

From the Polish of CASSIMER BRADZIMSKI. Translated
by Dr BOWRING.

Reviews.

The History of Ireland. By T. Wright, M.A., F.R.S. &c. Part IV. London: J. and F. Tallis, 100, St. John Street.

This part details the history of Ireland from the latter end of the reign of King John to the latter end of the reign of Edward I. It is comprised of about one hundred and fifteen years. The history of this period, its tides, feuds, wars, assassinations, plundering, &c. and slayings, seem during this period to have turned Ireland into one huge 'field of blood.' As usual, the Irish appear to have been more intent upon cutting each other throats than making any well-adviced effort to redeem their country from foreign oppression. It is at this period that the Anglo-Norman, or perhaps, as it might be more proper to call them Anglo-Irish barons, seeing that Strongbow's blood had now become the settled born and bred occupiers of the soil, added to the miseries of the unhappy country. The invasion

Irish themselves afforded their enemies every facility for carrying out this infamous system. In the course of the hundred and fifteen years embraced in this period of the history, there appears to have been but one attempt made to rally the Irish to a national struggle for the expulsion of the English from the island. One battle—the celebrated battle of Downfall in which Brian O'Neill, the chief of the anti-English confederation, was slain—sufficed to put an end to the combination which was produced by the English and to the success indicated by its progress. The subsequent wars were the wars of the English over the more or less aimless struggles of tribes and families. It was against each other that the Irish principally turned their arms.

We are told that Edward the First* was desirous of

* By Mother is meant here the native land. The superior attachment of the Poles to their country made them more sympathetic.

? Edit. 2.

On the beneficial operation and result of that measure said Mr W. Band has not a shadow of a doubt. 'Had we a national poor-rate,' he says, 'we should

and it is only proper it should. From the repeated escape of convicts from Portsmouth, there is evidently a want of proper vigilance in the guard placed over them. It was only last week that a number of felons confined on board the York convict ship lying off Gosport, laid a well-arranged plan to escape, but in this instance it was frustrated by some of the gang giving information of the proceedings to the authorities.

In the year 1877, the average wages of hand-loom weavers was £10s. per week; flour, per load, £2 7s. In 1810, wages, per week, 14s.; flour, per load, £3 10s. In 1840, wages, per week, 6s. 6d; flour, per load, £2 10s.

These tables of wages clearly exhibit the tendency of hygone years; and if further proof were necessary, the figures used by yourself on the increase of poor and poor rates would be amply sufficient; and I may add,

used an umbrella; what the mischief good did the shower bath do her? Deacon: 'She said she felt better. Her clothes weren't wet a mite. She sat under the umbrella for half an hour, till the water trickled off, and said 'twas cool and delightful, and just like a little shower-bath in summer. Then she took off her things, and rubbed her for half an hour arter.'—*American paper.*

heart not true to the cause of humanity, and to see a resolution so sprightly and indomitable enlisted in the most advanced principles yet discovered. His manners are elegant, and truthful in the extreme; he has a face radiant with peaceful, happy goodness; no bad passion has left a trace on his smooth, handsome physiognomy, which is lighted up by a pair of eyes of such bright splendour as is rarely seen.

TO THE CHARTISTS.

MY FRIENDS,

At Afoot you will find the indictment of Adams, McClellane, and Hildyard, the Glasgow and Paisley delegates to the National Assembly; and, if you feel insulted by so much space being so occupied, in the only newspaper in the Empire that is devoted to the cause of Labour, you must blame your friends and not mine, rather than Adams, McClellane, and Hildyard; because had it not been for the application of the friends, such rubbish never should have been consigned to the columns of the *Northern Star*; nor do I attribute the anxiety for its publication to any other than the best of motives, as my friends in Glasgow and Paisley, who come in contact with those three delegates, may naturally presume that he is non-publication of their oft-repeated nonsense, may give some colour of truth, not only to what was withheld, but to what may be expounded.

I consider this short apology necessary for the publication of the matter, assuring you at the same time, that henceforth and for ever, I shall leave all such charges to be discussed by the friends and not by me, as enemies of Chartism, while I think I may, without vanity, ask the reader whether any other proprietor of a newspaper in the world would open its columns to such absurd and insulting trash; and at the same time, from one of my correspondents, I have the writers have declared that the composition did not contain a single word of abuse. However, I am sure, if you shall judge for yourselves, and following it, you will find, not a mere evasive answer, but the most unshakable refutation of every charge, and the most unmistakable conviction of the plaintiffs.

STATEMENT OF ADAMS, COCHRANE, AND HARLEY, AS PROMISED, WITHOUT CURTAILMENT OR ALTERATION.

"We never seek the battle, nor show it when it comes."

TO THE CHARTISTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

RESPECTED FRIENDS AND BROTHERS,

At the conclusion of a public lecture delivered by Mr O'Connor, in the Chapel, 100, East Regent Street, Glasgow, on the evening of the 26th of October last, it was settled by mutual agreement between that gentleman and us, that the differences between him and us, respecting the proceedings of the National Convention and Assembly, and his conduct in reference thereto, should be fully and fairly discussed through the medium of the *Northern Star*; he (Mr O'Connor) pledging himself to give full insertion, without curtailment or alteration, to whatever we might have to communicate on the subject; in accordance, therefore, with that agreement, we now proceed to lay before you, as we best can, a faithful statement of the facts regarding this (hitherto) somewhat mysterious matter, resolved to be as brief as a due regard to a full disclosure of the requisite facts will allow us to be.

In this discussion we have two duties to perform—one to ourselves and another to the public, more particularly that portion of it which we now address. First, we must defend ourselves against the charges of Mr O'Connor; and second, state, and prove by evidence—on a clear, direct, and complete—the charges we have to prefer against him.

First, then, we will vindicate ourselves. Mr O'Connor, in his letter of the 7th October, speaking of the conviction of Cuffey, Dowling, Lacey, Fay, and Ritchie, says—"They are the victims of the National Assembly—an Assembly whose very constitution—from its numbers—was illegal, as I told you at the time; an Assembly which, from its mode of election, did not represent the feelings of the Chartist body." This short extract contains no less than three distinct charges, all of them important, and the first of a rather serious character, affecting as it does the moral integrity and personal honour of the members of the National Assembly; charges which—could they be clearly and fully substantiated—would, sufficient, we confess, for ever to disentitle those against whom they are preferred, to any degree of public esteem or confidence. We have transported poor honest Cuffey, and his unfortunate fellow-sufferers—so says Mr O'Connor. Assuredly such charges are no child's talk, and the public must see therefrom that our demand upon Mr O'Connor to throw open the columns of the *Star*, to afford the accused an opportunity of meeting them, is by no means an unreasonable demand indeed. Well—we shall meet them, and meet them fairly; and be content to leave the decision in the hands of a discerning and impartial public.

Well, let us now look at the proof which Mr O'Connor has adduced in support of this first and most serious charge. Here is the burden of it, and if you examine the letter in question, you will find it to be the only thing in the shape of evidence insisted on—that the plan of organisation propounded by the National Assembly was illegal. Now, waiving discussion for a moment on that point, let us ask: Does Mr O'Connor really mean to affirm that Cuffey and his brethren in bonds were transported for being members of that Association? Were they not rather tried and convicted of allowing themselves to be mixed up with an organisation of a character altogether distinct, and entirely different from the National Charter Association, and of having had recourse to measures neither sanctioned nor contemplated by the National Assembly? Were they not, as upon the evidence adduced in court they have been clearly proven to be, instigated to these criminal acts by the miscreants Powell and his co-conspirators, acting under instructions and paid by the Government itself? And yet Mr O'Connor unblushingly affirms, "they are the victims of the National Assembly." What are the acts of the Assembly? Are they not its resolutions? And where is the resolution of that body which either sanctions or enjoins a resort to secret combinations, or open armed aggression, or even resistance? But we will go further. Where is the rule in the Plan of Organisation requiring any of these things? or even, what member of the Assembly made the speech in which such proceedings are recommended? Although we hold it would be unfair to condemn the body for the words of individuals, as it would be unfair to hold the House of Commons responsible for one half of the blarney contained in the speeches of Mr O'Connor. Does he adduce any facts of that description? or does he simply make the assertion, in the consciousness of his own power of gulling, and the proportionate gullibility of his readers, many of whom take for fact and argument, without examination, whatever he chooses to affirm, to serve his own purposes?

But we have something to say regarding the legality of the Association. No one will dispute the fact of Mr O'Connor exerting a great influence upon the British Chartist mind. A large portion of the Chartist body are, undoubtedly, influenced by his example. Now, it is a published fact, that Mr O'Connor actually became a member of this very "illegal" Association. Why, then, has he not been victimised? Why is he not transported? If, as he would have you believe, the simple fact of being a member of the Association (for we defy Mr O'Connor to show another connecting link between these victims and the National Assembly), constitute ground sufficient upon which a person may be tried, convicted, and transported for life—may we not ask: Was Mr O'Connor anxious that he, and those whom his example might induce to join, should share the fate of Cuffey, Dowling, Lacey, Fay, and Ritchie? Did Mr O'Connor, previous to his being elected a member of the Executive Committee, know the rules of the Association? Then, why did he publish his acceptance of office, and, thereby appear to sanction the legality of an Association, which for its illegality, he now condemns? Did Mr O'Connor, previous to joining, not know the rules? Then, what kind of a political leader is he for the millions—who acts before he thinks, thereby

entailing the possibility of consequences the most disastrous to the freedom and safety of those who confide in him? But was it not *until* the trial of Cuffey, he came to be aware of the illegality of the Association? Then, what kind of a lawyer must he be, who did not know before? Did he know the rules to be illegal before the trial of Cuffey? Then, why did he not publish it *in time*, and thereby, at least, absolve himself from whatever consequences might result to those who, otherwise, might be entrapped through ignorance, and, perhaps, poor Cuffey amongst the rest.

But, Mr O'Connor says, in the same letter: "Chartism has been declared by the Attorney-General to be an illegal combination." Daniel O'Connell, long ago, declared Chartism to be a transportable offence; and, it is certainly somewhat surprising, that Mr O'Connor, after so many years' opposition to the great Irish leader, on this very point, should come, at last, to the same conclusion, upon the overwhelming authority of a Whig Attorney-General. But we take it, though he says it, he does not mean Chartism, but the Charter Association. Well, and are all things to be held as illegal, which a Whig Attorney-General chooses to call so? Splendid authority, certainly. Upon the same authority, Mr O'Connor is a seditious-monger, a libeller, and a conspirator. But, will Mr O'Connor plead guilty to these charges—simply because the Whig and Tory Attorneys-General, who preferred these charges against him, said so? An Irish Whig Attorney-General, backed by the verdict of an Irish Jury, has declared Smith O'Brien and his co-patriots guilty of High Treason; but will Mr O'Connor dare say these men were traitors, or, will he insult the Irish bar, of which he is a member, by saying that English Whig legal authority is more to be relied on than Irish? Let him answer these questions, before he asks his readers implicitly to bend their judgments to such authority, as, in this instance, to serve his own ends, he deems it proper to introduce.

The truth is—and Mr O'Connor knows it—that all powerful organisations of the people—that is, such as are well supported by numbers and means, are illegal. All weak organisations—that is, such organisations as are sanctioned and supported by Mr O'Connor—are legal, because possessing no power, either in point of numbers or funds; they are perfectly harmless, and, therefore, not worth the trouble or expense of prosecution. And, however Mr O'Connor may boast of the legality of previous Associations, the true test of legality for them all is their proportionate degree of efficiency in obstructing the tyranny of the ruling power; and assuredly the safety of the members of his pet Association was more attributable to its own inherent poverty and weakness than to the superior wisdom and discretion of its acknowledged leader—let him and his Whig lawyer authorities say what they will. According to them, all that does not and cannot effectively oppose tyranny, is legal; all that to any extent does and can, is illegal, and punishable if not sufficiently overwhelming to command obedience or respect. So much for the charge of transporting poor honest Cuffey and his unfortunate comrades; a charge no less malicious and vindictive, than it is false, cowardly, and absurd.

The second charge in the above extract which we shall notice, is—that the National Assembly "did not represent the feelings of the Chartist body." This may be either true or false. If true, it is the fault of those who appointed it. But Mr O'Connor, at least, ought not to have said so, seeing we can so easily arraign him as a witness to prove the contrary. In his letter to the National Assembly, in the *Star* of the 6th May, he says, "I consider you a fair representation of the Chartist mind." Should Mr O'Connor dispute the credibility of this witness, the public will at least have the benefit of knowing how much credulity they should attach to the same testimony in other matters.

There is still another, and by no means unimportant charge, preferred against the National Assembly, that of being an illegal body. Mr O'Connor says, "An Assembly whose very constitution from its numbers was illegal, as I told you at the time." Now, as so much has been said pro and con respecting the legality of such bodies, is it not high time the public had something definite upon this much disputed point? It is a very easy matter for Mr O'Connor, or any one else, to say this, that, or the other thing about it, but will he point out the particular Act of Parliament, or quote the words of the act, to convince the public that what he says is true regarding it? We demand this, in order to be fully satisfied on the subject, seeing, as yet, we have never got so much as the authority even of a Whig Attorney-General to convince us in the matter.

But we have authority for the opposite of what Mr O'Connor asserts, and though not lawyer authority, yet of such a description as Mr O'Connor must admit as being entitled to some respect. Mr O'Connor, speaking of the Lancashire Chartist trials, says, "So ample were the rights of the people, as defined by Baron Rolfe at Lancaster, that the fifty-nine persons who were then tried and acquitted, solemnly accepted the construction of the law by the Just Judge, and all declared that they would henceforth act upon his construction of the law; and the consequence is, not one of those fifty-nine have been entrapped by the National Assembly." Now, it so happens that Dr McDouall is one of those fifty-nine, and according to his expressed opinion upon the subject, the National Assembly, as regarded its constitution, was clearly within the law. His opinion was, that were the individual members duly elected at public meetings, and the objects of the body legal and well defined, whatever might be its numbers, it was merely an aggregate public meeting, and therefore in no way illegally constituted. (Care was taken to see that this was the case.) Now, there is one of Mr O'Connor's fifty-nine Lancashire men (out of a considerable number who were members) who acknowledged the legality of the Assembly's constitution, and if Mr O'Connor be correct in what he says, would not sanction any proceedings but such as were in strict accordance with "the construction of the law by the Just Judge, which they had solemnly accepted," and which they had declared that they would henceforth act upon? If, as Mr O'Connor insinuates, the Assembly either was a trap in which to be caught, or made a trap in which people might be caught, what comes of Mr O'Connor's boasting about the superior caution of these persons—the result of their superior legal advantages? If the Assembly neither was a trap nor made a trap, and therefore could entrap nobody, what comes of the charge of illegality, so unscrupulously preferred against it?

But, we have authority for the legality of the Assembly, notwithstanding of its numbers, which Mr O'Connor certainly will not attempt to contradict. At the morning sitting of Thursday, during the first week of the Convention, when the question of calling the Assembly was being discussed, Mr O'Connor being present, James Adams, of Glasgow, rose and spoke to the following effect—"I think the time has now gone past for us to be discussing about what is legal or illegal. The truth is, if the increased numbers of the proposed National Assembly are to constitute it an illegal body, this Convention must be illegal for the same reason, seeing we have sat here from the commencement composed of a number over forty-nine; and, if we have braved the law in the one case, why should we fear to do so in the other?" Here Mr O'Connor interrupted him with cries of "No, no, no; that does not make us illegal." James Adams resumed, "Very well, we are to have delegates from Ireland in the Assembly, and that will make it illegal at all events?" Here Mr O'Connor again interposed with cries of "No, no, no; that will not make it illegal either." James Adams again resumed, "Very well, I am exceedingly glad to hear such statements come from lawyers, and I hope that those who are lawyers amongst

us will always so tender their advice, in order to keep us right who cannot be expected to know much about these matters." Now, that is the truth, upon the testimony of as honest a man as Fergus O'Connor, Esq., M.P., and has this advantage over many of that gentleman's statements, it can be corroborated by the testimony of many others equally honest and respectable.

In fact, during the whole discussion of this question in the Convention it was clearly, distinctly, and universally understood, that the Assembly was to consist of a much larger number than one hundred, as ultimately agreed upon. Mr Thomas Clark, of the Executive, in his speech on proposing the programme for the Convention, [see report of the Convention proceedings of Wednesday, 5th of April, afternoon sitting, in *Star* of the 8th,] says, "They proposed that delegates should present these memorials to the Queen, and then he hoped to see a delegation of at least five hundred persons." Now the presentation of the National Memorials was the ostensible purpose of the National Assembly; and yet Mr O'Connor, though one of the Executive as well as Mr Clark, professes to be ignorant of the intentions of that body.

But if the Assembly was an illegal body, why did not the Government attempt to put it down, more especially after—if they did not know before—Mr O'Connor had published the intelligence so conspicuously through the *Star*. Mr O'Connor may say, "They were too powerless to be feared," but by so doing our argument upon the legality of the Association is confirmed.

Besides, if Mr O'Connor was so terrified at the "illegal" numbers of the National Assembly, and can so very cleverly trace the transportation of Cuffey, as well as all the evils which now afflict Chartism, to that circumstance, why did he sit in the Convention of '39, which had more than forty-nine delegates? Or must we attribute to that fact the subsequent proceedings at Newport, and the condemnation and ultimate transportation of the Welsh patriots? Why did he sit in the Manchester Convention of '42? Were there only forty-nine delegates in that body? And if more, was that circumstance attributable to the disturbances in Lancashire, and the consequent arraignment of the fifty-nine persons on a charge of conspiracy? Or were they arraigned on account of the objects for which they met, and certain resolutions which they passed, which Mr O'Connor, instead of courageously carrying out, denounced in the *Star* as the work of the Anti-Corn Law League? In the same year did he not sit in the Conference at Birmingham, and declare, in the face of about four hundred delegates there assembled, "that although he should go alone, he would go with the Charter on his back, whole and entire?"

And, after all, what says the leader in the *Star* of the 20th of May?—"That even before the French Revolution it was agreed upon, in the event of the National Petition being rejected by the Legislature, that a larger and more comprehensive Convention, representing all classes friendly to the movement, should be immediately called, to present a memorial to her Majesty, praying for the dissolution of Parliament—the dismissal of the Ministers—and the appointment of men who would make the Charter the law of the land." It was also determined, "that this body should consist of one hundred members—be called the National Assembly—and after the presentation of the memorial decide what steps should next be taken by the people to secure those franchises which are the inalienable rights of Britons." Now for Mr O'Connor, after all this, to denounce the Assembly as an illegal body, or plead ignorance of its intended numbers, is so extremely like trying to make a loop-hole for himself to escape from the consequences of his own cowardice, and his proper share of responsibility, that no person unprejudiced enough to look truth in the face, will consider it anything else.

Another charge brought against the National Assembly by Mr O'Connor—that of censuring and abusing him (see his letter of the 6th of May) we directly and distinctly deny. Throughout that long letter not one single word of abuse does he quote, except one expression—which is not abuse—namely, that some delegate said, "Let him stick to the Land, he is not a fit leader for us." Some delegate is not the National Assembly; and to bring such a charge against the general body, on such paltry grounds, bespeaks a desire of quarrelling, as unworthy as it is weak and contemptible. But the truth is, no delegate ever made use of such language at any of the Assembly's meetings, and let Mr O'Connor prove the opposite if he can, and at the same time, put the saddle on the right horse.

Mr O'Connor also, in a late number of the *Star*, says, "The Assembly spent three whole weeks in abusing him." If so, then they must have wrought time and half, seeing they only sat two weeks altogether.

In this letter, of the 7th of October, the Assembly is also charged with having deposed and denounced the Executive body. That we deny. Has Mr O'Connor quoted the particular resolution of the Assembly, by which they were either deposed or denounced? No, nor he cannot, seeing no such resolution ever was passed, or even proposed. And whatever may have been expressed by individual members, capable of being construed into denunciation, assuredly found no sympathy amongst the general body. The influence of the O'Connor party in the Assembly, notwithstanding of its "illegality," was too strong to allow it, had such been attempted. Even the expression—"Let him stick to the land," &c., had such been actually used, is not denunciation, but merely an opinion as to Mr O'Connor's qualifications as a political leader, and the sphere in which his peculiar capabilities might be more profitably exercised. And as he has often declared public character to be public property, surely cannot object to the members of the National Assembly acting on this principle as well as others. The Assembly never denounced any party, neither in the Executive nor out of it, and we feel confident, no member of that body, with the exception of Mr O'Connor himself, would have the effrontery to say so.

It is true the Assembly appointed a new Executive, but in doing so they were, so far, only carrying into effect a resolution of the Convention requiring them to do so. But they certainly did not intend thereby to wound the feelings either of Mr O'Connor or any other member of the previous Executive. None of them were re-elected, to be sure, but it was themselves principally who prevented it. They refused to stand the election on account of their duties, as Land Company Directors, dis- enabling them to give the requisite time and attention to the duties of the office. How, then, under these circumstances, could the Assembly have done otherwise than they did?

But it is somewhat strange, after all, for Mr O'Connor to complain of this, after what he previously stated in his letter to the "Old Guards" in the *Star* of the 13th of May. He there expresses his entire acquiescence in the appointment of the new Executive, and promises them his hearty co-operation and support, and asks his "Old Guards" to do likewise. He also gives the very same reasons, as did the others, for considering the step a necessary one, and assures us, at the same time, that the matter had been much talked over between him and the other members of the Executive, that the proper performance of the duties of the office was incompatible with the efficient discharge of the other, and had it not been for incurring a charge of shrinking, they would have very speedily resigned. But it appears Mr O'Connor just speaks as it may serve the purposes of the moment, regardless of what he had previously affirmed, never dreaming that his readers, particularly his "Old Guards," will ever think of criticising

what he says; otherwise, we cannot account for those flat contradictions of himself, which, so frequently characterise his very proxy and egotistical effusions.

So far, then, to the best of our ability, we have met and rebutted the charges of Mr O'Connor, whether successfully or not, remains with you, not with us, to say. Of this, however, we are certain—a dispassionate public will give us credit both for plainness and moderation. We have confined ourselves strictly to plain facts and reason, and if we have failed to convince we have not condescended to abuse. We have had to say things, we could wish we did not require to say, but in doing so we have but acted on the principle of calling things by their right names. We confess our own feelings have been injured by the treatment we have received at the hands of men whose Bible is the *Star*, and whose Great Prophet is O'Connor. But these we have restrained, from a conviction of the correctness of what our own poet has so happily expressed.

"Facts are obdurate than wine," and darena be disputed."

We shall now proceed to state, and prove, the charges we have to prefer against Mr O'Connor, which are as follows:—First, that Mr O'Connor falsified his promises, and betrayed the confidence of the people, during the late agitation for their political emancipation; and, second, that he deceived the Convention, and attempted to impose upon the House of Commons, by grossly exaggerated statements regarding the number of signatures attached to the National Petition.

Now, these are serious charges, and, however unscrupulous Mr O'Connor has shown himself to be, in preferring some of an equally serious character against us, who have neither equal ability nor means of defending ourselves, yet we confess, that nothing short of the strongest sense of public duty could have induced us to take such a course against one in whom a large portion of the Chartist body have been long accustomed to confide. But conscience must be obeyed, at whatever cost, and (as far as a statement of facts, which the public have a perfect right to know, can serve the object,) the sacred cause of liberty redeemed from ruin and disgrace.

First, then, that Mr O'Connor falsified his promises, and betrayed the confidence of the people during the late agitation.

Mr O'Connor, in his letter to the "English People," in the *Star* of the 15th April, says—"If I have been guilty of falsehood or deception, I am unworthy of your confidence." We shall see. In his letter of the 8th April, he writes as follows—"The mighty mind of England is looking to us all, and especially to me, for the promised fruits of our long and incessant labour; and, as far as I am concerned, I am resolved, that whether my days in this world be long or short, not to abate my ardour—not to diminish my demands—or to peril the cause which is nearest my heart—by throwing away a single opportunity which may lead to its accomplishment. If I had trafficked in your confidence, and made merchandise of your credulity, I might be induced to cry 'Wait! wait! wait!' But your poverty—your destitution and misery—and my own feeling and sense of humanity—the love of truth and justice, would not allow my lips to utter the delusive words; and, therefore, it is that I tell you, that in my soul I believe the propitious hour has arrived when our long suffering, and martyrdom may be crowned with the laurels of victory."

Now, one would suppose, from reading such soul-stirring sentiments as these, wrote just immediately before the Kennington Common Demonstration, on the 10th, and in the belief that Mr O'Connor was a man of his word, that he, of all others, would be foremost in the field of danger, most courageous in the battle, and the very last who would give the slightest countenance to anything in the shape of temporising or retreat. But what a grievous mistake. He was the man, and the only man, who deliberately resolved, and carried his resolve into execution, to make the people evince that spirit of cowardice and irresolution by which the grand results, anticipated from that display of their moral power and determination, were completely frustrated. He—after being a party to an agreement come to by the Convention, that the Executive were to take the command of the procession, when brought breast to breast with the armed forces of the Government—but not till then—and then to act as their own prudence might suggest; he—after telling the country, previous to the meeting of the Convention, that, if interfered with, the people would strike in their own defence—that man went to that Demonstration for the express purpose of prohibiting the procession, and, as a set-off to the affair—no doubt intended in the plan—was sent for by the police authorities, and came back with the information that, if the procession was attempted, the people would be fired on. This he actually confessed in the House of Commons. (See his speech in the House of Commons, on Wednesday, April 12th, on the question of going into Committee on the "Crown and Government Security Bill.")

And, what then? No sooner did he get the majority of the Convention away—some home to their constituents, and others as missionaries to prepare for the meeting of the Assembly, than out he comes with his temporising letter of the 22nd April, asking the country to postpone the meeting of the Assembly; with his cringing, crawling, crouching adulation of Sir G. Grey; and his dastardly fling at the Irish Confederate Repealers, in the person of C. G. Duffy, of the *Nation*; insulting the Convention, too, by attempting to thwart its resolutions—to which he had been a consenting party—and shabbily passing by, without consulting, the nucleus left behind, to whom, in the interim, properly belonged the right and duty of directing the mind of the country, and transacting all public business connected with the movement. Was not that policy something like the "delusive" one of "Wait! wait! wait?" Yes; "Wait," he says, "nine-tenths of the shopkeepers in England have become converts of Chartism. Wait till we see what the new Reform party are going to propose." The true version of all which is—"Wait; do not go so fast head. I am afraid of your enthusiasm. Wait—I told you the propitious hour had arrived; but I find it all a mistake. Wait, I expected to carry the Charter by the power of public excitement—so I see I could, but it might be somewhat dangerous, and I am not prepared to risk my corpse. The Convention were for going ahead; I have got rid of it. The Assembly may be such another set of go-ahead fellows; I must, therefore, get the people divided. This I can do, because I have some influence. That accomplished, the excitement will go down; then I am safe. And, if there is any doubt about the matter, I will throw all the blame upon your folly. I will throw dust in the people's eyes, and, after all, retain my position as the unpaid, unpurchasable, and unfinishing Leader of the Imperial Chartists." The enthusiasm of the people abated—their brightest hopes of success were all blasted by Mr O'Connor's letters—they hesitated about sending their delegates to the Assembly—the 1st of May came—the Assembly met—and behold the result: out of one hundred delegates elected, only twenty-seven appeared at the commencement. Gradually they came dropping in, till the beginning of the second week, but never did the number reach anything like that originally intended. The Assembly saw from the beginning it had not the unanimous support of the people. The sincere portion of the members, finding themselves so awkwardly situated, and knowing the cause, boldly and openly expressed their minds upon the subject. This called forth the condemnation of the O'Connor party, who, in consistency, ought not to have been there at all, and hence the speedy dissolution of the Assembly, and the complete prostration of the people's cause. Yet O'Connor is the "popular Leader."

In the *Star* of the 15th April, Mr O'Connor promised to pre-announce a plan in the *Star* of the Saturday following, "to upset the present system, and hurl the present Ministers from power in one week after Easter." His letter was that plan, and though it did not succeed in accomplishing what he said it would do, yet, doubtless, it has accomplished all it was intended for. Lord John still stands at the helm—the good old ship has weathered the political storm—and the whole Whig crew are as bold and brisk as ever.

Again, Mr O'Connor pledged himself—in the event of Sir George Grey's ("the tender-hearted man") Gaggling Bill becoming law—to stand up in the House of Commons, and declare himself a Republican—but he never did it.

Again he promised to impeach the Ministry ("the tender-hearted man" included) for their treason to the Crown and the people, regardless of the odium to which it might subject him—but he did not do it.

Again, he promised, to a deputation from the National Assembly (not disputing its legality), to bring on a motion for the Charter, as soon as the motion of Mr Hume, for the lesser measure, was disposed of—but no such motion has, as yet, made its appearance in the House of Commons.

Again, he told the Convention, he would be prepared to do the bidding of the Assembly, when it met; but, instead thereof, he tried to prevent its meeting, and, to some extent, succeeded. Those of its members who did meet he exposed to public scandal, by false accusations and misrepresentations of their proceedings; and, by the instrumentality of his own partisans within it, he rendered the best efforts of its honest members, to turn its little remaining power to the best account, unavailing and fruitless.

But why need we enumerate? We could fill the *Star* with his broken pledges. Yet that is the man whose patriotic soul, horrified at the misery and destitution of Englishmen—whose unbought love of truth and justice—whose strong feeling and sense of humanity, would not allow his lips to utter the delusive words, "Wait, wait, wait." That is the man to whom the mighty mind of England—ay, and of Ireland, too—was especially looking for the promised fruits of their long and incessant labour. That is the man who tells his "Old Guards," that "change of circumstances never alter his resolution." That is the man who "does not traffick in your confidence, nor make merchandise of your credulity." That is the man who tells you "that the time has arrived when those who hold your confidence must appeal to your wisdom—when those who have struggled from the infant's birth to the giant's maturity, will have to rest their claims and confidence, not upon one solitary act, but upon their every act." We say—measure him by his own standard. Exercise your own judgments. Be men. Read, read, read; think, think, think. Try him—not by one solitary act, but by his every act, and then decide as to whether he be entitled to a continuation of your confidence. We know something of his history. In 1843, he boasted, while on a provincial tour with Mr Duncombe, that he had enrolled 1,500 members in Glasgow, in a new National Charter Association he was then establishing, while the fact was, he enrolled none at all, but only sold some 300 cards, without asking the names of those who bought them. His then "toady" in Glasgow repeated the lie in his report of the meeting, and, when asked, refused to give any explanation of the matter. He boasted, also, of having enrolled immense multitudes in the other provinces he visited; but, if we may judge from the report of his efforts in Glasgow, the statements were just so many barefaced, impudent falsehoods. He told the country in 1846, that public opinion was then sufficiently extensive in favour of Chartism—that his organisation was sufficiently powerful—and all that was wanted to insure success was the right direction of the power at their disposal; while, at the time, the weekly receipts of the Association would not pay the expense of a decent place of meeting, much less pay the wages of the Executive. His constant aim has evidently been to make the country believe, by such fabrications as these, that he is the leader of a great and powerful party, while he knows—that he is aware the Government knows—that, when the struggle comes, he cannot marshal the forces he boasts he can command, and then he must have recourse to the delusive policy of "Wait, wait, wait!" in order to screen himself from the consequences of his own foolish pretensions. His political career is but one continuous system of falsehood and imposture, only to subserve the vain-glorious purpose of retaining a position, the duties of which he never had the nerve nor the discretion efficiently to perform.

He is unbought in his egotism, pretending to the possession of power outrivalling Omnipotence itself. In 1846, he said, Peel was Almighty—Peel declared himself beat by Cobden—and O'Connor assumed to be the conqueror of the great Free Trade agitator. He is as changeable as the weathercock, having for many years zealously opposed the measures of the Anti-Corn Law League, and afterwards turning so much in favour of them, when adopted by Peel, as to declare them to be such as would make us great at home, and, therefore, great abroad, and doubted if even a Chartist Parliament would have been prepared to sanction a measure so sweeping. So "generous" was he in his advocacy of Free Trade, that even at his own expense he assembled a Convention to declare in favour of the measure, and as a grand wind up to the proceedings, gave three times three cheers in honour of the "Almighty Minister;" and now, Jim Crow like, he attributes "the distress of the country to these very measures. We ask, again, is such a man worthy of your confidence and support?"

We shall now proceed to the proof of the second charge, namely—that Mr O'Connor deceived the Convention, and attempted to impose upon the House of Commons, by grossly exaggerated statements regarding the number of signatures attached to the National Petition.

In the *North British Express* of the 28th of October, Mr O'Connor is reported to have said, in reply to Mr Shirron, at Aberdeen, "That although upon his oath, or even upon his death-bed, he would unhesitatingly declare that that Petition contained 5,000,000 signatures."

Mr O'Connor will also remember having stated in the Convention that, after having made the necessary inquiries, he could now state, that the Petition had already received not less than 5,400,000 signatures, and that it would not be proper for him to make statements there which he was not prepared to substantiate in the House of Commons, as it might be examined. We ask you to keep these facts before your minds, and compare them with the evidence we shall presently adduce.

In the *Star* of the 7th of October, Mr O'Connor, in his letter to the Chartists, says, "I believe in my conscience that a more honest or sincere man never breathed than Cuffey." And again, in the same paragraph he adds, "I tell you that an honest man does not breathe the breath of life than Cuffey, and that he was appointed auditor of the accounts of the Land Company, from the implicit confidence that those of his own order placed in his integrity." So much, for the acknowledged credibility of this witness.

Another principal witness we have to bring forward is Mr James Grassby, of London, a man well known and much respected by the trades of the metropolis. Let us hear, then, what they have got to say in this matter.

On Thursday, the 4th of May, on the road between John Street Institution and the Land Office, in presence of Mr John M'Crae, a member of the Executive, and delegate to the Assembly for Dundee; John Pearson, delegate for Greenock; and Andrew Harley, delegate for Glasgow; William Cuffey stated, in answer to questions put to him on the subject, that on

the occasion of him and Mr Grassby waiting on Mr O'Connor, at Osborne's Hotel, for the purpose of asking him to make arrangements for giving a full report of the Convention proceedings in the *Star*, Mr O'Connor enquired "How they were getting on with the Petition?" Their reply was, "Pretty well, but they thought the number of signatures would not come up to anything like what he (Mr O'Connor) anticipated." Mr O'Connor replied, "That he had already stated to the country, that there would be 5,000,000, and he would so state it to the House of Commons." He was then reminded, "that it might be dangerous, as it might be inquired into." Mr O'Connor rejoined, "Pooh, pooh, pooh; it will never be challenged."

Mr James Grassby, in presence of the three persons whose names are added to this document, on the 10th May, when we called on him for the purpose, fully and freely corroborated the evidence as freely given by Mr Cuffey.

James Adams, of Glasgow, also, at a meeting of the Convention held in the Land Office, on the Friday previous to the meeting of the Assembly—the subject of conversation being the best means for obtaining a good report of the Assembly's proceedings—heard Mr Cuffey say, "It's all nonsense talking about asking Mr O'Connor to give a full report, for though he promises, he won't do it. He promised to give a full report of the Convention's proceedings, but never did it; he is a liar." Such is the opinion entertained regarding Mr O'Connor, by a person to whom Mr O'Connor declared at Edinburgh, "there is not a more amiable man in England."

In corroboration of the above, we subjoin the following important extracts from correspondence upon the subject. We refrain from giving the letters entire, simply for the sake of brevity; at the same time pledging ourselves, should such be demanded, to "give them" in full, as they contain not a single sentence we have the slightest reason to conceal:—

Mr Grassby to Andrew Harley:—"Dear Sir: If the statement of a fact be of any service to our friends in Scotland, as far as I am concerned, it is at their service. The first words Mr O'Connor spoke to me and Cuffey were, 'What sort of a petition are we going to have? Are you manufacturing?' We said, we thought the petition would be a good one, but not so numerous as he had stated. To which he replied, 'That he had made up his mind to state it to contain five millions and some hundreds of thousands,' the exact amount of which I do not recollect. We asked him, if it would not be dangerous to do so? To which he replied, 'Not a bit, as these things were never looked into.' That is the substance of what passed respecting the petition, and nearly verbatim."

"He told the Executive what numbers he should put to it, and they were as bad as him not to protest against it. The *Star* of this week tries to throw the blame upon the people."—May, 22nd, 1848.

Mr Shirron, Aberdeen, to Andrew Harley:—"speaking of the discussion in the Convention on Mr O'Connor's letter of the 22nd of April, writes as follows:—'When the delegates had each spoken in their turn the chairman for that day, (Mr Cuffey) requested the privilege of expressing his opinion also; this was granted. In the course of his short address he said, that Mr O'Connor had, in his speech in the House of Commons, called him (Mr Cuffey) a "Tomfool." But in one thing he had the advantage of Mr O'Connor, and that was, in being an honest man. Mr Cuffey had always looked upon petitioning as a farce; but if the Chartist body had been brought into ridicule on account of the disclosures made in the House of Commons, respecting the National Petition, it was Mr O'Connor alone who was to blame. Mr Cuffey stated, that he was present in the Land Office at the time Mr O'Connor inquired as to the number of signatures attached to that document, and he was informed that the number was less than two million. On hearing which Mr O'Connor stamped his feet and said, 'By G—d, I have stated to the country that there would be upwards of five millions, but it matters not, I shall so represent it to the House, they will never attempt to count the numbers; it was not done with the last petition presented by Mr Duncombe. It did not contain one million five hundred thousand signatures, although it was represented to Mr D., and consequently to the country, to have contained three millions, and upwards.' Now, Sir, Mr Cuffey made the foregoing statement in the Convention, in the presence of most of the members then in London; Messrs M'Grath and Dixon were present when the statement was made in the Convention, and Mr Cuffey said that Mr O'Connor made the foregoing declaration in their presence and hearing. Neither of these gentlemen contradicted or called in question the truth of Mr Cuffey's disclosure, and it was firmly established in the conviction of all parties there present."

In conclusion, Sir, I cannot but express the disgust which I felt,—when having expressed the astonishment I experienced at the many lies and inconsistencies with which Mr O'Connor was chargeable, since the commencement of the Convention's proceedings—on being coolly and freely told, that *I must be very green indeed, not to have known, long ere now, that such was nothing new in the character of O'Connor*. This statement was received, by the servants of O'Connor, with great glee and good humour.—Oct. 23rd, 1848.

Our work is done—our proof is complete—one word of comment upon such evidence is unnecessary—and it now remains for Mr O'Connor—if he can—to disprove the facts here alleged against him, and our earnest wish is, that he may succeed in doing so. But, let him bear this in mind, that "Facts are stubborn things," and that it is not by such attempts as his vulgar, contemptible epistle of Saturday, the 4th instant, he can rationally expect to clear himself. Throwing mud upon his opponents will not wash his own skin. Calling people by such epithets as "Nest of hornets," is not, and will not be taken, by thinking people, for fact or argument; and, at the same time, they will miserably fail to prejudice the public mind—for which purpose they are evidently intended. Let him make do this, the public may, perhaps—if such be sufficiently overpowering—be induced to decide in his favour; otherwise, he will be left in that position which he, and all such unprincipled pretenders, ought to occupy in public estimation.

(Signed) ROBERT COCHRANE,

Concomitant Inquiries.—On Wednesday, an inquest was held at St Bartholomew's Hospital, on the body of Ann Kent, aged 71, who, being very deaf and somewhat intoxicated, in crossing the Old London

street in the parish of St. Anne, Westminster, at the Printing Office, 16, Great Windmill-street, Haymarket, in the City of Westminster, for the Proprietor, **FEARGUS O'CONNOR, Esq., M.P.**, and published by the said **WILLIAM RIDGE**, at the Office, in the same Street and Parish.—Saturday, December 2nd, 1848."