

den and Kaubley, Liverpool, Jamaica agents.
 Webster, Ramsden, and Co. Bingley, Yorkshire.
 spinners; as far as regards W. Webster, Ent-
 and Taylor, corn dealers, Liverpool. Bedford
 Smith, Openshaw, Lancashire, coal merchants. G.
 and J. Watson, Sheffield, street sweepers. J. W.

Stephen Hyland, the approver.

Q. Do you know Kennedy, the prisoner at the

born." Yes, and by virtue of my oath I never knew any harm of the boy in my life!

N. B. Hyland was ordered off the table—a bill of indictment sent to the Grand Jury against him—put on his trial—convicted, and had sentence of death passed on him. He was executed.

The evidence for the Crown closed here.

Patrick R.ally, for prisoner, said, he overtook the prisoner at the town on the evening of the 6th of May last, near his own house; but was so drunk, that without pay he did not pay him fifteen shillings he owed him for shoes. He then told him that he would give him a guinea if he would go with him. Witness then went with him till he drank with him. Witness then told him that he would turn with him, but was afraid he would fall in the ditch. They went to one Duff's, in Kishawanna; prisoner called for a pot of ale, and soon after quit him; but he was afraid to go home, as he was drunk, and till he saw him in Court.

In answer to questions by the Court, said he lives within a mile of the prisoner's, and within about two miles of Mr. Sparks. He heard Kennedy was taken down. He never told Sparks or any other person that he was drunk, or that he was drunk that evening; Kennedy was a lad of very good character.

In his cross-examinations Mr. R.ally said he had been drunk on the 6th of May, and was sometimes before; but had beaten them.

Catherine Duff, sworn—Lives at Kishawanna, the prisoner's and Paddy R.ally came into her house about midnight, the night Mr. Sparks's house was attacked, and Kennedy was the drunkenest man she ever saw, they drank a pot of ale together, and then went away, and when Kennedy quarrelled with witness for not giving him more liquor, she would not let him stay any longer in the house for fear of the soldiers; he went as she thought to his own house, lives within five or six piches of witness.

Rose Kennedy, sworn—Lives at the new chapel, saw the prisoner, the night of the attack at Mr. Sparks, he came to her father's between ten and eleven at night, and they were all in bed but witness. He was so drunk, that he was hardly able to walk; he said the day was much better than the night, and that he was afraid to go home, as he could do was to keep from falling. He was court-witness, she heard the shots, and was afraid they would wake her father; and she made the prisoner go out, she pulled him off by force, because her father would not let him in; he found him there, she said she loved the prisoner, and let him visit her against her father's consent several times. Counsel for the Crown did not cross-examine her from motives of delicacy; she appeared a modest and very pretty girl.

Edmund R.ally, sworn—The witness closed, the Jury retired and in eighteen hours and a half brought in their verdict—"Guilty."

On account of the evidence in favor of this prisoner, his remarkable good character and the informer's evidence, the Jury were divided, and the prisoner was acquitted, but above all as one of the Jury refused to find him guilty, and all his brothers were going to throw him out of the window, several gentlemen, grand jurors, and others presented a petition in his behalf to the Solicitor-General, who promised to send it to the Lord Lieutenant; but Kennedy was executed.

SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1843.

and a few other Irish members to resist that unhappy connexion with England, which has since proved such an endless source of expence to both countries.

On the last of January, 1801, 100 Irish Members became part and parcel of the Legislature of the United Kingdom : and if we take up the Parliamentary history of the country from that period, especially to 1815, when peace was proclaimed, we shall find that Mr. PITT in his day, and Lord LIVERPOOL in his day, relied upon the corrupt support of the Irish Members as their majorities to increase the Debt, to violate the Constitution, and to overawe public opinion.

No twenty years of the history of England present such a catalogue of Ministerial profligacy, corruption, and tyranny as these twenty years, from 1801 to 1820, both inclusive. And the reader will find, with very few very honourable exceptions, that the 100 Irish Members invariably constituted the mischievous majorities of the English Minister.

An open contract existed between the Irish Orange Faction and the English Minister; the conditions of which were :—

of Union. (to be found in our eighth page, of that by the seventh article, the respective debt of the two countries was apportioned as follows—England, for her share, to pay 15-17ths, and Ireland, for her share, to pay 2-17ths. It will also be seen that this contract was to hold good for twenty years; and that any subsequent contract for the following twenty years was to be regulated by a just re-appointment, reference being had to the rule established by the Act of Union. By the 56 of George III., this most important of the several articles of Union was violated by the consolidation of the English and Irish Exchequers. This flagrant act of injustice was forced upon the English Minister immediately after the peace, when the disruption of the army and its several lucrative concomitants so increased the hoard of idle paupers, that the single field of Irish speculation became too narrow for their use. The document to which we refer is of great importance, and will be read with deep interest by all who would confine their advocacy of Repeal within legal limits. We would ask, wherein differs a contract supposed to be made between a king and a people and a contract made between two individuals? and if not only nonperformance of the stipulated conditions, but total violation of the whole contract, would be grounds sufficiently strong for declaring it null and void in the latter case by what rule of law might not the very discussion of the violation of every one of its provisions in the former case be held to be seditious, illegal and unconstitutional? Let us see what really are the leading conditions of this contract, which in the "*habendum*" as we may call it, is stated to last for ever. The first article by which the number of Irish members is apportioned, was violated, we acknowledge, with the consent of the United Parliament, by giving to Ireland five additional members. In the six subsequent articles we have the terms upon which the Irish contractors sold their country, every one of which has been violated; except, indeed, we are to consider that the condition to expend the stipulated amount in Irish improvements was fulfilled by its application to factious purposes. We have before analyzed the condition of the seventh article which was to hold good for twenty-years, and which the united Parliament had no power to alter. If it had not been for the support of the Irish Members, the English Minister would have found it impossible to increase the National Debt to its present amount. Had it not been for the subserviency of that party, the English Minister would not have been able to make the successful inroads upon the liberties and privileges of Englishmen, which, with their co-operation, he has made without difficulty; while had the amount of monies contracted for, by like act of the Union been faithfully expended upon Irish improvements, England would not now be overrun with an Irish corps de reserve of labourers for the masters to fall back upon, as a means of reducing the wages of Englishmen.

If we take a still more comprehensive view of the whole subject, we find the time of the United Parliament, night after night, occupied in angry Irish discussion; and whether Whigs or Tories are in office, they but become the administrators of patronage to their respective parties. The great value when to be attached to the present agitation is the fact that it takes the question out of the old see-saw. It is no longer a question as to which party can best govern Ireland, but as to how the two countries living in a state of union and amity can best govern themselves.

The purification of the English Parliament is surely matter of deep importance to the English people of all classes: and this can only be accomplished by extracting from it the Irish poison upon which GRATTAN relied for its contamination. And Ireland can have no chance of dealing with her domestic grievances—the principal of which is an expensive and unprofitable law-church,—so long as her representatives are chosen by persons upon whom the Protestant landlord must confer the franchise.

In the words of Mr. O'CONNOR we say: "If you have grievances to complain of, and if the most prominent are the burdens imposed upon you by an adverse Church and the restrictions imposed upon you by landlords lest your Emancipation should damage that Church to whose patronage they look for support,—how can you suppose that those landlords, as patrons of Church property, will carve their Protestant lands into electoral qualifications to be used against their interest?"

So long as the Protestant land must constitute the elective franchise, so long will Catholic Emancipation be a mere empty sound; so long will all the burdens of the Law Church be allowed to continue; so long will the restrictions of landlords remain in force; and so long will those angry feelings which disgrace both countries be kept alive between Catholic and Protestant. The remedy therefore, the only one which can be effectual for the correction of these grievances, is a transfer, from the soil to man, of that right which is inherent in him, and of which he has been unjustly deprived by brute force. Enfranchise the Catholic *man* instead of the Protestant or Catholic *land*; and then, when in full possession of his constitutional rights, should he invade, interfere with, or attempt to abridge, those of his Protestant neighbour, we shall be amongst the first to demand from a freely chosen Parliament such measures as the weak shall require for their protection against the strong. So long as the Protestant land is the shield of the Protestant Church, so long will the proprietor prefer leasing it to a Presbyterian or Protestant or Dissenting tenant, (upon whose veto he can rely) for twenty shillings an acre, to leasing it to a Catholic, (whose veto he dreads) for twenty-five shillings an acre. Whereas if the Catholic had the vote in virtue of his person, the Protestant landlord would accept him as a tenant at twenty shillings and sixpence an acre, rather than give it to a Protestant or Dissenter for twenty shillings and threepence an acre.

We think it, therefore, the duty of the English Chartists to struggle zealously, peaceably, constitutionally, and incessantly for a Repeal of that Union by which their Legislature has been poisoned; while it is equally the duty of Irishmen to struggle by the same means for the acquisition of those rights by which alone they can hope to have such a Legislature as English gold cannot again corrupt; and by which alone the Repeal becomes valuable or important to them. We have much yet to say, and especially to the Irish people, upon this great subject.

We give the following article, whole and entire, without the abridgement or alteration of a single word, from the *Times* of yesterday week :—

"There are some things which may be either a blessing or a curse, and among them we may reckon the refinements of law. Where it is necessary that the liberty of the subject—the free enjoyment by every one of the social communities to which he belongs of the entire rights of man as a man, as a citizen, as a proprietor, as a pursuer or person, of fame or fortune—is to be secured from the tyranny which could otherwise be exerted by might against right; where poverty in rags is to be saved from the merciless oppression of wealth invested in power; where the rights of the weak are to be sheltered from the rage of a remorseless majority; or where the majority itself, exposed to hazard from being in a more or less defenceless condition, requires a shield against the attacks of a well-armed minority; where the rights of the people are to be secured at the subtility of the administrators of the law being able successfully to defend the oppressed against the oppressor. But even in such cases our applause is not unqualified by the consciousness that there is a price to be paid for the privilege of being free. We bring ourselves too acquainted with the woe which heart in an acquittal being obtained by a remorseless majority, however cordially we may hail the fact

pelish ends, or acting from mere recklessness, has
 insatiated hundreds of his deluded fellow-subjects to
 the ruin of the country. In defiance, has success-
 fully urged them, by assuming a false name, to per-
 il the property and lives of themselves and all
 within reach of their violence, has succeeded in
 placing extensive districts under a system of terror
 and subduing them, without compunction
 to the calmness and tranquillity of the country.
 He has been imprisoned and transported by scores
 for merely having obeyed his bidding, escapes him-
 self with absolute impunity, on the sole ground that
 he is a Quaker; some lawyer discovered a clerical
 error in the indictment, and he is now at large.
 I press our indignation at the scandalous prostration
 of justice before the Bolla of verbal nicety.
WHAT RIGHT HAS FEARGUS O'CONNOR TO
USE THE NAME OF THE STREETS OF MANCHESTER
FOR AN INNOCENT MAN WHO HAS THE REMOTEST
INDIVIDUAL IN GREAT BRITAIN WHO HAS THE REMOTEST
DOUBT, THAT, SO FAR AS JUSTICE IS CONCERNED,
O'CONNOR WAS GUILTY OF THE CRIMES FOR WHICH HE
IS NOW OFF, WHOSE SUSPICION WAS A GROUND OF
SUSPICION THAT O'CONNOR OUGHT, AS BETWEEN
HIMSELF AND THE COMMUNITY, TO BE NOW EX-
PIATING HIS OFFENCES against his victims
 of the death of the innocent, the rape of the
 crime or the innocent suffers from the enormity
 —IN A DUNGEON **THE HULKS** of the British
 has been "let off" because in one count of the
 indictment—in one of what are denominated in
 law the "various" and "unimportant" counts—
 what reason we cannot pretend to say—it happened
 that "the venue" was omitted! No matter what
 was the notoriety of his crime—no matter that
 every Judge on the bench was as fully aware that
 the crime was committed in the streets of Manches-
 ter and had no more doubt of its meaning and of the
 accuracy with which it conveyed to the prisoner
 the fullest possible information that was neces-
 sary to enable him to make his defence—there-
 fore, that the omission was a mere technicality
 could only be set at rest by giving the prisoner the
 benefit of it. Law this may be; justice it is not.
 How much longer is this to be permitted? Are acts
 of Parliament made to bind the good only: are they
 made to express the purposes of the Legislature
 prior in their meaning, and allowing the right as
 Mr O'Connell boasts, "to drive a coach and six
 "through them"? We plainly tell our Legislators
 that the time is come when the Convention of
 the people of Great Britain shall be a permanent
 dictum against him being so framed that the keen-
 est legal acumen shall not find a single phrase in-
 capable of being distorted into conveying a meaning
 contrary to the intention of the Legislature. We
 have the practice of the criminal law reduced to
 some accordance with common sense, and the people
 re-assured by finding that the laws which they
 are required to obey are not incompetent to defend them
 against the grossest outrages. What example can
 be more salutary to the Government than the
 "ordinary power of the Constitution" are referred to
 as being relied on by the Government to suppress
 rebellion in Ireland, than an acquittal like Feargus
 O'Connell's proclaiming the utter inefficiency of those
 laws which are so much vaunted as the bulwark of
 the Constitution? His law reforms were not intended as
 mere clap-traps, or were not introduced by him
 merely that he might reap the laurels which had
 been plucked by Sir S. Romilly and others, to obvi-
 ate the defects of the law, and to prevent the
 which we have of late had such repeated reason to
 complain, of the spirit of the law being entirely set
 at naught in deference to its mere letter. He is
 bound, as the head of the Government, to justify the
 laws which he has introduced, and to show that
 securing the punishment of the leading offender, and
 thereby to clear the Government and its officials

rest, from the suspicion under which they cannot rest, of conniving at the errors of their subordinates. I profess myself a great secret admirer of the Government that O'Connor should be prosecuted to conviction last autumn—and of us properly no suspicion has ever yet been kindled—it is equally as proper now that a fresh indictment should be preferred against him, for the same single offence, delay, and that, while the facts are in the recollection of the witnesses who were produced on his trial, their evidence should be again made use of. It is of more urgent importance that the supremacy of law should be indicated, and that those who are disposed to disregard it should be taught that the chances of a criminal prosecution are not on a par with those of a lottery or a dice-box.

"There are plenty of gentlemen in Parliament who would not suffer a poacher to escape scot-free under a false plea of ignorance, and who are some one proving in his place there that his whole sympathy is not confined to his preserves. There are plenty who would give up even the Derby-day to vote for or against free trade. Let us see that there are plenty among them who will require the Government to prosecute O'Connor to a successful conclusion."

We are at a loss which to admire most, the malignity, the impudence, or the ignorance, of this tirade. Fortunately all these qualities are so conspicuous that it must excite in every man's mind who reads it and who knows the facts, a thorough contempt and loathing for the scribbler who could write it.

"What right has Fanchus O'Connor to be walking the streets with Marguerite!" forthwith! The right of his obedience to the law, you fool! a right which you violate in the penning of this flagitious article, and for which, if O'CONNOR does not trounce your proprietors, he deserves to be bugbitten, to

"Is there a single individual in Great Britain who has the remotest doubt, that so far as justice was concerned, O'CONNOR was guilty of the crimes for which he was tried?"

Yes; there are at least fourteen individuals in Great Britain who have no doubt at all upon the subject; who know that O'CONNOR was not "guilty of the crimes for which he was tried"; and these are the twelve Jurymen who tried him, the JUDGE before whom he was tried, and the ATTORNEY-GENERAL who prosecuted him. All these parties know, and have recorded their conviction that O'CONNOR is not "guilty of the crimes for which he was tried." He was tried for conspiracy, for riot, for illegal meetings, and tumultuous assemblies; for the forcible "eviction of labour; and for a host of other "crimes" committed by the patrons of the *Times*. All these were industriously set forth in the indictment; but the Judge said that these allegations of "crime" had no business there—that they could not be sustained—the ATTORNEY-GENERAL acknowledged that the Judge was right, and he abandoned many of the "crimes" sought to be charged, at once. But though, even then, the indictment still charged many things upon the defendants which the law does consider "crimes," the Jury refused to credit the indictment, there being no evidence to support its allegations, and they, by their verdict, affirmed that they held O'CONNOR and others to be guilty only of that which they had just been told by the Judge was "A MOOT POINT IN THE VERY HIGHEST QUARTERS, AS TO WHETHER IT WAS ANY OFFENCE IN LAW OR NOT." These were the very words of the Judge, when charging the jury, in reference to the allegation contained in the fifth count of the indictment, the only count upon which O'CONNOR was convicted. And yet this malignant libeller, knowing this, impudently writes about it:—

"A convicted criminal, who, either for the most selfish ends, or acting from mere recklessness, has instigated hundreds of his deluded fellow-subjects to set the laws of their country at defiance, has successfully urged them, by plausible sophistries, to peril the property and lives of themselves, and of all with whom they are connected, by the commission of placing extensive districts under a system of terrorism, and in subjecting them, without compensation, to the calamities of civil war, and after his poor tools have been imprisoned and transported by scores for merely having obeyed his bidding, to cast themselves with absolute impunity on the ground that the astuteness of some lawyer discovered a clerical error in the indictment."

And affirms that "O'CONNOR ought to be now expiating his offences in a dungeon or the hulks"!!

The animus of all this is so apparent; the impotence of disappointed malice is so obvious, that I need not have said more. I have said enough to show we had no other proof of that which we told those people at its very beginning—that the strike was an infernal faction plot—we should point triumphantly to this article as our best confirmation. Of course the Leviathan liar and slanderer is followed at a respectful distance by all the small fish of the same fry. The *Nonconformist*, the *Bradford Observer*, the *Leeds Mercury* Goady Goose and each other petty birdling of faction has its own "wee" note in the wake of "the thunderer's" roar.

They will not succeed in inducing the ATTORNEY GENERAL to prefer a bill in contempt against Mr. O'CONNOR; for this simple reason: the ATTORNEY GENERAL knows as well as the *Times* knows that he has no ground of legal accusation against Mr. O'CONNOR.

the Judges have shown him that his "best" is "go."

THE Tory press, from the *Times* downward, demanding the blood of the Irish Repealers, with yell of savage recklessness which we scarcely supposed that at this day could have been assumed.

We give, as "a sample of the sort," the following from the mouthpieces of the Sheffield Tories, the *Sheffield Mercury* :—

After some stupid abuse of Popery, the Editor's bloodthirsty proceeds :—

"We have already stated that measures are being taken to meet the necessity at the point of the bayonet. *Would it not be better to meet the opposition with a halber in hand?* We have had a great deal of political special pleading of late about all strict rights—there is no evil in social life, no in the rights of property, no in the rights of the law, of being argued by the same monod operandi. *We want a well-defined cure, not for those who are taught rebellion, so much as for those who teach it.* We will apply a strong remedy. We trust Parliament will be able to do so." "But, says the Irish demagogue, the Union was an act of the Legislature, and it is competent in any British subject to petition the King to repeal any act of Parliament." *This is true like the monarchy, but the Union is a right of succession—the Monarchy are all fixed and settled by the Legislature, and, in our opinion, they are all treason or there is no such thing as a right of succession.* Did ever such a born-fool head pen before?" "The Union—the right of succession—the Monarchy, all treason!" : these are his exact words. *Gods, what a best possible instructor!*"

"It is one thing for Parliament to Repeal an Act having reference to questions of privilege of the House, and another for the Legislature to make a tax itself by an Act which deserves no other name than *felo de se*," "Sir Robert Peel has no alternative but prompt, immediate, and vigorous measures—measures that shall reach miscreants with certainty on a scale of wholesale treason, murder and incendiarism, and who evade the law with impunity."

There, gentle reader, there is the spirit of Toryism with a vengeance. Affect agitation with a halberd in hand! Should Sir ROBERT PEEEL want "walking gallows" to assist in "TRANQUILLIZING Ireland, we hope he will not forget the special claims of the "gallows" Editor of the *Sheffield Mercury*. Declare the Repeal agitation treasonous and punish the agitators as traitors! Softly, Miss Addebrains; or if to petition for the Repeal of that Union, even the alteration of the line of succession, be treason, what were those who altered the succession by expelling JAMES II., and calling in Dutch WILLIAM; or, He? We have always heard that they were "glorious revolutionists." Your doctrine of "treason" "won't do now-a-days, no, now," as the Yankees would say. Every generation has clearly the right of willing by what form of Government it will be protected,—all your musty parchments and CASTLEBROUGH Acts not

From this and other specimens of English Toryism, O'CONNELL may see what he has to expect at the hands of that party. And yet even at such a moment; when the hand-writing is on the wall; when the ships are in the offing, and the demoucry of

Is almost ringing through the land ; when the
 "Tory hunters" are panting for the blood of the
 Irish people, and waiting but for one false step, to
 "let slip the dogs of war" ;

"Like the swift lightning, which doth cease
 Ere one can say, it lieth there!"

at such an hour, O'CONNELL spurns the aid of the only party in England, who either can or will efficiently assist him in the carrying of Reform! Well, well! DAW knows his own game, or thinks he does so. His speech at the Corn Exchange, last week, wherein he denounced the English Chartists, has created a spirit of indignation against him that may not be very easily allayed. We speak not of the Chartists, but of the Repealers, whose grief and vexation at this conduct of O'CONNELL it is impossible adequately to describe. The best possible feeling was existing between them and the Chartists, who were mutually aiding and assisting each other, wherefore! Mr. O'CONNELL throws in the apple of discord, and strives to undo all the good that has been effected by the real patriots of both parties.

Many parties, even of his best friends, speak and write most strongly on the matter. We are inundated with letters to which we, acting from a different spirit to that which the writers ascribe to him, do not give currency. We desire to give every man credit for the best motives by which he can be actuated; and we make Mr. O'CONNELL no exception.

tion. Possibly he may have in view some stroke of policy which we do not yet see, and which may sufficiently excuse the apparent suicidal course he is pursuing: "Charity hopeth all things." But let O'CONNELL be wary. We have laboured hard to obtain for him with the English Chartists credit for sincerity in this movement—credit for a honest pur-

pose to carry through repeal, and not to bully back the Whigs to power; if this be his purpose—let him be as honest now as we have tried to think—let him not prevent the hands and hearts of Irishmen from uniting for the salvation of their fatherland; nor imagine that Ireland can obtain her freedom by the disunion of her sons. Many Irishmen who have not yet joined the Repeal Association, but were about to do so, declare that, if the English Chartists are to be expelled, they will not join it. Others, who are members, declare that they will now join the Chartist Association. Let O'CONNELL pause ere he finally reject the generous, tendered co-operation of the English Chartists; let him reflect that the battle is not yet over, nor the victory won. And, at all events, let not his conduct, absurd and foolish though it may be, induce Englishmen to be unjust to others and themselves to withhold their aid from Ireland struggling for her rights. Let us remember always that honour and interest combine to induce us to sympathise with our Irish brethren. Honour bids us to assist them, that the remembrance of crimes committed by English tyrants may be effaced by the fraternal deeds of English patriots; and interest, that our labour market may be freed from Irish competition and all the deadly consequences which have followed in its train; while the manly feeling of our nature should command us to assist them that are right; may triumph.

ONE LAW FOR THE RICH AND ANOTHER FOR THE POOR.—A case occurred at Marlborough-street police office on Monday, which furnishes another beautiful illustration of the fact, which we have repeatedly stated, that there is no law for the poor. The particulars of this case are briefly as follows:—A young soldier of nobility, who, it seems, was powerfully refreshed with something considerably stronger than tea, was driving in a cab down Shepherd-street, when he was suddenly assailed by a beggar, who, not only he caught sight of a cock, and jumping down from his vehicle, commenced a vigorous pursuit of the bird, and after a ten minutes chase succeeded in bagging it, and was just in the act of driving off with it, when a policeman who happened to be passing saw him, and, not knowing what to do for it, he called to him, and asked him where he had got the cock. When that policeman never was found when they are wanted.—"Knowing the fowl to be the property of a house-keeper in the street, pursued and stopped the cab, and took the aristocratic delinquent into custody." On being brought before the sitting magistrate, that considerate functionary, after hearing the statement of the case, blandly suggested that possibly the cock might have been abducted by way of a lark! The quick-witted policeman instantly caught at this meretricious suggestion, and adroitly replied that he thought his Worship was right, and that the thief, who had been caught, was a scoundrel, where-upon the prisoner was dismissed with a fine of five shillings for having been found drunk! The inference we draw from this magisterial decision is that provided a man be rich and nobly descended, he may do as he likes, and be no more molested, in the stance of his wealth and nobility by any convincing proofs that he bags them with no felonious intent, but simply by way of a "lark."

Sir,—Will you allow me space in your paper for a word of comment upon the brutal and significant attacks to which I have been subjected in the *Times* newspaper, since my successful opposition to the Messrs. Walter, in their attempts to usurp the representation of Nottingham. I shall pass over the libels which appeared in that journal in connection with the two elections, and which appeared prior to the recent decision of the Court of Queen's Bench upon the Rule to arrest judgment upon the first count, in a long indictment, upon which I was tried and found guilty at Lancaster. I pass these by; as writ in a civil action for those libels was served upon the Solicitor for the *Times* on the evening preceding the publication of the very ignorant letter of "Special Pleader," which appeared in yesterday's number of that journal. Before I offer a few remarks upon that letter, permit me to observe that I laid the two recent outrageous articles which appeared in the *Times* newspaper in connection with my case, before counsel, with the intention of proceeding against the responsible parties, and upon which I received the following opinion, from an authority which will be considered better than that of the laic-recruit of the *Times*. It runs:—

"I am of opinion that that part of the article in the *Times* of the 18th inst. 1843, which I have marked with ink in the margin is untrue. I have no O'Connor; and that he might sustain either an indictment, or an action against the proprietors of that paper. I also think it possible that the Court of Queen's Bench might grant a criminal information against the proprietors upon the article of Mr. O'Connor, but their so doing would, I think, depend upon the ability of Mr. O'Connor to negative, by affidavit, the truth of the charge contained in the fifth count of the late indictment against him, on which he was tried and found guilty, and on which he was found guilty. The Court expects an applicant for the extraordinary powers of the Court to come before them with clean hands; and if Mr. O'Connor negatives, on oath, the guilt of the charge imputed to him, I see no objection to his applying to the Court to give him the same protection and advantages which would afford to any other innocent individual against so violent and mischievous a libel as this appears to me to be. If a criminal information is moved for, it must be supported by evidence, and if it is proved, and it cannot be moved for the last day of term."

Now, Sir, as an Irishman answers one question by asking another, I think I may answer "Who is the traitor?" by asking, "Who is the illiter?"

With respect to the commentary of the "Pleader" upon my speech at Manchester, it is applied to the *Times*' Manchester correspondent rather than to me. In the short notice with which the *Times* honoured my speech at Manchester, there is not one word of truth. I never mentioned the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Irish Secretary, or George IV.; all of which the *Times* puts into my mouth. There was not a single resolution passed, although the *Times* correspondent communicates the fact that several resolutions were passed.

And now, Sir, as to what I did say relative to the charge of Treason. I said—"They talk of making the agitation for Repeal, treason : why, they would have made the agitation for Reform, treason, had they dared to do so. Treason, indeed! What a whole nation to be guilty of treason! If it was made treason to-morrow, and if my conscience, my mind, and my judgment, approved the treason, then should I be compelled to commit it, in conjunction with those who are ready to do so. I am resolved against oppression." Sir, the difference between me and Walter and me, as Journalists, is this : my name stands boldly in the imprint, as the registered proprietor, while he tries to gratify his petty vengeance with impunity under that sympathy which a defenceless female would be sure to receive at the hands of a British jury. I must doubt that there is another instance on record of a journalist so far prostituting the gentleman to the wounded feelings of the angry politician, as is furnished by the *Times* in its endeavours to mark me out for unrelenting persecution ; and to meet and beat what I truly not more upon my own vigilance at discretion than on the counsel of my friends. We must be his tools, in which must come least loathing and disgust in the mind of every honest Englishman.

If such are the means by which the Walters desire to hope to dispose of political opponents, they will find themselves mistaken; for wherever they present themselves before an English constituency, there shall I be also, determined to resist so gross a violation of all those rules by which the gentleman, the politician, and the journalist should be

In conclusion, Sir, I must say that it is rather an unfair mode of procedure to have a speech reported for me by the Manchester correspondent of the *Times*, which I never made, and then be arraigned upon the falsehood when published in the *Times*.

I have the honour to remain, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
FEARGUS O'CONNOR.
6, Chapel-place, Hammersmith,
14th June. 1843.

ATROCIOUS OUTRAGE.—*We have received from a number of parties, who give their names, the following particulars of a diabolically atrocious outrage on a poor woman:—*

A certain poor woman, resides with her son and daughter, in a cottage by the road side, in the chapelry of Astley, parish of St. Mary, county of Salop, and to which said cottage is attached a small croft, or crofts, of ground, with garden &c. The said son and daughter, by the name of *Thames or doles*, the present occupiers being proprietors of three doles, the *Lady of the Manor* one dole, several others one dole each, for which is paid 2s. 6d. each dole, as chief rent, which is all they can demand. The subject is as follows:—

A rich neighbour, a "gentleman," is proprietor of one dole. The said woman has perceived for some time past his desire to obtain possession of her bit of land, by his clandestine means, growing in the hedge adjacent to the turnpike road. She put up a board in one of the said trees warning all trespassers; but, Ah! like him, he could not be happy without this bit of land, notwithstanding all his possessions; therefore, on the 13th, he brought his men to the place, and fell the trees. The woman's son, a youth, perceiving their intention, declared they should not cut the trees down. The gentleman challenged him to fight, at the same time putting himself in a lofty attitude, and strutting about in a most conceited manner. He got him to fight, he ordered some of the men to hold him, whilst the others cut the trees. As soon as the mother knew she was threatened, she ran to her son, and begged him to rescue her son, whom they were ill-treating and killing. They said, they would not, and he picked her clean out of the hedge, into a ditch, on the road side. She got through the hedge again: one of them again sent her into the hedge by a violent blow. At the same time her daughter received a violent blow on the head, which she fell down, giving her a black eye. But notwithstanding all this abuse, they stood to protect the trees, when the "gentleman" shouted, "Cut their d—d legs, and the man will stand the blunt," or blunt One of the men cut the woman's leg, and she was so cut dreadful that it was three inches in length. We saw the clothes cut to the length of four or five inches, and covered with blood. They threw her into the road again, when, being exhausted through loss of blood and pain, she was carried home, and Mr. Cresswell, a magistrate, called to see the woman in the ground. The son's and daughter's anxiety were then directed to the mother, whilst the "gentleman" and his men, having no further interruption, finished their disconcerting job with effectualness. But there was a lady, who, in company with the plaintiff, was present, and this honourable gentleman next do but procure a magistrates summons, in the name of the barbarous magistrates, who cut the woman's leg, against the mother and son, and daughter for assault, thereby causing all kinds of pain and suffering to giving evidence; and the poor woman had to be conveyed some miles in the state she was in to appear before the magistrates, when they were all three bound over to appear at the Session, —the villain who wounded her being the prosecutor.

If the facts be as here stated, the scandalous "gentleman" should be severely punished. We hope the particulars of the trial at the Sessions will be sent us with the names of all the parties.

THE KING-PIT COLLIERIES.—We did publish the subscriptions received for these men last week. The paragraph was amongst the Newcastle papers.

R. J. J. has been so kind as to insert the day of meeting in his forthcoming notice: of course it was of no use.

W. PINFIELD, REDDITCH.—I have made the only use we can of his letter—sent it to Mr. Clowe.

A CHARTIST, TOWER HAMLETS, presses the attention of all Chartist friends to the necessity of exertion on behalf of the families of our friends in duynance.

