous mulcts and pecuniary fines (for they are such in substance) contained in the present Bill. But what is done at

present by this Bill is, that it transfers the pecuniary punishments under this Bill, and gives that punishment by reason of the issue of a proclamation and of disturbances that existed eighteen or twenty-four months ago, or perhaps still further back.

No matter how far back the former disturbances or proclamation may be, they are all hooked in *ex post facto* by the present Bill, and the punishment for them may be the forfeiture of the entire property of the occupiers of the district, or at least of some of them, probably of many.

There is an insulting affectation at humanity in lessening the punishment of being absent from the dwelling-house within prohibited hours from fifteen years' transportation to only seven. Mark the crime, and mark the humane punishment. The crime is, being five minutes, or even less, out of the dwelling-house at night; the punishment is only seven years' transportation. And this, forsooth, is merciful! And this is boasted of as being a great concession; the former punishment being fifteen years' transportation, just as if the term made any difference to the unhappy Irish peasant. How is he ever to come back from New South Wales? And then the severance of his dearest affections—the tearing of his heart-strings. . . . But I must desist; it almost maddens me to think of such a punishment for such a crime, and especially when the proof of innocence is thrown upon the accused, and not the proof of guilt upon the accuser—a most manifest perversion of law and justice.

There is another perversion of law and justice incidentally introduced into the eighth section; it is this—it is provided by the section that, in the first instance, when a person is arrested for being out of his habitation at night he shall be brought before the magistrates at petty sessions, who are to investigate the case; if the majority of the magistrates are against him, he is to be committed to gaol as a matter of course. Suppose the magistrates equally divided, one would imagine that the accused would have the benefit of that division, especially for so trivial an offence; but no such thing. Equality on the bench is equivalent to a majority against the prisoner.

This iniquitous law comes in with a casting vote against the unhappy prisoner, and thus, in everything, great and small, tramples upon constitutional liberty.

The eleventh and twelfth sections are ludicrously verbose and atrociously severe.

Referring to proclaimed districts, the eleventh section enacts the punishment of transportation for any person who may be found in a house of public resort, licensed.

Secondly—In an unlicensed house.

Thirdly—In any house in which malt liquors are sold.

Fourthly—In any house in which spirituous liquors are sold.

Fifthly—In any house in which malt liquors are consumed.

Sixthly—In any house in which tea, or coffee, or provisions, liquors, or refreshments of any sort are sold.

Seventhly—In any house in which tea, or coffee, or provisions, liquors, or refreshments are consumed.

Eighthly—Or in any shop wherein tea, coffee, provisions, or liquors, or refreshments are sold.

Ninthly—In any shop wherein tea, coffee, provisions, liquors, or refreshments of any sort are consumed.

Tenthly—Or in any room wherein tea, coffee, provisions, liquors, or refreshments of any sort are sold.

Eleventhly—Or in any room in which tea, coffee, provisions, liquors, or refreshments of any sort are consumed.

I have thus been minute in analyzing the eleventh section, in order that there may be no disguise practised by reason of the verbose nature of the Act. Dissecting the section, as I have done, that it might run in these words, for this is its meaning:—

“Be it enacted, that any person not being one of the family or a traveller, found within any house in the proclaimed district, within the prohibited hours, is liable to seven years’ transportation.”

The crime consists in being in any house but one’s own in the district. I say, emphatically, in any house; for, surely, in every house malt liquor, or spirituous liquor, or tea, or coffee

or provisions, or liquor generally, including water, or refreshment of some sort, is consumed.

It is, therefore, totally idle to enumerate the particulars. The words, "any house," supplies the same meaning, and would be more simple in expression, if simplicity were not a thing carefully avoided by the framers of the Bill.

Under this section, therefore, if a gentleman dines with his neighbour—if a farmer takes a glass of punch in a friend's house—even, if a lady takes a cup of tea with any of her acquaintances in the district—the gentleman, the farmer, and the lady are, each and every of them, guilty of a misdemeanour, and liable to be transported, unless they return home before one hour after sunset.

Behold what ludicrous and absurd legislation! It includes in guilt, everybody, and every house, and every liquor, including water. Alas for the poor teetotallers!

Let me here remark another peculiarity in this penal section. Any person found in another person's house within the prohibited hours, is liable to transportation by the very fact, and is not allowed the miserable privilege of proving the negative of crime, namely, that he was there on a lawful occasion.

The reason of concealing the real meaning of the eleventh section, by smothering that meaning with verbiage, is discovered by the twelfth section.

For, mark, the twelfth section authorises any justice of the peace, or anyone having a warrant from him for that purpose, to demand admission into any such house as is included in the eleventh section; and, in case admission is not given in what such person shall deem a reasonable time, to break open the door, and enter by force into the house! In England, every man's house is his castle, until some offence is charged upon him by oath. In Ireland, neither oath nor crime is necessary; all is left to the discretion of the magistrate, or his deputy. And this is the way that the Union is worked out.

A few words more, and I shall have closed.

The fourteenth section, among other things, enacts that if

any person shall, by any means howsoever, endeavour to deter or intimidate any person from appearing or acting as a witness, he shall be guilty of a transportable offence.

Now, nobody should be intimidated from appearing as a witness; but it may be quite justifiable, and even a duty, to deter a false-witness from appearing as a witness, by representing to him the horrid guilt of perjury, and the extreme iniquity of accusing an innocent person. This would be a duty and not a crime; and yet, for the performance of this duty a man may be punished by seven years' transportation.

There is one important observation more: In general, a transportable offence is made a felony. By this Act, there is no felony created, all the offences are misdemeanours.

Would you wish to know the reason? Would you wish to understand the secret? Listen!

At present, every man who is tried in Ireland for a felony has twenty peremptory challenges to the jurors. He can set aside twenty jurors without assigning any cause. Any man tried in Ireland for a misdemeanour has no peremptory challenge.

Do you understand?

I have now gone through many clauses of the Bill. There are others which, in a Bill of less atrocious features, would deserve a marked reprobation. But I have done. I am wearied and disgusted with this preposterous attempt to legislate for Ireland.

Thus punishing the effects, and taking no care to remove the causes.

"Misery in Ireland, unequalled in any other country in Europe," says the Devon Commissioners. Not one particle of alleviation of the causes of that misery. No Coercion Bill for the landlords who exterminate by the clearance system. No mitigation of the facilities for working out that most sanguinary system. Coercion, and no remedy for the innumerable evils that produce the maddening misery of the Irish peasant.

Let me, however, be distinctly understood. There is no excuse for murder; nothing can excuse it. There is no palliation for

murder; nothing can palliate it. There is no mitigation of the diabolical crime of murder.

Whoever commits the infernal crime of murder deserves justly all the punishment the law of man can inflict. Against the murderer the red arm of God's vengeance is bared. “Vengeance is mine,” saith the Lord, “and I will repay.” Yes, the vengeance of God will, sooner or later, meet the murderer, and his unatoned-for crime will plunge him in eternal reprobation.

Every honest man, every good man, every Christian should assist in detecting and bringing to punishment the murderer. Every man who does not assist in the detection and punishment of the murderer, participates in the horrible guilt of his crime.

Ireland can never prosper as long as those crimes continue. The curse of heaven is upon those crimes.

Would to heaven that Government were wise enough to remove the causes of our miseries and crimes; but, alas! it would require all the knowledge, and all the interest and anxiety of a domestic Legislature, to procure such blessed results.

Yours very faithfully,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

To T. M. Ray, Esq.

The following letter explains O'Connell's most private feelings, and we may add, reveals his keen, and too little appreciated, sufferings in connection with the "Young Ireland" question.

LETTER TO THE RIGHT REV. DR. BLAKE, LORD BISHOP OF
DROMORE.

Merrion-square, Dublin, November 21st, 1846.

MY EVER REVERED AND VENERATED LORD—For the fifty years that I have been engaged in politics, I never received so deep and heart-rending a pang as by the receipt of your letter of the 20th instant. Oh, how unhappy I am that you, my loved and venerated lord, should not more distinctly behold the real cause of disunion between us—between us, sincere Repealers, and those who have seceded from us. You do, indeed, my dearest lord, wrong me, if you think that I am not most intensely anxious to heal the dissension that has arisen in our body. There is no practicable sacrifice that I would not make for the purpose of reconciliation. I would consent to any personal disgrace or ignominy for that purpose. I would suffer any infliction for that purpose. I would consent that seceders should spit in my face, instead of shaking hands, for that purpose. Do not, my ever venerated and loved lord, doubt my perfect sincerity. But there are things which I cannot do, and which you are certainly the last man living to advise me to do—namely, to sacrifice principle, and to risk and put in jeopardy the liberties and even the lives of all the members of the Association.

The point hinges upon this. We, the sincere Repealers, have placed the basis of our exertions on this: the carrying the Repeal by peaceable, legal, and constitutional means, and by *none other*. The seceders, on the contrary, insist that, in case

we do not succeed by peaceable and legal means, we should reserve to ourselves the use, in any favourable opportunity, of the sword.

Now, my venerated lord, I solemnly, as a lawyer of many years' standing, assure your lordship, with the most perfect truth, that the plan of the seceders would, if we were to accede to or even tolerate it in the Association, involve every member of the Association, including your lordship, in the guilt of high treason.

I do not, my dearest lord, deceive you—I am incapable of doing it—and I most emphatically tell you, that, if we were to-morrow to admit the seceders upon their own principles, we should either dissolve the Association or render ourselves, in point of law, liable to at least imprisonment, with the greatest risk of incurring actual execution on a scaffold.

I now, my venerated lord, conjure you to withdraw your letter, and not to require it to be read in the Association. If I were in your presence, I would go on my knees to ask this favour. I do pray you not to refuse me.

Such a letter, coming from you, and making light of the difference between us and the seceders, would be considered by the public, and made use of by the seceders, as an approval of their physical-force principles; as an approval, in short, of the illegality and treasonable nature of their principles.

I know full well that no man living would be farther than you, my lord, from intentionally giving the slightest sanction to the doctrines of the seceders.

I have received much and many acts of kindness from your lordship. No man can revere you more than I do. In one thing alone can I compete with your lordship, and that is, in the knowledge of law; and I solemnly assure you as a lawyer, that allowing the seceders to return to the Association without disavowing physical force, would involve us all in the guilt, and many of us in the punishment, of treason.

Permit me, then, my dear lord, once more to ask you to withdraw your letter. I shall not call at the Post-office for the £3 until I hear from you again.

I have the honour to be, with the most profound respect and veneration,

My ever dearest Lord,

Your ever devoted humble servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

O'CONNELL'S REPEAL POLICY.

Letter to the Right Rev. Dr. Blake, Bishop of Dromore.

Derrynane Abbey, September 18th, 1840.

MY DEAR AND REVERED LORD—I cannot describe the pleasure which your lordship's letter of the 3rd inst. gave me. I was beyond expression delighted at the sanction which your deliberate and calm judgment confers on my now exclusive plan for the amelioration of Ireland—the restoration of our domestic Legislature. But that satisfaction had, I trust, a higher and better foundation than anything personal to myself could have. Yes, my cordial gratification at its contents was founded on this—that such a letter coming from a Prelate of your lordship's retiring and unobtrusive habits, and of—I must say it—your high character for learning and piety, is actually part of our means of success—assuring as it does the timid that under such auspices as yours the Repeal of the Union agitation must be carried on, and its triumphant result secured, by means exclusively moral and peaceable, without the violation of any law—human or divine—and without injury to person or to property.

Your letter is also of inestimable value by the declaration it contains of your adhesion to this now demonstrated truth—that there is no possibility of the people of Ireland obtaining the redress of any of their multitudinous grievances from the British Legislature. Whatever may happen with respect to the “Repeal” (*sic.*) this, at least, is certain; that the present House of Commons will do but little indeed for us, whilst the House of Lords, by an overwhelming majority, ostentatiously and insultingly proclaims a determination to do nothing beneficial for Ireland,

and to take away as much from us as they can; a determination also evinced with respect to the elective franchise the most precious of all existing human rights, by six majorities of the House of Commons, in no less than four of which the ministers themselves and all their supporters were defeated. After this, my lord, you are justified in thinking that our domestic legislature is the only source from which we can possibly derive redress or relief.

I should, of course, have felt it my duty to acknowledge, as I now do in the most respectful manner, the honour of your lordship's letter; but this acknowledgment is now dictated firmly by the command of a body destined, I believe, to engrave its name on the brightest page of Irish history—"The Loyal Repeal Association of Ireland."

Your letter was manifestly intended to be laid before that body; I accordingly and proudly laid it before them, and they have, by a formal resolution, commanded me to reply to the statement so clearly and so distinctly made by your lordship, of the principal objections raised by the "Unionists" to the restoration of the Irish Parliament. I proceed to do that with all that sincerity which is due to the revered prelate whom I address, and to the gravity and vital importance of the subject of which I treat.

The first objection, in point of order, which is stated in your lordship's letter, as made "under the form of supposition," is this—"In the event of England declaring war, might not the Irish Legislature differ in opinion from her, and refuse the supplies of men and money?"

My answer is unequivocal; certainly, my lord, such a case may arise. The difficulty may arise. The fact is not to be denied; the amount of evil arising from the possible existence of such a fact, or even from its actual existence, is really the matter to be discussed.

I contend, that the possibility of such a fact would be no evil. I contend, further, that its actual occurrence, if it shall

occur, would be no evil, but one of the greatest advantages and blessings to be derived from the Repeal of the Union.

Let me first observe, that there is an inaccuracy in talking of *England* going to war. It is not the English nation that goes to war; the prerogative of making peace or declaring war belongs exclusively to the reigning monarchy. If the monarch of England declared war, it would also be a declaration of war by the monarch of Ireland. Ireland would, therefore, be equally at war as England; the monarch of both being at present, and, of right continuing always one and the same person.

Now, the objection really exists with the same theoretic force, and has the same solution if England stood alone in the world, and Ireland were, as the late Sir Joseph York wished, sunk in the bottom of the ocean.

Our Constitution is not formed to run in all things together smoothly—that is the principle of a despotism; but one of checks and reciprocal control in which consists, if not the principle, at least the practice of free institutions.

If England, as I said, stood alone, the objection above stated applies to her. England—that is, the monarch—may be at war, and the English House of Commons may refuse the supplies of men and money. Nay, further, England may be at war, and the Commons may vote the supplies of men and money, but the House of Lords may refuse both, and resist altogether supplies voted by the Commons. This objection, therefore, already exists in the English Constitution, is inherent in that Constitution, and is one of its advantages and not matter of censure. The just cause of censure is, that this constitutional advantage has not been more frequently made available by either House, and profligate wars more frequently prevented or terminated.

The real strength of the objection is this: that it is more probable that one Parliament should grant supplies, than that two would concur in granting them. I admit that such probability exists; but what a paltry objection it is to do so great a

national measure as the giving Ireland the income of her own soil to spend, and the protection of her own Legislature, that forsooth one thing is more probable than another. But [there is still more: is it at all probable that if the war were in its nature just and necessary, and engaged in to promote or to vindicate the essential interests of these countries, that the Irish Parliament would, any more than the English, refuse the supplies. Alas! the contrary is the fact, and all history proves it: that popular assemblies are more ready to approve of and support wars, than monarchs themselves; and Irish history shows that the Irish Parliament, during its separate existence, more particularly from the days of Charles I. to the Union, and especially at the glorious era of 1782, equalled, if not exceeded the means of this country in the liberality of the supplies of men and money.

The former history of the Irish Parliament is, therefore, an additional answer to the supposed objection.

But I will banish the supposition, and take for granted the reality. Would not such reality be a blessing—I would say almost a celestial blessing; because it would be an additional obstacle placed in the way of going to war at all. Can there be anything more desirable than another impediment to going to war? What is war? The multiplication and congregation of all human sufferings and all human immoralities; all these crimes which disgrace individuals, and render them obnoxious to punishment by human law and bring down the vengeance of God. All these crimes are the daily occupation of the state and existence of war. Besides the occasional occurrence of such horrors as the 15th regiment perpetrated in Canada, and as were enacted on a larger scale upon our allies, the Spanish inhabitants of Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajos, and St. Sebastian. It is not, my lord, possible to describe in language of suitable horror, the plunderings, the vileness, the violations, the multiplied murders that were committed with perfect impunity upon the Spanish people, our allies and friends, by the *glorious heroes*, as they are called, who captured these towns.

Yes, I do hope the Irish Parliament will stop supplies when required to carry into effect such atrocities. I do confidently address you, my lord, for YOU are a minister of PEACE. I confidently address you and your colleagues in the ministry of the God of charity, in favour of that Irish Parliament, which might, and I hope, would, render war less frequent, and would prevent the recurrence of all the enormities of that horrible state.

But I put the matter on another footing. Let any rational man look back to all the wars in which England has been engaged for more than a century. Let men look at their causes their mode of being carried on, and their results, and tell me what interest had the people of England therein. But I am now on the Repeal, and will confine myself to Ireland. I therefore, ask to be shown what interest had the people of Ireland in any of these wars?

The two latest, for example, the American war of Revolution and the French war. What had the people of Ireland to gain by these wars? What interest had they in them? The first was a war against American liberty. The interest of the Irish people was against, not for that war. Yet what oceans of Irish blood was shed in that accursed quarrel, and we are groaning still beneath the burdens it has created. So, likewise, of the French war. What was it, to the people of Ireland what form of Government the French nation might choose to adopt? Yet this quarrel, in which Ireland was no more interested than Lapland, costs myriads upon myriads of Irish lives, and pressed so hard on the Irish poor that taxation became actually unproductive by reason of the magnitude of its pressure.

My opinion decidedly is, that there never should be war—that what is called national honour is a sanguinary cruelty when it stimulates to the cutting of mankind, and that national interests are capable of being maintained in the present state of society, by reason, justice, and the power of opinion, as well as by peaceable retaliation for injuries, without the universal use of the sword or the sins and crimes of warfare.

With these opinions, for which I respectfully claim

your countenance, I insist that, if the supposed objections were well founded, and that the Irish Parliament refused Irish supplies to carry on a war which that Parliament disapproved of, it would be a great blessing and an additional motive to desire the Repeal of the Union, and not any argument against that measure. I am the more anxious to express these sentiments at a moment like this when England appears to be on the very verge of a war, to promote, as I think, the interests of and an alliance with one of the most sanguinary, and coldly unrelenting of the persecutors of Christian truth that lived since the days of Dioclesian—I mean, of course, the Emperor of Russia.

Again, my dear and venerated lord, I turn to the objection of the Irish Parliament keeping the Irish people free from the burdens of an English war, and on my part I beg to put a case equally, "under the form of a supposition." Suppose, then, that England were to engage again in war—suppose that war to be totally unnecessary, most unjust, unreligious, and cruel, at the same time directly adverse to the commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of Ireland. Now, this is not an imaginary case, for it was actually the case of the American war of the Revolution. Suppose England once more engaged in such a war. I now turn, my lord, on your objectors, and ask them, indignantly, is not Ireland now, with the Union, and by reason of the Union, liable to have her supplies of men and money drained from her in such a war, without her consent, against her will, as against her interests. If every man of her one hundred and five members voted against such a war, what are they to the five hundred and fifty-three Scotch and English, who might once again grant supplies for such a war? Place the supposition of the Unionists alongside of mine. Mine has the advantage of being supported by historic facts, of recent occurrence. Compare the results of both our systems of Government of Ireland. Mine would give protection to Ireland, and save her effectually from such a war. Their system leaves Ireland bound hand and foot to be dragged at the wheels of England's

car of war. But, alas! your Unionists have the forms, without the hearts, of Irishmen, and every country is to be preferred by them to their own.

My lord, I have disposed of this objection I have shown the improbabilities of its occurrence. But, better still, I have shown that, if it did occur, in point of fact it would be beneficial and protective to Ireland, and also repulsive of the crimes and horrors of war. I claim it as an argument not against, but for the Repeal of the Union—that Repeal which would be surrounded on every side with blessing to Ireland. Permit me, then, to make my triumphant conclusion—Hurrah for the Repeal!

I come next to the second objection, “under the form of supposition,” which the Unionists make to the Repeal, they ask, you say— “*Might not the Catholic majority exclude their fellow-subjects of other religious communions from places of trust and emolument?*”

I am ready, as you, my lord, anticipate, to answer this question, so as to make it impossible that any fair or just man of ordinary capacity should not admit that the objection raised upon it has not any, even the smallest, foundation. I do, indeed, my most esteemed lord, thank you for giving us the opportunity to banish the fears of the timid and satisfy the doubts of the reasonable.

There are two ways in which after the Repeal Protestants may be excluded from offices of trust or emolument—*first*, by legislative enactments or the interposition of religious tests inconsistent with their belief, as the Catholics were excluded by the penal laws; or, *secondly*, by the practice of an adverse Government, as the Catholics were by the Wellington and Peel Government during the time of the Emancipation that they remained in office.

I will take up each of these modes, but begin with the first, which would be in its nature a great grievance to the Protestants, and one against which if there were a rational apprehension of its occurrence every precaution should be taken.

The first embraces this question—*could* or *would* the Irish restored Parliament enact penal laws against Protestants?

I utterly deny that it *would*. I am able to demonstrate that it **COULD NOT** enact any such laws.

The Catholic majority supposing—a supposition which is somewhat gratuitous—a Catholic majority, I assert, **WOULD** not enact any such laws, and the reasons which I submit in support of such assertion are these:—

First—The Irish Catholics of the present day have been brought up in the assertion of the principle of freedom of conscience. One of the most powerful arguments in favour of that principle was made by your lordship at the last public dinner which I attended at Newry. Laymen, priests, and prelates, all the Catholics now living have appealed. It was our grand argument in favour of Emancipation. We urged it, we insisted on it, we succeeded upon it? Is it possible to suppose that we, Catholics, would abandon our own doctrines, renounce our own principles, or expose ourselves to the mockery and derision of the world, and especially could we be so silly as to arm those we might now seek to persecute with a damning proof of our insincerity, falsehood, and turpitude, as our violating that principle would inflict upon us. No, it would not be in human nature that such depravity should exist, or in human folly to exhibit that depravity, if (which is impossible) it did exist. The Protestants, therefore, could not possibly apprehend any violation of that principle from the present generation of Catholics, and it would be absurd to suppose that we are to produce a generation to succeed us with principles worse than our own. No; an objection to what the next generation may do—an objection thus in the *paulo post-futurum*—would be laughed at by all reasonable men.

Secondly—But the principle we thus professed and profess has nothing in it simulated or unstable. The events which have occurred since the Reformation, as those which we have ourselves witnessed, all show the futility of persecution. Besides, the doctrines of Catholic truth, in which we believe, all have

their foundation in that universal benevolence, and all-comprehending charity which makes us see in every fellowman a brother, and teaches us that to use force or fraud towards him is a crime, cruel in its nature, unjust in its principle, and incapable of being productive of any but the worst consequences of crime, and impart unjust punishment towards him.

Thirdly—The time is gone by when any species of persecution would be endured by the more exalted reason and education of any persuasion of Christians. Hideous but salutary example, has shown us all, that one may make hypocrites but cannot make converts by any kind of persecution. That the low but vexatious intolerance, which gratifies itself and teazes, rather than torments, others, by the exclusion of persons of a different persuasion from offices of honour and emolument, for their dissent, has no tendency to diminish that dissent or to create conversions; but, on the contrary, is sure to make those who are thus unjustly excluded more tenacious of their own opinions, whilst they detest the religion of the persecutor, and adhere with a feeling of pride, as well as of perseverance, to their own. The time is gone by when good men could in any way sanction intolerance, and when crafty men could think it a means of increasing the number of their sect.

Fourthly—Is it not perfectly clear that if a Catholic majority in the Irish Parliament were to evince in that Parliament a disposition to enact restrictive or exclusive laws against Protestants in Ireland, they would thereby not only stimulate, but justify, and even require, the Protestant majority in the English Parliament to pass similar and, perhaps, more severe laws against the English and Scotch Catholics. It would indeed be inevitable that the British Catholics should be persecuted if we were directly or indirectly to persecute the Irish Protestants.

Fifthly—It is impossible to imagine that there should be found one Catholic in Ireland so base, as by joining or allowing any kind or species of Protestant persecution or exclusion to give a triumph to, and justify, the calumnies of the M'Ghees,

the Stowells, the Butts, the Todds, and the M'Neills. The very anticipation of the savage shout of exultation which that gang would justly and properly raise, would deter every Catholic from, for a single moment, participating in or tolerating any one bigoted law or practice.

Sixthly—You know well, most esteemed lord, that all the great examples of assertion of the rights of conscience have been afforded by Catholics. It was Catholics who first, after the Reformation, passed in the Diet of Poland comprehensive emancipation laws in favour of the Protestants of Poland. It was an *unanimous* law because every one member of the Diet might have stopped it by means of his veto; and there were numbers of Roman Catholic Bishops in that Diet.

Seventhly—You know well, most respected lord, that the next great example of Christian liberality after the Reformation was given by the Parliament of Catholic Maryland in America; when a comprehensive Emancipation Act of their Protestant brethren was unanimously passed; having been drawn up by one of the most meritorious, but most calumniated, Order—the Jesuits.

Eighthly—You know well, most excellent lord, that another great instance of similar Christian benevolence was exhibited by the Diet of Hungary, who, in 1792, passed a thoroughly satisfactory and complete Emancipation law for the Protestants of Hungary, not only giving them complete equality of civil rights, but actually exempting them from the *payment of tithes*. That Act, indeed, deserved to be called an Emancipation Act.

Ninthly—But why should I dwell on foreign instances or examples, when I have the Catholics of Ireland to refer to—triumphantly and proudly to refer to—the Irish Catholics who were, since the Reformation, three times restored to power after suffering the most cruel and sanguinary persecution?

Yet, they never retaliated, they never persecuted one single human being; but I prefer using the language of a living Protestant historian to my own. Here they are—speaking of the reign of Mary, in England, *Bloody Mary*—he says:—

555 *We have always Repudiated Religious Persecution.*

“The restoration of the old religion was effected without violence; no persecution of the Protestants was attempted; and several of the English who fled from the furious zeal of Mary's inquisitors, found a safe refuge amongst the Catholics of Ireland. It is but justice to this maligned body to add, that, on three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand, they never injured a single person in life or limb, for professing a religion different from their own.”

This passage is found at page 169, of the first volume of the “History of the Civil Wars of Ireland,” by W. C. Taylor.

And we, my Lord Bishop, we are as good as our ancestors; we have always repudiated, and always will repudiate and condemn religious persecution in every shape, mode, or degree—neither (may I say it by way of parenthesis) do any one of us believe that our pure and holy faith requires the aid of profane law, or iniquitous enactments, to fortify in their belief its votaries, or to augment their numbers.

We have, my venerated and beloved lord, a generous and not a vain confidence in the power of truth and the efficacy of Catholic piety, and scorn any base or unworthy auxiliary, as persecution must ever be.

I have dwelt with pleasure but at quite unnecessary length on to me the cheering and consoling proofs that the Irish Catholics would not persecute if they could. But there remains behind the conclusive proof that no Catholic majority in the Irish Parliament could, even if it *would*, persecute or exclude from office any Protestant. The proof is this :—

First—The King or Queen of Ireland must be the same as that of England and consequently must be a Protestant. It is impossible to suppose that such monarchs would assent to any bill offered by the Irish Houses of Parliament for the purpose of persecuting in any way the Protestant subjects of any part of the realm.

Secondly—A very large proportion of the House of Commons of Ireland will necessarily be Protestants. So that no Protestant persecution Act could reasonably be supposed to pass the House of Commons against the natural and vigorous

opposition of such a number of Protestants, fortified by every liberal Catholic in the House, and with all the liberality of the entire nation at their side.

Thirdly—But suppose such a Bill to pass by a Catholic majority in the House of Commons, there is the House of Lords, full nine-tenths of whom are Protestants—a house whose members can be increased only by the Crown, which is Protestant. So that it is, on the part of the Unionists, ridiculously absurd to imagine that any Protestant persecution or exclusion Bill could by any possibility pass the Irish House of Lords.

It is utterly impossible.

I have, my lord, taken more pains than were at all necessary to show that by a Repeal of the Union it is impossible that any such Protestant restrictive law could be passed by any Catholic majority—a majority which, though it may exist in one House of Parliament, could not possibly be found in both; besides, the monarch must continue a Protestant.

The third objection which you, my lord, have stated may be *now* easily dismissed, as I have anticipated a reply to the only formidable matter it contains. It is this—“ Might we not see offices filled by persons selected, not on account of their superior fitness for them, but by that fallacious and very corrupt rule that each religious denomination should be represented according to its numbers.”

I do admit that such a rule would be both fallacious and corrupt. It would also be absurd and indefensible. But I deny that it would arise or be brought into action after the Repeal. Why should we anticipate so profligate a conduct on the part of the executive? I have already shown that it could not be the result of any anti-Protestant law. Neither is it calculated in any respect to be the subject of legislative enactment.

It is put forward by Unionists with a view rather to suggest some desire for Catholic ascendancy—or rather the fear of such an ascendancy. I have also demonstrated the futility

of any such fears, and after that we are entitled to dismiss their objection without much ceremony.

Besides, one great object of the Repeal is, to secure good and rational Government. Its natural tendency must inevitably be to secure that species of administration of the affairs of Ireland; and therefore it is as clear as noon day that the effect of the Repeal is utterly inconsistent with the "*fallacious and corrupt rule*" which the objection suggests. Instead of adding one, we should by the Repeal be able to abolish every existing fallacious and corrupt rule, and govern the country by maxims of justice, equity, honesty, and common sense.

Permit me, then, to repeat our watchword of peace, concord, and fraternal affection—"Hurrah for the Repeal."

I cannot conclude this letter without appealing by its means to the Protestants of the land to dismiss foolish fears, idle jealousies, past animosities, and present prejudices, and to rally forth, with their Catholic fellow-countrymen, for the peace, prosperity, and constitutional freedom of their native land.

Why, oh, why! should the love of fatherland, the inevitable attachment to the land of their birth, the exalting impulses of liberty, be banished from their minds and affections? Are they not Irishmen as well as we are? Is not Ireland their country as well as ours? Why should not their country once again take its station amongst the nations of the earth? Why should they and their country be depressed and left in the attitude of a grovelling inferiority?

You, my loved lord, and men like you, prove the safety, the sanctity, the integrity of our struggle. You prove that, in a contest which you countenance, there can be nothing of force or violence, of injustice or injury—that no property will be injured—no life sacrificed. Innocent and holy is our strife. It is for the protection and prosperity of Ireland—to extinguish grinding opposition, to banish withering poverty, to increase manufacturing industry, to extend commercial activity and wealth, and to promote agricultural interests—to give to Irish-

To Secure Good and Rational Government. 559

men a country, and to Ireland a name amongst nations, to spread abundance and comfort amongst the people, and to crown them with prosperity and constitutional freedom. Hurrah for the Repeal!

I have the honour to be,

My beloved and most respected Lord,

Your most faithful and obedient humble servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

*To the Right Rev. Dr. Blake,
Bishop of Dromore.*



APPENDIX.



No. I.

WE append the following letter of the Right Rev. Dr. Nulty, as an important addition to contemporary history. It is much to be regretted that public opinion in Ireland is not more generally heard in England; if it were much misapprehension would be saved, and, possibly, grave political blunders, if not worse, would be averted:—

THE COERCION ACT IN WESTMEATH.

To the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli.

SIR—You were a distinguished member of the committee appointed by the House of Commons in 1871 to inquire into the outrages alleged to have been committed in Westmeath at that time; and I distinctly remember with what punctuality you attended all the tedious sittings of that committee, from its opening to its close. The appointment of the committee itself, its composition, the character of its members, and the principle on which it was to carry on its inquiries—all gave rise to considerable excitement and to the interchange of heated party recriminations. While the committee was occupied merely with preliminaries, and before it held any of its regular sittings, we all felt that our liberty and independence were inevitably doomed. But it was of the witnesses summoned before the committee that the people arraigned before it had the greatest reason to complain. If it were assumed that Parliament, having resolved to annihilate our freedom, sought to discover

some colourable pretext to justify to the world the coercive legislation it contemplated, then the witnesses called before the committee would be in perfect harmony with the theory. Of all the witnesses summoned there was only one who could have the smallest sympathy with the people whose liberty was about to be immolated. I therefore stood all along alone. My testimony was exceptional throughout, and I differed on vital points with all the other witnesses. I deprecated coercion throughout; they all clamoured for it—all except Mr. Mooney and another; the latter, speaking from experience, preferred jury-packing. Yet nothing could be more natural than this essential divergence between us, for, with the exception of Sir Ralph Cusack, who gave his evidence with singular moderation and respect for our rights, they were all in the employment and pay of the Crown, or the avowed enemies of the people. Even if I had not positive certainty that the evidence given by them was substantially unsound, I should, for this reason alone, always maintain that on the question at issue it was not trustworthy or reliable. These witnesses were marvellously unanimous in proving the existence of a widespread, well-organised, and thoroughly-disciplined Ribbon confederacy, with recognised leaders, and with a code of laws, bound to each other by the sanction of a most awful oath, holding their meetings and maturing their plans in impenetrable secrecy, and spreading terror and dismay among her Majesty's peaceful and loyal subjects. And yet not a single witness examined could give direct testimony to the existence of this formidable confederacy that so alarmed them. They argued: you felt yourself confronted with this wicked conspiracy everywhere. And yet it was everywhere shrouded in darkness; its power was everywhere acknowledged; its authority everywhere obeyed; its vengeance everywhere dreaded; yet it was itself something invisible and impalpable. Its members were banded together under a fearful oath, and yet (if we except a piece of dirty paper found in the tap-room of a public-house) no one ever saw that oath. Of course, that oath must, in their theory, have been administered to thousands; yet no one was ever found to testify that it had been administered to anyone. Hundreds of the most degraded, the most needy, and most unprincipled of men must have been enrolled in the ranks of this confederacy; yet no reward, no amount of money, ever induced any of them to turn approver, even to the length, I will not say of bringing them to justice, but of giving a rational account of any of their proceedings.

To convince the committee, therefore, of the veritable existence of this confederation, your witnesses had to rely entirely on inferential or circumstantial evidence. The disturbed state of the county, they argued, the terror and dismay of peaceful men, the special character of the outrages perpetrated and the murders committed—all pointed evidently to the existence of a fearful Ribbon conspiracy, and could not be satisfactorily explained on any other hypothesis. I have read through the evidence taken before the committee

quite recently, and I cannot find there a single remark worthy of notice that is not substantially reducible to this argument. Unfortunately for us, this argument convinced the committee, and Parliament proceeded at once to the enactment of that precipitate, passionate, and penal legislation, whose galling and exceptional severity you yourself, sir, in your scathing philippics against Mr. Gladstone's Government, have so eloquently proclaimed. It was in vain that Mr. Seed, a Crown Solicitor, with an experience of more than forty years of our county—and with sympathies so avowedly hostile to us that his testimony was beyond all question—assured your committee that the outrages on which your witnesses relied were far less numerous and less criminal than those of former times, when no one thought of coercion. It was in vain that the Catholic clergy of Meath and Westmeath and King's County indignantly repudiated and denied, through me (as I conveyed to the committee), the existence of that Ribbon confederacy as a foul calumny, both injurious and unfounded. It was in vain that they referred the five murders, on which your witnesses principally relied, not to the operation of a Ribbon society, but to what everyone now knows to have been their true cause—the acts of personal, private revenge, the murderers being, in each case, isolated individuals, carrying out their designs with a secrecy and skill that precluded the possibility of detection. Parliament, after holding us up to the execration of all honest men in the empire as assassins or the abettors of assassins, as a community of miscreants, devoid of honour and humanity and religion, proceeded straightway with that penal legislation which strangled our liberty, despoiled us of our property by fines and penalties wantonly enacted, and then condemned us—robbed of reputation and of honour—to a degrading slavery. If Mr. Rochfort-Boyd correctly interpreted the wishes of the party which he is commonly supposed to represent, they would have felt satisfied, in 1871, with our enslavement for *two years!* They have now enjoyed the gratification of witnessing our slavery for nearly *four years!* Yet the same fierce instinct which then influenced them—instead of being appeased—now clamours to perpetuate our degradation indefinitely. And now, sir, it is time to inform you that her Majesty's subjects in this part of the empire have been arraigned again, and again put, for a second time, upon their trial. The magistrates of Meath, Westmeath, and King's County constitute the tribunal before which we now stand, with fear and trembling.

Your committee in 1871 was composed of distinguished, experienced, and honourable men—commissioned by the highest authority in the empire—who published their inquiries, and the result of their inquiries, fearlessly to the world. The magistrates, before whom we now stand accused, needed no commission from higher authority, and asked none. They authorised and commissioned themselves; they set themselves up to judge and adjudicate on our liberties, and—for aught we know—on our properties and very lives. We

objected to the credibility of the witnesses produced before your committee, on the ground that, notwithstanding the high personal character of some of them, all seemed profoundly and manifestly prejudiced against us. But it is the *sublime prerogative* of the tribunal before which we are now arraigned to require no witnesses; to dispense with the vulgar requirements of all other tribunals, and that the magistrates themselves should discharge at once the functions of *Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Accusers*. The presence or absence of the accused is quite immaterial in the *findings* of this tribunal. Men may be impeached and condemned here, not only without a hearing, but without a suspicion that any action has been taken against them. Your committee summoned, at least, one witness whose sympathies were notoriously on the side of the accused; and though you declined to follow my advice or carry out my proposals, you listened to them with respect and attention. But I was not summoned by the tribunal of the Westmeath magistracy. I did not apply to be admitted—for I felt sure that I should not be admitted—to give my people, in defending them, the benefit of the experience acquired before you. Now, sir, I do not intend to say one word disparaging to the private character of any magistrate in these three counties. Speaking from personal knowledge, I affirm that some of them, with whom I am acquainted, are as honourable, as just, and as kind-hearted as any men living; and having said this I will not even insinuate what I think of others. But, speaking of their public acts, what right had these magistrates to gather themselves together thus into secret conclave; to erect themselves into a Star-chamber tribunal; to sit in judgment on us, and listen to the defamatory declamation of stipendiary magistrates, accusing us, behind our backs, of crimes of which we had not the slightest knowledge or warning? What right had they to impeach us in our absence; to deny to us the privilege of defending ourselves; to condemn us in the dark, without judge or jury, and then pass us on to Parliament for punishment? These magistrates, therefore, with their secret tribunals—with their neglect of the essential forms of justice; with their refusal to the accused of the right to be heard; with their cruel and unjust findings against innocent, honest men; but, above all, with their deep-laid schemes and organised conspiracy against the liberty and constitutional rights of a large number of her Majesty's subjects—are certainly the nearest approach that I can find to the description that they themselves give of that pestiferous confederacy that spreads dismay among the peaceable inhabitants of these counties. And such is the impenetrable secrecy in which this Star-chamber tribunal held its deliberations, that it is only by the merest accident that we have recently discovered our accusers or our crimes. Mr. Marlay, of Belvidere, in an excess of zeal and loyalty to his party, has, unintentionally, I suppose, revealed both to us. Mr. Marlay assures us that the magistrates in other counties as well as those in Westmeath were unanimously of opinion that the great Ribbon

confederacy of 1871 existed still in full force and vigour, ready to burst forth as soon as the checks that held it in restraint were removed; and, consequently, that the same reasons that rendered the imposition of coercive legislation necessary in 1871 render a continuance of the same legislation necessary now.

Magistrates very often support their opinions by very loose and, illogical arguments; but the magistrates of Westmeath did not leave themselves open to that imputation—for they advance no argument at all. The statement they make plainly contradicts itself. In 1871 the disturbed state of the county, the character of the outrages and of the murders that had been committed, proved unanswerably the existence of a formidable Ribbon conspiracy, and could not possibly be accounted for on any other hypothesis. And now, the absence of all crime, the cessation of every form of outrage, the profound peace and universal respect for law and order, prove exactly the same thing—the existence of this same confederacy! In 1871 we were murderers and rebels because we were Ribbonmen; and now we are peaceable and loyal subjects for precisely the same reason! In 1871 we were blamed and punished for our criminal acts, and now we are reproached and upbraided—and the Legislature is called on to punish us—for our criminal intentions! Our criminal intentions render us as culpable as our criminal acts, and merit for us exactly the same amount of punishment. Thus the magistrates of Westmeath have the glory of having invented and of having added a new species of crime to the criminal jurisprudence of mankind. They have arrogated to themselves a right which no human tribunal ever claimed before, because it is one of the exclusive prerogatives of the Deity. Human tribunals take cognisance of, judge, and punish criminal free acts; God alone judges and punishes *purely* criminal intentions. That this pestiferous principle was a recognised maxim of Westmeath magisterial jurisprudence is proved by a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of magistrates held at Mullingar in the year 1869, and which Mr. Rochfort-Boyd informs us was the largest meeting of magistrates ever held in Westmeath. This meeting was convened, of course, for purely coercive purposes; for when did the magistrates of these counties ever meet for any other object? After calling on the executive for the extension and aggravation of the penal enactments then existing; after demanding the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus*; after requiring that the magistrates and police should have the right to pay domiciliary visits, make arbitrary arrests, and establish a detective force in the several districts of the county—the Westmeath magistrates coolly wind up by demanding that a liberal grant of the public money be made for the purpose of establishing and subsidising a band of informers who will hunt up such information as will enable them to detect and bring to justice the perpetrators of *intended* as well as of actual crime! Here are the very words of the resolution:—

"That a detective force for the several districts be organised; and, further, that the resident magistrates should be entrusted with funds for the purpose of acquiring information of intended as well as perpetrated crimes."

An intended crime is simply a future free act, and a future free act is simply nothing at all, and suggest even nothing reprehensible, except a purely criminal intention. Just fancy a gang of informers let loose among a people with express instructions to hunt up and bring to justice all those whom they might suspect of harbouring criminal intentions! Verily, the justice which the Westmeath magistrates would dispense is precisely the justice meted out at the fountain by the wolf to the lamb. "How dare you, sirrah, muddy my drink?" "That is impossible, sir," meekly replied the lamb; "for the stream flows down from you to me." "Well, if you did not muddy the stream," quoth the wolf, "you intended to do so, and that makes you just as culpable." "Why do you murder her Majesty's subjects and disturb the peace and order of her Majesty's shires?" "Why, gentlemen," we reply, "that is impossible, as no murder has been committed anywhere, and everywhere a scrupulous observance of law and order prevails." "Well, if you do not do so, you *intend* to do so, and that makes you just as culpable." Need I add that the people as well as the lamb go to the wall in the sequel. The local magistrates, having no reason of their own, rely entirely on the recommendation of the resident magistrates; as far as one can glean from Mr. Marlay's letter, that is the only rational ground they allege for the coercive legislation they recommend. The whole question, then, hinges on the weight and importance that a rational, experienced man would attach to the authority of these functionaries. A resident magistrate—as far as our experience enables us to judge in this locality—is, as a rule, a gentleman by birth and education; and I may add, too, a gentleman in his habits, his manners, and his style of living. He does not forfeit his rank by accepting this situation; he is recognised as a gentleman, and enjoys the privilege of associating with gentlemen everywhere. The power annexed to his office secures to himself personally the influence and respect that always attach to authority, whilst the liberal salary he draws enables him to provide the luxuries and comforts enjoyed by the highest and most respectable. As long as you keep him to the routine of his ordinary, recognised duties, he may be—and I am happy to testify that resident magistrates, as a rule, are—honourable, just, and conscientious; I may add, too, reasonable and kindly-hearted. But, if you take him out of the natural sphere of his usefulness, and put him in the face of a hotly-contested political question, in which the Government has taken a side, and has interests involved; or one in which a local magistracy, having much influence with the Government, think themselves seriously compromised—to expect, in these circumstances, that a resident magistrate, through a romantic affection for abstract justice, would express dissent, is

tantamount to expecting him to commit suicide. He would soon feel the penalty of his rashness in the loss of his situation; and that would imply the loss of position and influence, and sometimes, perhaps, involve the ruin of his family besides. It was, therefore, not only inconsiderate, but excessively unkind, to invite the resident magistrates to take part in a controversy to which their authority could add no weight, and in which they could hardly avoid compromising themselves; still worse, to shift on them the entire odium and responsibility of a resolution demanding the continued suspension of the constitutional rights of a large community. This hardship was largely aggravated by the fact that, as we learn from Mr. Rochfort-Boyd (*Question 1,527*), local magistrates have hitherto "denied the right of the stipendiary magistrates to attend any meetings of this sort."

But, painful and humiliating as is the position in which Mr. Marlay's letter has placed the resident magistrates, they can hardly expect much sympathy from us. They have, without provocation, arraigned us before a tribunal composed of the hereditary and, in some cases, the avowed enemies of our civil rights. They have accused us there of grave crimes of which they have not given us the slightest intimation or warning. They have accused us in our absence, where we could not be heard, and where we could not possibly defend ourselves. They have put into the hands of our enemies the only tangible arguments on the strength of which they could have the hardihood to ask for a continuation of our bondage. Grave charges, such as these—charges vitally affecting the dearest interests of a whole community—ought never to be alleged, even if they were clearly true, except with pain and reluctance, and always under the pressure of an overwhelming sense of responsibility. But when these charges are doubtful, or cannot be clearly established—nay, when they are positively untrue as well as unjust—then the responsibility of those who make them is great indeed. Now, it is my painful duty to attest that these allegations are utterly untrue. The Catholic clergy of Westmeath, after most careful inquiry and patient consultation with each other, have certified to the world, in a resolution published in the *Freeman*, that not a single trace of any Ribbon confederacy exists now, or has existed for years, in any part of the county. The statement, therefore, in which the resident magistrates affirmed the existence of such a confederacy, though made, no doubt, in good faith, did grievous injustice and wrong to the people of Westmeath.

And now, sir, this letter has become so unexpectedly long, that I promise to close it very briefly. The evidence taken before your committee was so conflicting on so many vital points, that it is quite refreshing, on reading it through, to find all your witnesses unanimous on the existence of one important fact, and to that fact all testified unhesitatingly—namely, that the vast majority of the people of these counties were peaceable, loyal, and in-

dustrious ; and that the miscreants who were the real responsible contrivers of the outrages that disgraced us were a mere handful, not numbering more than a dozen. The committee itself adopted that view in its "report," when it describes these men as "a few individuals who may be looked upon as the heads of the society, and are alleged to be known as such to the local authorities." Further, all the witnesses unanimously certified that these few leaders were notorious to the magistrates, to the police, in fact to everyone in the district. Some of the witnesses strongly impressed on the committee that the arrest and imprisonment of these men was the only means of restoring peace and tranquillity. It was argued, and with much force, that the people themselves would cheerfully consent to their own enslavement, and to the temporary suspension of their constitutional liberties, for the purpose of being relieved from the alarm and terror with which these few ruffians inspired them. The temporary suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was recommended, and only as a lesser evil. No coercive witness ventured to suggest the perpetual suspension of this Act ; and Mr. Rochfort-Boyd (Quest. 1,549) declared that such a demand would be "repugnant to any man's ideas and feelings." These, sir, are the only intelligible grounds on which the Legislature could have enacted the penal legislation passed four years ago, and of which the magistrates of these counties now demand the indefinite prolongation. Immediately after the passing of this Act, several of these leaders were arrested and cast into prison. Now, sir, if a brigand or a highwayman whose excesses and outrages had filled an entire community with mortal fear, had at length, at an immense cost and sacrifice to that community, been captured and conveyed to prison, what would be thought of a man bearing her Majesty's commission of the peace, who would sympathise with that ruffian, mature such plans, and take such steps as eventually succeeded in getting him free ? Now, sir, that is exactly our case against a section of the very magistracy that are now clamouring for a continuation of our bondage. Among the "leaders" thus imprisoned there were two—*primi inter primos*—who were believed by every witness examined to have been the *fons et origo* of at least all the principal outrages perpetrated in one entire county. What has been the history of these men since their arrest ? That after having endured a short and tender imprisonment, they have been set free, and are now at large and in the very midst of us. The fact cannot be denied—I have it on high authority—that gentlemen holding her Majesty's commission of the peace, signed a memorial and presented it to the Executive, petitioning for the release of these "notorious leaders," and the Executive, in compliance, I presume, with the prayer of the memorial, as a matter of fact set them free.

Now, sir, let me repeat what I said before—that we know of no Ribbonism in these counties, save that which seems to be thus fostered and encour-

raged, and, I suppose, subsidised by a section of our magistracy. Perhaps you may remember the indignant incredulity with which this statement was met when I first made it, in that now famous pastoral of 1871, and in support of which I appealed to facts in my examination. I stated in that pastoral what I now repeat—that the Ribbonism I then denounced—

“ Was got up by hired traitors for the sole purpose of enabling exterminating landlords to carry their projected clearances through with increased security and confidence. It is a matter of notoriety that two of the most cruel and extensive exterminators in this diocese had been Centres of Ribbonism in their respective districts, whilst carrying their inhuman clearances through. I have before me what I cannot but regard as solid grounds for believing that the relations still subsisting between exterminating landlordism and Ribbonism are the very reverse of unfriendly. . . . We fear that before many days we shall witness those secret societies co-operating with a weak and pusillanimous Executive in handing over the people to the tender mercies of a party that was never yet known to exercise absolute power with moderation, or with a due sense of the responsibility accompanying it.”

These, sir, were my deliberate opinions then, and they have since ripened, by observation and reflection, into mature firm convictions. And I confess, in looking back at the events of the last five years, I feel astonished how the Legislature could have been led into the enactment of harsh and exceptional laws against honest, loyal men, at the cry of a party, amongst whom were to be found the very men who, above all others, countenanced and encouraged the outrages which all good men deplore. And now, sir, let me add one word about Mr. Marlay, who moved the resolution adopted by the magistrates of Westmeath, and to which we have taken such serious objections. Mr. Marlay's character as a landlord stands very high with the people of this neighbourhood; and, therefore, they regretted bitterly that he should have lent his influence and his name to a movement so unfair in itself and so hostile to them. But, let me assure him that, though he saddened them much, they are not angry with him, for they believe that though he did them this grievous injury, he did it in good faith; and that the moment he discovers his error, he will promptly make ample and suitable reparation.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

✠ THOMAS NULTY.

Mullingar, February 18th, 1875.

No. II.

The following note, which has been communicated to us by a literary friend, will be of interest:—

“The first time I saw Mr. O’Connell was in Dublin, in 1822, after my return from London, at which time I was introduced to him by Charles O’Connor, Esq., of Merrion-square. Mr. O’Connell was then working hard for Catholic Emancipation. I remarked to him that I thought he never could bring it about; his reply was—‘No matter; we will persevere, and no doubt but we shall one day or other carry it.’ His determined manner and appearance struck me forcibly, and I could not help thinking that it was a pity he was not brought up as a military man, for he would have made an able general-officer. His zeal for his country, and his exertions in favor of civil and religious liberty, will hand his name down to posterity; while his private character, which is so exemplary as a husband, a father, and a friend, endear him to the recollection of all who have the pleasure of being acquainted with him in his domestic circle.”—*The Veteran; or Forty Years’ Service in the British Service*. By Captain John Harley, late Paymaster, 47th Regt. London: 1838. Chap. v., vol. ii., 148.

Kennmare Publications.

APPROBATION OF THE RIGHT REV. DR. MORIARTY.

“ THE PALACE, KILLARNEY, *June 20, 1875.*”

“ MY DEAR SISTER IN CHRIST—I learn that you are issuing some new works, and some new editions of those already published; your literary labours reflect honour on your Convent, on your Order, and on this Diocese.

“ But I rejoice much more in this, that you are contributing to supply one of our greatest needs—a Catholic Literature. I know, too, that the funds realised by the sale of your works are exclusively devoted to the service of religion.

“ Praying God to bless you, and to preserve your health and strength,

“ Yours sincerely in Christ,

“ ✠ D. MORIARTY.

“ To SISTER M. FRANCIS CLARE (COBACK),

“ *Convent of Poor Clares, Kennmare, Co. Kerry.*”

HISTORICAL WORKS.

THE LIBERATOR. HIS LIFE AND TIMES: POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS. New Library Edition, Seventh Thousand. Two Vols., 12s. each Vol.

The illustrations in this work are executed in the very highest style of art, and comprise portraits, engraved expressly for this work, which manifests throughout Miss Cusack's extensive research, biographic skill, and literary talent. By the way, the frontispiece, 'O'Connell's Last Look at the Irish Shore,'—a mere sketch—would form a fine subject for an Irish historical picture.

"The finest work of a vigorous mind, a loving heart, an enthusiastic soul, and a genius matured and mellowed by exercise and training."—*Cork Examiner*.

"The style of printing and illustration is really superb. We understand that an intense rivalry exists at the other side of the Atlantic to get the advance sheets."—*Freeman's Journal*.

"We can truly bear testimony to the ability of the author, the admirably well-conceived plan with which she treats her subject, and the artistic brilliancy of the typographical part of the work."—*Dublin Evening Post*.

"The writer is engaged in a work which will rival those of her religious predecessors who, also under the shadow of the cloister, gave to the country those chronicles by the light of which we can still live in the past."—*Catholic Times* (Liverpool).

THE LIFE OF ST. PATRICK, APOSTLE OF IRELAND.

Seventh Thousand, Magnificently Illustrated, with a Translation of the Ancient Irish Tripartite Life of the Saint, from a MS. over a thousand years old. Large 4to, 660 pp., 85 magnificent illustrations, cloth, richly gilt, 80s.

"To our Beloved Daughter in Christ, Mary Francis Clare, of the Sisters of St. Clare, Kenmare.

"Beloved Daughter in Christ, Health and Apostolic Benediction. We congratulate you, beloved daughter in Christ, on having completed a long and difficult work, which seemed to be above woman's strength, with a success that has justly earned the applause of the pious and the learned. We rejoice, not only because you have promoted by this learned and eloquent volume the glory of the illustrious Apostle of Ireland, St. Patrick, but also because you have deserved well of the whole Church; for, in recording the actions of so great a man, you have placed before the eyes of the world the benefits received through the Catholic religion so clearly, that they can no longer be questioned."—*Extract from the Apostolic Letter of His Holiness Pius IX. approving this work.*

"Well may the Bishop of Kerry—himself a scholar of the highest order—take pride in the successful efforts of the Nun of Kenmare, and when giving his episcopal approbation to her works, say: 'Your literary labours reflect honour on your Convent, on your Order, and on this Diocese.'"—*Cork Examiner*.

POPE PIUS AND THE POOR CLARES.

"In the midst of his troubles Pope Pius has found time to send an Apostolic letter to our countrywoman, Miss Cusack, known in religion as Sister Mary Francis Clare, Author of the 'Life of St. Patrick.' . . . He compliments her on having completed 'a long and difficult work, which seemed to be above woman's strength, with a success that has justly earned the applause of the pious and the learned.' We believe this is the first time the Holy See has congratulated a woman on the success of her literary labours. And the compliment was never more deserved. . . . His Holiness does not forget the 'Island of Saints,' which now so keenly sympathises with his sufferings. The letter is a charming summary of the benefits conferred on Ireland by the Apostle, and a tribute to the learning and sanctity of his successors, who, in the sixth and seventh centuries, as Apostles and Missionaries, illumined the darkness of Pagan Europe with the light of Divine truth. The Poor Clares, in their seclusion in Kerry, must be delighted at this testimony to the genius and services of one of their community. The rarity of the tribute vastly enhances its value."—*Freeman's Journal*.

"It is worthy of note, as not a very frequent occurrence in the literature of the nineteenth century, that a religious lady, a nun in the 'sister island,' has been turning her time to such good account of late years that she has produced quite a crop of literature, and that of no mean order, including, besides a host of lesser works, a 'History of Ireland,' and a 'Life of St. Patrick,' both in quarto, the one containing six hundred, and the other a thousand pages. Miss Cusack is Hibernian—Irish of the Irish—and her name is well known in her native country, and especially in Dublin, as a painstaking, accurate, and able writer; and we are glad to learn that she has made the name of the community of Sisters at Kenmare a 'household word' through the length and breadth of Ireland. She has devoted herself heart and soul to works of charity and mercy, and she has been able to combine with those works a devotion to the Muse of history and of facts, which we do not often see realised except in such persons as Miss Strickland, Mrs. Everett Green, and Mrs. Cowden Clarke. Miss Cusack is not overstating her case when she claims for herself the credit of having written the first life of the great 'Apostle of Ireland,' which has 'given full details of his acts and missionary labours,' as it is certainly the first in which a real practical use has been made of the materials at hand."—*Illustrated Review* (London).

"As a literary work it can scarcely be lauded too highly. Every source of information has been thoroughly exhausted and collated, so that in the line of research

it is complete. The theological views and reflections, which are occasionally called forth by the subject, are so lucidly stated as to be clear to every intelligence, while at the same time rendered highly interesting by a fascinating style."—*The Morning Star* (New Orleans, United States).

"It is this *Life*, never before fully written for modern readers, that Miss Cusack, the nun whose fame as an authoress now stands almost too high for encomium, has undertaken to recount. The execution has been a wonderful success. For all that a graceful and flowing pen could do in giving expression to the results of unwearied diligence we were prepared, but we own we were astonished at the extent of this lady's scholarship."—*Irish Times*.

"Next after the Holy Scriptures and the Apostolical writings of the Fathers of the Church, no productions of Christian authors are of greater importance and value than the writings of the Saints. They have served to stir up the faithful to deeds of deep devotion and Christian heroism, and to plant the seeds of virtue and grace in many a fruitful soil. Whenever, therefore, a fresh attempt is made to describe and illustrate the life of one of the sanctified servants of God, we rejoice, if the work be well done and calculated to profit the immortal souls of those who may read it.

"The volume before us is very handsomely got up and illustrated, and consists of no less than 656 pages, and is in many respects a very important publication. In some respects it is an indirect reply to a recent treatise of the late Rev. Dr. J. H. Todd, who discussed at great length the subjects collaterally connected with St. Patrick. In other respects, its author has avoided controversy, trusting most wisely to a plain statement of undoubted facts for the results produced and the aim gained. The 'Preface,' occupies exactly twelve pages, and contains a terse and lucid defence of the principle on which the book has been written, incidentally referring to the archaeological discoveries of Mr. W. Hennessey, the Rev. J. O'Laverty, and others, which have notoriously thrown so much light on Irish Ecclesiastical antiquities. Most touchingly and beautifully is every detail in his important life dealt with in this volume. It is thoroughly Christian from beginning to end. It aims to be a standard work on the subject, and those aims are justly and deservedly satisfied. Learning, investigation, patience, careful criticism, and hearty devotion have all combined to render this book full of value. The style is pleasing, the information sound, and the conclusions solid and just."—*The Church Herald* (London).

THE ILLUSTRATED HISTORY OF IRELAND.

Tenth Thousand, demy 8vo., 700 pages, 10s. cloth; gilt, 12s.

"We have already introduced Miss Cusack, in a late number, to our readers as eminently the literary nun of the age; and we told them that her cell in the convent of Poor Clares, at Kenmare, is no place of indolent repose, but a genuine place of study, a literary workshop of no common merit, as proved by her '*Life of St. Patrick*.'

To-day we have to bring before their notice the same lady, not as a biographer, but as an historian. We do not, of course, agree with her views; but we can desire to see them fairly and fully stated, and can pardon a woman, and an Irishwoman, for giving expression to them in elegant and feeling terms. We may not agree with her politics, but we recognise in the Nun of Kenmare a writer of no mean order upon political questions, so far as they affect her country, her people, and her religion."—*Illustrated Review* (London).

THE STUDENTS' MANUAL OF IRISH HISTORY, 6s.

"Miss Cusack has demonstrated that she possesses the highest capacity for works of this kind."—*Civil Service Gazette*.

"Much of the nonsense which has been spoken and written regarding Ireland for the last two years has arisen from ignorance of Irish history. Miss Cusack's volume will help to remove this."—*Examiner*.

"Miss Cusack's work will repay a perusal."—*Evening Standard*.

A HISTORY OF THE COUNTY AND CITY OF CORK.

Demy, 8vo., magnificently illustrated.

Some of the first topographical, antiquarian, and philological writers of the day have assisted in this undertaking, and the Rev. Maxwell Close, a member of the Royal Irish Academy, has most generously furnished a geological map of the county at his own expense, and has added a valuable chapter on the Geology of the county. A chapter on the Fauna has been written by Dr. Harvey, the well known and respected late President of the Cuvierian Society. Mr. Isaac Carroll has contributed to the Flora; and Sir Ralph Cusack has added a list of High Sheriffs from archives in the Dublin Record Office. A number of other gentlemen have contributed unpublished documents, making the work of more general interest than a county history.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

From the Cork Examiner.

"It is impossible for a thoughtful person to see, wherever he passes, the testimonies to a former existence so full of life and activity and variety without wishing for some more accurate information of the men and women who watched and fought and prayed, who lived their lives, and spent their passions, and carried out their loves and hatreds in these vehement times. It is the object of this book to afford the necessary information for this purpose—it is designed to re-people the remote past, to set the fighting

shepherd again upon his rath, to place the mailed warrior once more behind the loophole of his tower; to furnish a picture of the monk, and to give an echo of the hymn of praise which went up from Kilcrea and Timoleague, from Benedictine and Franciscan, from pious men and holy women. Such a task, it is needless to say, is one of great difficulty. It involves long and patient research, most diverse and often very profound study. The mere amassing of materials, however, is only a part, and that the subordinate part of the task. It is only the quarrying of the stones which the builder has to fashion. The capacity of the historian has to be exhibited in causing order to reign through the chaos, in so arranging the stuff in the loom that a distinct pattern shall run through it, in so ordering the telling of events and people that the story shall read as a tolerably continuous narrative without break or trying back or confusion. This task the Nun of Kenmare has accomplished with characteristic ability, producing a history that must be read with deep interest as well for the vivacity of its story as the importance of the events and circumstances with which it deals.

"The history is traced back to the earliest or pre-Christian period, and the author, without placing excessive reliance on the legendary portion, still gives so much of it, under due reserve, as may be considered worthy of a certain amount of credence. As there is little doubt that Ireland was first peopled in Munster, the history of Cork naturally involves something of the early history of the whole island; and we are therefore furnished by the author with a striking picture of the manners and customs of the Irish before the Conquest, not as the barbarians they were long represented to be, but, as is shown abundantly by the discoveries of O'Curry, a people fully abreast of the European civilisation of the day. This early history was honourably distinguished from that of other nations at the same period by the number of men of sanctity who adorned its annals and refined its morals by their example, and left to it, probably as their blessing, that traditionary attachment to the faith which has made Ireland deserve the glorious title of the 'Martyr Isle.' Such a theme could hardly be uncongenial to such an author, and we find naturally due prominence given to the ecclesiastical portion of our history, from the foundation of the City of Cork, down to the latest exemplification of bigotry under the penal laws. But no such prominence is given to this portion as to absorb the secular history. We have, indeed, in these chronicles, an epitome of Irish history at large. We have all its leading features set out. The quarrels of the septa, the English invasion, Perkin Warbeck's insurrection, Henry the Eighth's introduction of the royal Supremacy which is called the Reformation, the wars which took place when Ireland was being pacified by Elizabeth's pirates, Cromwell's butcheries, the struggles of the Irish Catholics under the silly and ungrateful Stuarts, the insurrection of '98, and the political consequences which followed, are all told in stirring strain which keeps the reader's attention absorbed, while it is so explicit as to its connection with the general history of the country as to render the student of this book fairly acquainted with the history of the whole."

"Much of the nonsense which has been spoken and written regarding Ireland for the last two years has arisen from ignorance of Irish history. Miss Cusack's volume will help to remove this, as well as for educational purposes."—*London*

"Miss Cusack's work will repay a perusal."—*Evening Standard*, will in the conver
put a genuine place of
 "Life of St. Patrick."