

Onward, and we conquer!
Backward, and we fall!
THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER AND NO SURRENDER!
TO THE OLD GUARDS.

Valiant friends and comrades! It has ever been my delight to remind you, that, whenever our banner has been struck down by tyranny, we have watched our opportunity again to march onward from that spot which tyrants intended as our grave; and if ever our glorious cause did make rapid advance, it has been since Monday the 10th, when, armed with the constitution, we laid tyranny prostrate at our feet, and, guided by prudence, we threw the shield of protection over our battalions and their children.

Old Guards, it was intended that London should have been an unroofed slaughter house, and that tyranny should have its last feast upon the remains of constitutional liberty—but they were foiled. Mark, when I use the word tyranny, I do so in a more comprehensive sense than is applicable to the mere government of the country. I apply it to the pressure of faction upon the Government. I always speak of communities, not of individuals, and in justice to Sir George Grey, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, I unhesitatingly assert, that no living man would more regret a single act of unnecessary cruelty, than would Sir G. Grey. A more tender-hearted man breathes not; but, as I have often stated, MEN WILL COMMIT ACTS AS A BODY, WHICH THE BASEST AMONG THEM WOULD BLUSH TO ACKNOWLEDGE AS AN INDIVIDUAL.

However, it is consoling to me, and must be cheering to all, that I have received communications from all parts of the United Empire, expressing the highest thanks and gratitude for my conduct on Monday, the 10th, while we have even disarmed the Press of the factions; and now, as I predicted, the Charter fills every month, and is the one topic which interests all classes.

Having, therefore, secured this triumph, and having increased your confidence in my judgment and resolution, it becomes my bounden duty to improve the advantage that oppression has given us.

Old Guards, without selfishness, or without looking for too much sympathy—having made up my mind to brave the battle and the breeze—I think I may exultingly call your attention to the manner in which, despite of the preconcerted plan to damage my fame and overawe my resolution, I have sustained myself against the howl of faction and the taunting jeers of rampant tyranny.

My veracity was assailed upon two points. Firstly—Upon the number of signatures, and the description of signatures, attached to the National Petition; and, secondly—as to the numbers that congregated upon Kennington Common.

Now, I will divide the first subject under two heads:—Firstly, as to my own responsibility; and, secondly, as to the conduct of the Government; and then I shall make a few general observations upon those two points.

As to my own responsibility—it was, as I stated in Parliament, morally and physically impossible that I, or any other man, could critically scrutinise the signatures to a great National Petition, and if it had been possible for me to do so, I would have struck out every oppressor's name, and every obscene word, as, if my knowledge of those forgeries could be presumed, I would hold myself unworthy the name of man if I allowed the constitutional appeal of a virtuous people to be thus defiled. Secondly, as to the conduct of the Government, I charge the Government, upon the most perfect circumstantial evidence, of having conspired to damage your cause, by having an unjust, ungenerous, and unjustifiable disrepute upon your Petition.

Now, mark, how I apply the evidence in support of this charge. The forms of the House require that fourteen days' notice shall be given of any motion that is submitted to it—that is, that no motion can embrace a longer period. Aware of this fact, I denied myself the pleasure of witnessing (to me) a gratifying spectacle of seeing the occupants taking possession of their castles and free labour fields on Monday, the 27th of March. I was in my place upon that day, to have the first chance of bringing on the motion on the 10th, as an amendment upon supply—Monday being, in general, devoted to the voting of taxes out of your pockets; but, as no question of supply had been entered upon the order book, I was delayed, and purposely delayed, of this opportunity; meantime, with a hypocritical magnanimity, characteristic of hypocritical Whiggery, Lord John Russell would not give me up the Monday, but pompously conceded the following Friday, for the mere purpose, as I stated in Parliament, of discovering and bringing to light those obscenities and forgeries, which had been practised by spies, as I shall presently prove.

On Thursday evening, it was announced to the House by the Chairman of the Petition Committee, that the signatures to the petition were only one million nine hundred thousand four hundred and fifty-two, and there was evidence of a most critical review evinced in the fact that the Inspectors of the Petitions had discovered the several repetitions of different names, as well as the different ridiculous names and obscene words. This, I say, proves a very critical inspection, and yet, we are told that thirteen law-stationers' clerks counted the whole of the signatures, and discovered the whole of the forgeries and obscene names, in the space of seventeen hours. Now, I resort to figures in refutation of this assertion, and I find that each clerk, besides the critical inspection of names, must have counted about 147,170 names, in round numbers, within the prescribed time; each clerk must have counted 8,600 within the hour, or 150 names in every minute, for seventeen consecutive hours, or two names and a half in each second, for that period of time. This calculation only applies to the number of signatures stated by the law clerks; and my position cannot be disturbed, or my argument refuted, by the rejoinder, that they counted them in sheets; and for this reason, because the sheets were not uniform, even from any one town in the kingdom, while the minute inspection which led to the discovery of forged and obscene names, establishes, firstly, the impossibility of performing the work within the time; and secondly, the certainty that those names were inserted by the enemy. If they pervaded the whole petition—ten, twenty, nay, thirty times, the number of clerks could not have performed the work within the time; while, if those forgeries and obscenities were confined to a few sheets to which immediate attention was directed by the perpetrators, was it fair—was it just, or honourable, to cast reproach upon the National Appeal for justice upon so weak, so disreputable, and so disgraceful a subterfuge.

Old Guards, keep the thread of this argument before you—it is, that thirteen law-stationers, for seventeen consecutive hours, counted two and a half names in every second, and critically inspected 147,170 names within that period. Now, I ask, if there is a sane man in England who believes such an assertion? And then, mark the period of time within which those seventeen hours were devoted to the work. I presented the Petition at five o'clock on Monday, and at twelve o'clock on Wednesday a member of the Government—as I stated in the House—formed me of the discovery; that is, within forty-three hours after I presented the Petition, as the announcement was made to the House on Thursday evening, amid such yells and groans as I never before heard in my life, and in the most disorderly assembly. Well, in the midst of all I neither lost my resolution nor my presence of mind, because I was sustained by my own consciousness of innocence, and the guilt of the Government, as I wholly

The People's Charter AND NATIONAL TRADES' JOURNAL.

VOL. XI. No 548.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1848.

PRICE FIVEPENCE or Sixpence per Quarter

exonerate the House and the Petition Committee, the latter merely making the report which they had received from the Clerks, and the former receiving it as proof of my negligence, or an attempt to practise a delusion, time not being allowed upon the spur of the moment, to calculate the impossibility of arriving at the conclusion stated to the House.

Well, then, I ask, whether or no Friday was pompously given up by the noble Lord for the purpose of making a parade of this hidden treasure, and thus affording an opportunity to many mock supporters of the principle to creep out of the dilemma?

So much for the signatures; and now for the numbers assembled on Kennington Common. I confess that the marvellous coincidence of opinion that pervaded the whole Press on Tuesday morning, led me to the inevitable conclusion that some extraordinary influences had been operating upon their dreams on Monday night; but, without a single comment of my own, I give the following letter, as proof of the genius by which this coincidence was produced. Read the following letter, Old Guards. It comes from one of the most efficient short-hand writers, who is in the habit of attending public meetings, and who was in the car upon the 10th:—

DEAR SIR,—A fact has just come to my knowledge, which may be interesting to you, and which will in some measure explain how all the daily papers on Tuesday last stated that there were only 15,000 persons present at the meeting on Monday last; which somewhat surprised me, as I am certain there were upwards of 200,000.

The Commissioners of Police on Monday evening last, sent round to the papers a document marked private, requesting them to state that there were only 15,000 persons present at the meeting. Now, I think you ought to ask the Home Secretary, whether the police are paid for the purpose of supplying the newspapers with lies.

Of course I do not wish you to mention my name in connection with the matter, but you may place the greatest reliance upon my information.

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

To Feargus O'Connor, Esq., M.P.

Now, then, what say you to the virtue of your government, and the justice of your Press? I leave those two disputing subjects of the Petition and the assembly with this single observation; namely, that there never has been a large petition presented to the House of Commons in a tenfold degree to that stated to have occurred in the case of your Petition; and I am aware of the fact myself, that parties employed by the day to affix signatures to Petitions both for and against Catholic Emancipation. A charge of a similar nature was made against the League, and against those who got up petitions for the admission of Jews into Parliament; but at those assertions the Government sneered as they were in favour of the cause they espoused.

Old Guards, I now leave this disgusting subject, and I come to the consideration of a matter of paramount importance, namely—

THE DEATH OF LIBERTY.

On Saturday next the corpse of the Constitution will come in funeral attire to the House of Lords, to lie in state for a few moments, and thence to be conveyed to the sepulchre where the remains of the Lord William Russell now lies, and there will the friend of liberty, and liberty itself, rest entombed until the loud voice of an indignant people shall proclaim the honour of the one and the joyful resurrection of the other.

Old Guards, I never addressed you so critical a period in my life. I have carried you successfully through the turmoil of '39 and '40, of '42 and '43, and have piloted the good ship safely on the 10th of April, '48, through the ranks of our armed assailants; but the voice of knowledge silenced the cannon's roar, and the vessel with her crew came safe to harbour.

Then, Old Guards, at whom do you think the present stab that killed liberty is aimed? Can you doubt that it is at the pilot who has so often steered the vessel between the shoals and the quicksands, and who has stood foremost in the battle, and received the lion's share of persecution. I have suffered for the folly and indiscretion of others, but I have ever kept with firm footing upon the constitution, and within the limits of the law—narrow and limited as they were—and now, Old Guards, will you allow folly or indiscretion to drive me from my vantage ground. I hear you respond, "No!"

A THOUSAND TIMES "NO!"

Hear me, then, and if you are valiant be discreet. The National Assembly proposes to violate the law, as the law only permits an assembly of forty-nine persons to sit as a Convention; and if that assembly meets, it will not only strengthen our opponents, but will deter the thousands—yea, millions—who are now preparing to join us from entering into our ranks.

I bore, and without a murmur, the indiscretion and the folly of some members of the late Convention, and my reward was the payment of 150l. towards their expenses, and insults, contumely, and reproach in the House of Commons for their every act of indiscretion.

Will you just imagine men getting up at public meetings, in London, and announcing that they were prepared for battle! You remember how Parson Stevens was prepared. How Peter Bussey was prepared; and you know what has become of these valiant heroes.

Now I tell you, with more courage than they possessed, that I am not ready to "tuck up my sleeves and go at it;" but I tell you what I have done. I have suffered more in health and constitution within the last three weeks than I have within the ten years previous, and still I am more ready and prepared to "go at it," in the right way, than any one of our immaculate heroes. You are aware that I have always told you that the existence of three parties in a state was incompatible with the existence of peace, law, and order—that we would drive Peel and Russell to unite; and having thus reduced parties to their proper dimensions—the oppressor and oppressed—that the voice of the multitude brought to bear upon the votes of the representatives, would overwhelm and finally overthrow tyranny.

Well, notwithstanding the boasted triumph of Whiggery, its pointed cannon and "specials," on Monday, the 10th inst., so rarely great is our victory manifest in our consummate courage, judgment, and skill, that one half of my time since has been devoted to reading the most kindly and affectionate letters from shopkeepers, tradesmen, and others of the middle classes, tendering their hearty co-operation to the popular cause, and expressing their determination to urge their representatives in parliament to assume a bold and manly position after Easter, and to propound measures which, six months ago, they would have scoffed at.

Old Guards, have I not always told you that the shopkeepers would fraternise with you when they understood their real interests; and now that we have won them by our prudence, our judgment, and our courage, shall we repulse them by our folly, our indiscretion, and our madness?

Old Guards, have not I always been in front of the battle, and will you allow the madness of the intemperate to balk us of the service of those recruits, and once more throw them into more deadly hostility?

One week after Easter will test the sincerity of the Opposition. Upon my banner shall remain,

THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER AND NO SURRENDER!

But in the name of God! in the name of Justice! of Liberty and of Common Sense! let us wing the foe, and not scare the friend. Not only from all parts of the kingdom, but in the House of Commons, I have received assurance that the People's Charter will be the adopted principle of the Opposition; and the landed aristocracy of this country having proved themselves the greatest enemies of liberty, a prompt assault will be made upon their unconstitutional and worn-out privileges.

Old Guards, you are not aware of the appliances at the disposal of Government, especially in London; but I will give you one significant proof of the fact, it is this—as I was leaving London on Saturday the 8th, to discharge my duties as your bailiff, a man watched me, and followed me from John-street to the Bank. He ran after the cab; Mr Price, the manager of the Bank, was with me, and he observed, "What does that fellow, dressed like a navvie, mean by running after us?" When I came out of the Bank, he addressed me thus—"Your honour, you don't know me now, but my name is —, and you got me into the police when you were member for Cork, and for God Almighty's sake take care of yourself on Monday, for there's orders to shoot you; and you should know that half of the devils that's cheering in the gallery in John-street is sent there by the Commissioners; and could Wellington (bad luck to his soul) is to be the Commander-in-Chief on Monday."

Now, Old Guards, I did not require this statement to convince me of the fact that spies were sent to John-street; and for this reason—having a sharp eye and a sensible ear, I always found that the most ridiculous and violent speeches were cheered by those who were in sheep's clothing, while the sensitive working-class-looking men shook their heads and hung them down.

Old Guards, there is another class who have recently joined us—I mean the Irish Repealers—but you must never lose sight of the fact, that not many months ago the then leading organ of that party designated the Six Point of the Charter as an abomination—the editor, Mr Duffy, declaring that his study should be "to widen the breach between the English and the Irish, and that he would be the last to bridge the gulf." He has only recently become a convert to the "abominations," and would now proclaim a very unequal division of labour—assigning to the ABOMINABLES the duty of fighting, and to himself the more easy task of talking about it. This champion of liberty is not quite satisfied with the result of our Demonstration of the 10th; but you will read in another part of the paper, a very different opinion, given by the editor of the *Freeman's Journal* upon the subject, and to whom I invite your attention. Add to this the fact, that all the pure Republican French papers declare that valiant Chartism had a noble triumph over armed tyranny on the 10th; but, what is more gratifying than all, while oppressed with sickness, with rheumatism, and debility, reflection tells me that the gathering upon Kennington Common was the recruiting service of Chartism.

Thus, I show you that the middle classes, the shopkeepers, and Irish Repealers, are but recent converts to our principles, and that, thus augmented in force, it is our bounden duty to try its pressure upon the House. If you doubt the present temper of the former supporters of Whiggery, you should have been in the House on Friday night last, when every member of the Government, as well as the Attorney General, was received as heroes, with the hootings, the howlings, and the yells of their former supporters, though not one word of it is reported by the Press, although they were actually hooted down every time they rose.

Old Guards, I assure you that declining trade, falling manufactures, empty mills, increasing armaments, increased taxation, additional plagues and pestilences, increased pauperism, and growing insurrection on the part of the Government, has taken the gilt off the Free Trade gingerbread; and that the former advocates of that measure are now amongst the most strenuous opponents of the Government.

In conclusion, then, what I have to implore of you, is to postpone your National Assembly, whose enthusiasm may be operated upon by spies, until you see the effect of this new combination of disappointed hope, when arrayed against an intemperate liberty-slaving Government. You who have followed me so long, and whom I have served so faithfully, will not, I am convinced, for the gratification of any passion, refuse obedience to my advice, and should its following fail, then command

Your faithful and devoted friend

and servant,

FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

THE KENNINGTON COMMON MEETING.

The (DUBLIN) WEEKLY FREEMAN'S JOURNAL of Saturday last contains an excellent article on the late Chartism demonstration, from which we give the following extract:—

We have heard the result of this movement classed by the advocates of oligarchic domination as a triumph over the people. We hold that the triumph is on the other side. Had the people contemplated an immediate revolution by force of arms, then, indeed, might the oligarchy elate a victory in the result, but the hard-working honest people contemplated no such thing; and, in the fact of their holding the meeting, regardless of threats, and still more in the fact of their refusing to be dragged into giving battle where they meant no force, and where even an armed enemy would have been taken by surprise, and would have been forced to have won a signal triumph for themselves and for constitutional agitation.

MR O'CONNOR'S VISIT TO HIS CONSTITUENTS.

NOTTINGHAM.—F. O'Connor, Esq., M.P., will make a public entry into Nottingham, on Easter Monday, on which day a tea party and ball will be held, to celebrate the triumph gained by him over the faction that presented a petition against his return to Parliament. Mr O'Connor will enter the town from the railway station precisely at twelve o'clock at noon, and the people will assemble in the Market-place, at half-past ten o'clock that morning—to start at eleven o'clock, and proceed down the highgate, Albert-street, Lister-gate, and Carington-street, to the railway station, where the procession will await Mr O'Connor's arrival. Thence from the station will be along the Leen-side, Bridge-street, Fisher-gate, Carter-gate, Sneinton-street, Hockley, Goose-gate, Broad-street, Parliament-street, Chapel-bar, round the Market-place, where Mr O'Connor will address the people. The tea party will be taken at six o'clock in the afternoon. A ball will be held at the Exchange Hall, Dore, to be open at half-past five o'clock, and dancing at nine. Tickets to be had of Mr W. H. Mott, Goose-gate; Mr Dove, Carrington; Mr Saunders, Radford; and Mr Thornton, Lyson-green.

HARTWOOD.—Mr Clark Cropper, of Manchester, will deliver a lecture in the Chartism-room, Hartwood-street, on Sunday evening, the 23rd inst. Chair to be taken at six o'clock.

HELSINGBURY.—Mr Clark, of the Executive, will attend the camp meeting on Sunday afternoon, at two o'clock; and the Stockport meeting at six o'clock in the evening.

ST HELEN'S.—The members of this locality are requested to attend their weekly meeting on Sunday, April 23rd.

THE CHARTER AND NO SURRENDER. UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE. VOTE BY BALLOT. NO PROPERTY QUALIFICATION. ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS. PAYMENT OF MEMBERS. EQUAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

28th Three subjects:—the parliamentary debates on the Gageing Bill; the proceedings of the Convention; and the great demonstration on Kennington Common—occupied the columns of our last number, to the almost total exclusion of all other subjects. Very unwillingly we were compelled to leave unnoted a host of important matters, held in different parts of the country. We now prefix to this week's reports, abridged notices of the meetings excluded from our last. It will be seen that we have adopted an arrangement by which the reports of the people's meetings will appear to greater advantage. Let the enemies of Chartism read the contents of the following columns, and remember that

"THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE IS THE VOICE OF GOD"

The Northern Counties.

MANCHESTER.—On Sunday week, a monster demonstration, supposed to have numbered nearly a hundred thousand persons, took place in Smithfield Market. The assembly was divided into two distinct meetings. Amongst the speakers were Mr Crockett, Mr Donovan, Mr Nuttall, Mr Cropper, Mr Rankine, and Mr John Murray. Resolutions were passed, pledging the meeting to support the Convention in any emergency. An immense meeting was held in the People's Hall, in the evening.

THE SPECIAL CONSTABLES.—A numerous body of special constables signed a requisition to the mayor for the use of the Town-hall, to consider how far they were justified, in case of riot, to use their own weapons. Of course the Town-hall was refused. The constables then engaged the Corn Exchange, and held two meetings, and passed resolutions to support the People's Charter.

THE TRADES.—The trades delegates of Manchester have held two meetings and passed resolutions in favour of the Charter, and protesting against the Gageing Bill.

THE UNEMPLOYED OPERATIVES.—A meeting of the "unemployed operatives" was held on Saturday evening, in Stevenson's-square. W. H. Chadwick was called to the chair. They were told that they were not yet prepared to receive their rights; that they were too degraded and ignorant. He believed the people were not yet ready to receive their rights as moral as any other people in the world; and if they were not, it was the fault of the government. If government changed the laws, they would also change the conduct of the people. He believed that the people were intellectually and physically prepared to receive their rights. (Hear, James A. Ball declared, that he was determined to speak his mind, in spite of what the authorities might say. They had, however, had plenty of talking; and it was now high time for acting. They were told to be contented. But could they be contented in slavery? No! They were determined to act. A resolution was determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators," who were inciting the people to the destruction of property. Had he ever advised them to destroy property? No! They were determined to resist the oppression, under which he had suffered.—William Schofield said, the mayor of Manchester had put out a proclamation in which he alluded to "unprincipled agitators,"

prerogative of the present House of Commons to abrogate the constitutional right of the people to meet and discuss their political and social wrongs; that this right, guaranteed and secured by the successful repulsion of tyrannical power, is, in the opinion of the meeting, the least security of the people to be established by the Bill for the better Protection of the Crown and Government, justifies the people in the exercise of their natural rights, and the assertion of their sovereign power, and the consequent re-institution of a new form of government of the people for the people.

Resolved, That this meeting, believing in the truth of the principle that 'all men are brethren,' contemplate in the Alien Bill now before parliament a gross and flagrant attempt, on the part of the tyrannical Government, to deprive the people of their rights and liberty, and to establish a new and arbitrary system of government, and that this meeting, expressing an odious distinction in treating the foreigners, creating as enemies, while the foes of freedom are fostered and protected—our vile government vainly thinking thereby to pay the onward march of Liberty, Liberty, Liberty.

Dighton	1	0	0	Woollwich	--	0	10
D Cowan, Tod	--	--	--	Mr Stubbs	--	8	6
Doyle	0	2	6	Mr Shidlon	--	8	0
W Setcliffe, Jo.	--	0	1	Mr Matthias,	--	--	--
J Barker	--	0	6	Mr Thomas	--	1	1
Drummond	--	0	9	Plymouth	--	0	15
Leamington	--	0	19	Ptsmouth	--	0	15
J Cantello	--	0	2	Lynn	--	0	10
Abergeyny	--	0	0	Massance	--	8	2
Warrington	--	1	0	Kilwinning	--	0	2
Doncaster	--	0	18	James E Duncan	--	--	--
Westphalia	--	0	10	Subscriptions	--	--	--
Rotherham	--	0	6	John-street, per	--	0	6
Barnbury	--	0	0	Fozza	--	--	--
Bath	--	0	0	Burslem, per	--	--	--
London-Ashefield	--	0	3	nough	--	0	2
Mansfield, Linby	1	0	0	Sourbridge	--	0	12
Ruthven Ffinty	--	0	5	Shields	--	0	7
Sheffield	--	0	0	Stalton	--	--	--
Bradford, Wilts	--	0	6	Mr Newton, dra-	--	0	10
Nottingham	--	0	0	per Leigh	--	--	--
John Bray	--	0	3	Leigh	--	0	16
Ereux	--	0	9	Charter Assocn.	--	2	6
Sleaford	--	0	3	Mr T Williams	--	0	6
Chorlton Rossendale	1	0	0	Raglan	--	0	16
Bingley	--	0	0	Stridington	--	0	6
				John Early	--	0	0

LOWLANDS AND REDMARBLE.—A general meeting of the members of this branch of the National Land Company will take place on Sunday, April 23, at the School-room, at six o'clock.

LOUGHBOUGH.—The various villages in this district are requested to send delegates next Sunday evening, to meet the council at the Wheatsheaf, at seven o'clock.

NOTTINGHAM.—A meeting of the friends of Mr. O'Connor will be held at the Leopard, Derby-road, on Sunday next, at twelve o'clock.—The next meeting of the Land members will be held at the Flamingo, in the street, on Sunday evening, at seven o'clock.—The free and easy will be held at Mr. Marshall's, the Lord Nelson, on Saturday evening, at seven o'clock.

SUNDERLAND.—A general meeting of the Chartist Association will be held on Monday evening, April 24, at seven o'clock, at the Commercial Hotel.

HALIFAX.—Mr. Hannay will lecture in the Working-man's Hall, on Sunday, April 23, at six o'clock in the evening.

Mr. HuxFORD.—A great public meeting was held here on Monday, to hear an address from Mr. Clough, a talented Englishman, on "The signs of the times, and the duty of the people at the present momentous period." Mr. Hugh O'Neill, an Irishman, occupied the chair. Mr. Clough spoke for an hour, in an eloquent strain, taking a searching view of the present state of England, and especially of the struggles made by the enslaved, and more especially the glorious victory achieved by the brave people of France, and concluded by calling upon the people of this oppressed country to make a bold and determined effort to secure their political freedom. Mr. Clough then read a long and brave and true speech, in which he called upon to move the following resolution:—"That this meeting being composed of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen, equally unrepresented in the legislature, resolve to throw aside all national prejudice, and make an united struggle to obtain the People's Charter."

SOUTH LONDON.—At a very full meeting of this branch of the Charter Association, held at the meeting hereby expresses its full and entire confidence in Feargus O'Connor, Esq., M.P., for his indefatigable, noble, and indomitable defence of the best interests of the working classes; and this meeting has resolved to send Mr. O'Connor a testimonial of its warmest thanks for his services to the cause of the so-called House of Commons, and that the secretary be instructed to forward this resolution to Mr. O'Connor.

WESTMINSTER.—A splendid meeting was held on Monday evening of the Wallace Brigade branch, held at the residence of Mr. John Wallis, Sutton Ground. The meeting was most ably addressed by Mr. Vernon and Mr. Churchill. A meeting takes place every Monday evening, at eight o'clock precisely, when persons wishing to become members may enrol their names.

GREEN PASTURE ROAD.—At the weekly meeting of this branch of the Charter Association, held at the Green Gate, on Monday evening last, Mr. Ferdinando in the chair, G. 5d. was collected towards defraying the expenses of the London delegates.

in the history of this country were of the same nature as the one which is applicable to what may be fairly apprehended from the state of feeling existing in the minds of the unemployed and half-starved population of England, Ireland, and Scotland. I now say to my late employer, to whom I have written the letter which you have used, and to any other employer to whom I may be sent, that if they thought by an immediate dismissal to punish me for my political disobedience, let them know I have felt them, by having calculated upon both the incompetency and the arbitrary unwillingness of any employer to receive my services. In concluding, I lay to state that although I am not a Chartist by enrolment, I am one from conviction; and therefore I now working men indeed who are not Chartists in that sense of the word.

E. FAIRBANK, Tin-Plate Worker.

THE FRATERNAL DEMOCRATS.—A members meeting of this association will take place on Wednesday evening next, at eight o'clock, at Cartwright's coffee room, 15, Abchurch Lane. All members are requested to attend on important business.

