

and a unanimity that was truly edifying. Such spectacles are historical. We could not help feeling that we were present at the commencement of proceedings, the end of which it was difficult to foretell or foresee. There was, however, too much reason to fear that we were sowing the wind and must expect to reap the whirlwind.

Mr Keogh's motion on the subject of the recent trials in Ireland, and the manner in which the Jury was packed in order to procure the conviction of Mr Mitchell, led to a characteristic scene. Parliamentary "rows" are quite common affairs with a Whig Cabinet. It would almost seem that, conscious of their inability to say or do anything in a proper and statesmanlike manner, their only resource is to go into a passion with any one who touches them on the sore place, or who even so much as points his finger thereto. In this instance Mr Keogh raised a legitimate question, and treated it in a manner thoroughly in accordance with the forms of Parliament. He kept to his subject strictly (a great merit nowadays) and in the course of his really able, eloquent, and spirit-stirring speech, did not utter an irrelevant sentence. He contrasted—as he had a right to do—the conduct of every man of the present Government on former occasions, when they were in opposition, and their professions, as well as the avowed principles of their party, with reference to the administration of justice, and the composition of juries in political cases, with their own conduct, now that they have the power of ordering all these matters. He reviewed most truthfully, and, therefore, most disagreeably to Whig ears, the policy of the Ministry towards Ireland; and, in return for discharging this necessary duty, Sir G. Grey jumped up and made a personal attack on the hon. Member, which was most creditable to any man pretending to be a gentleman, and certainly most disgraceful as coming from a high Minister of the Crown, who more than any other Member of Parliament is bound to observe the conventional courtesies of society. He began by charging Mr Keogh with having had a good opinion of Repeal, of O'Connell, and Lord Melbourne's Government, which he called a "paternal" one, some eight years ago. Poor fellow! he was only in his teens when he committed these mistakes, and may be pardoned the sins of youth; and inexperience. With respect to the two latter—namely, O'Connell and Melbourne and Whigs generally—he may fairly say that his eyes have been opened to their characters in the years that have since elapsed; one must live to learn. But this was not the most creditable part of Sir G. Grey's attack. He insinuated that Mr Keogh had given the Government reason to suppose that he would be a supporter of it, while he had an election petition hanging over his head, but that since that was withdrawn, he had gone over to the Conservative side, because no place was given him. Mr Keogh's instant and indignant repudiation of this charge may settle the matter so far as he is concerned, but what does Sir G. Grey mean by the insinuation as to the Election Committee? Are we to understand distinctly what is so often whispered out of doors by other parties, that Government have it in their power so to form these Committees, as to render the throwing out of an inconvenient opponent, and the seating of an obsequious supporter, a matter of certainty? If so, we can congratulate Sir G. Grey as little upon his discretion as his temper. Such things, he may depend upon it, are better left in the shade, as far as the "Government" are concerned. The people's interest in the matter is another thing. With respect to the subject of the debate, the Home Secretary's own statement fully bears out the allegations of Mr Mitchell at the trial. It was carefully and basely packed, for the express purpose of procuring a verdict against him, and there is an end of the matter. All the official conventions and phrases coined in the Mint of the Treasury and law offices, cannot disguise that fact.

Several other important topics have been discussed during the week, to which we can, at present, merely advert, reserving comment until a future opportunity. The Encumbered Estates (Ireland) Bill has passed the third reading in the Commons, but so emasculated that, like the Irish Poor-law, it is valuable merely for the principle it affirms. Practically, it is to be feared that it will be almost nugatory as a remedy for the evils it is intended to meet. An important change in the law of marriage in Scotland has passed the Lords. In future no marriages will be considered legal, should this bill pass into a law, except where parties have resided in the parish fourteen days and given that notice. At present, no notice or preliminary formalities are required, thus offering facilities for clandestine marriages, which the far-famed Gretna Green, and other less celebrated places prove, are extensively taken advantage of. Mr C. Duller, the new President of the Poor-law Board, has brought in a batch of bills to amend the administrative operation of the Poor-law. The first of these has reference to the mode of assessing certain charges, which he is of opinion ought to be borne equally by the whole union; by an equitable rate on the property of each rate-payer. At present, they fall most unequally on certain parishes and classes. The charges which he thus proposes to make general, are the cost of the Union Officers, the Clerk, the Medical men, the Master of the Workhouse, and generally what are termed establishment charges. Secondly, the support of vagrants; and, thirdly, the maintenance of what are called the irremovable poor. In the course of his speech, the Right Hon. Gentleman dealt out some blows at the former administration of the Poor Law, which must, we imagine, have been rather unpalatable to Mr Cornwall Lewis, who sat near him on the Treasury Bench. On Wednesday, the O'Connell force of a motion on Repeal was played out by the discharge of the motion. Justice was done to the moral courage and determination evinced by Mr O'Connell in bringing the question forward at an early period of the Session, and the way in which he fairly tested the feeling of the House upon it, was praised by Sir B. Hall, as affording an honourable contrast to the sneaking policy of the Young "Liberator." The management of our Colonial empire formed the subject of an admirable speech by Sir W. Molesworth, which, together with the lame reply of Mr Hawes, will furnish ample matter for a future article.

Among the bills which have been introduced and read a first time, we may notice one for preventing night work by journeymen bakers in the metropolis. The bill prohibits any master baker to employ his men in the manufacture of any kind of bread between the hours of six in the evening and four in the morning, under a penalty for the first offence of not more than forty shillings, or imprisonment for not more than a month, and for every subsequent offence a penalty of not less than five pounds, or imprisonment for not more than three months. The second reading of the bill stands for next Wednesday, when we trust that the manifest evils of the practice which it is intended to prevent, will secure sufficient support to ensure its passing into law. It is wholly unnecessary for the accommodation of the public, and is only perpetuated by a minority of poor and selfish employers, who care not what evil they inflict on society at large, so that they can grow speedily rich.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LAND COMPANY.

MY FRIENDS,

I dare say that it will not require much eloquence to convince you of the state of excitement that I was in for some time previous to the 10th of April, till Chartism, upon that day, proclaimed its triumph over despotism; and yet, great as that excitement naturally was, when a single incautious step upon my part might have led to the sacrifice of thousands of lives, and jeopardised the cause of Chartism; nevertheless, I assure you, that that excitement was as nothing compared with the state of madness I have been in since the Committee was appointed to inquire into the affairs of the National Land Company.

To have jeopardised a political movement by rashness or folly might be set down to enthusiasm, or want of judgment; but to rob the poor—or the bare suspicion of it—would be a crime, nay, a sin, which repentance could never obliterate.

You are aware of the ferocious manner that I have been attacked by every newspaper in England, with the exception of the "Times," the "Post," the "Herald," and the "Wakefield Journal"; and you are aware how those uncontradicted slanders must have militated against my character as a gentleman, and one elected to represent your order in Parliament.

I was aware that these representations had no great weight with those who have long known me, and faithfully confided in me; but you are aware that thousands who read the accusation never saw the defence; and this is the Press mode of destroying a gentleman's character.

When that Committee was appointed, the Judge Advocate of England, with a salary of 2,000*l.* a year, was elected as the Chairman; and I now unhesitatingly declare, that Judge Jeffries never evinced a more reckless or disgraceful partiality than that gentleman has evinced as Chairman of the Land Committee. He appeared to hold a brief, in which the evidence of every witness was detailed, and he would only allow such witnesses to be examined as he presumed would damage the Company. And, as I told you before, although I brought an Occupant from O'Connorville, and three Occupants from Gloucestershire, at my own expense, considering them the best witnesses, as being longest located, yet they went as they came; the Chairman would not allow them to be examined, although one would naturally presume that they were the very witnesses who ought to be examined.

The first question gone into was the application of the funds; the hope and the object being at once to damn the Plan by damning the man; and with this view the whole accounts of the Bank and of the Land Company were submitted to an accountant, appointed by the Chairman, who, I presume, following his instructions, conducted the investigation, not as if I was an insolvent, but as if I was a fraudulent insolvent. This gentleman, as a matter of course, entered upon his duty with suspicion, as he, like the Committee, from report, entertained serious doubts as to the integrity of the management. For more than three weeks this investigation lasted, and you can well imagine the difficult position in which I was placed.

I think I hear some banker's clerk, who has nothing to do but to attend to his books, saying—"From whence could arise your difficulty if you had kept proper accounts?" My answer is—"That, multifarious as the work is, it would be impossible to keep more honest accounts, although they may be somewhat puzzling to a regular accountant, who is only accustomed to a certain description of accounts; and still more difficult, when I inform you that there is not one word of mine written in any book connected with the Company—and this fact will prove as creditable to those employed under me as to myself."

The accountant has now made his report, and you may judge of its magnitude when I tell you that he went over the accounts from the first day the operations were commenced at O'Connorville, down to Saturday, the 15th of July. And, as a set of hired scribblers have attempted to arraign my balance sheets as fraudulent, it may be some satisfaction to the Members to know, that the accountant compared the balance sheets with the original documents and receipts from which they were taken, and that there was not a difference of two shillings. And while I am prepared to admit that the accounts have not been what a merchant would term strictly kept, yet my only wonder is, that, having furnished those balance sheets after the strictest investigation by seven auditors for each, that I had retained receipts for sums as low as 2*s.* 6*d.* I was satisfied, and you were satisfied, with a faithful expenditure of your monies; but if I had not been equally to satisfy Parliament and the country, I feel thoroughly convinced that the Land Company would have been my death.

But I think I may now boastfully assert, that I can lay such a balance sheet before the world, as neither individual or corporation have ever before submitted; for, you must bear the fact in mind, that, with scarcely an exception, directors, managers, committeemen, and lawyers, like a livelihood out of their confiding but gullible dupes; but because they are not tinged with the odium of Chartism, but belong to some recognised faction, they pass unscathed, and are considered devilish clever fellows.

With so much of a preface, I shall now proceed to lay before you the evidence of the accountant, as submitted to the Committee, and then it will be for you to judge whether or not I have established this Land Plan for your benefit or my own. Here follows the evidence of the accountant:—

Mr WILLIAM HENRY GREY called up and examined:—

You say it was impossible for you to examine all the vouchers and receipts?—Yes.

Was I prepared with a sofa full?—Yes.

I believe you went into the accounts very critically more so than I then thought necessary, or than I now think was necessary; however, you went back to O'Connorville from the very beginning?—I did.

I believe I showed you vouchers, as far as we went, for sums like 2*s.* 6*d.*, 1*s.*, and 7*s.*, and so forth?—There were very many small vouchers; some I did not think it necessary to notice.

I think I explained the responsibility in all cases of separating the particular items as to the individual costs; as, for instance, there might be fifty or sixty horses sometimes working half a day at the houses, and sometimes half a day ploughing?—So I understood from you; I did not attempt to go into that.

Did I not tell you that you should have every facility in my power to enable you to make an abstract account of the several estates?—Yes.

And you have done that particularly and critically?—As far as it was possible in the time, and with the materials.

You have been over all the balance sheets; you have been over my balance sheet, and you compared the sums charged in my balance sheet with the sums stated to have been paid in the labour-book kept by the overseer, who has that labour-book?—Yes.

Did you find any difference between the amount that was taken from that statement and my balance sheet?—None.

Did you go over the Lowlands balance sheet, that is the large balance?—Yes.

Did you take the labour-book and compare it?—Yes.

Was there any difference between the sums stated to be paid in the overseer's book by him, and that which appeared in my balance sheet?—None.

From the examination of the vouchers, as far as we went through them, you have ascertained that the most critical examination, you having been fifteen and sixteen hours a day at work upon them, and you having come to a rough estimate, leaving to a subsequent period a more minute disquisition to be made of the different estates; have you any doubt upon your mind that the company is in debt to me?—None whatever; that balance sheet is a proof of that.

Did I give you my last book?—Yes.

Did I show the balance I took credit for in the London Joint Stock Bank, as stated in my last balance sheet?—Yes.

What was the difference between the balance I took credit for and the real sum?—None.

I think there was a slight difference between a balance of £21,320 and the balance of £21,310?—That was explained by two £5 bank notes.

Did you see the balance I took credit for as in the Gloucester Bank in my balance sheet of £6000 odd?—Yes.

I gave you a surplus balance in the Gloucester Bank when I gave you the £500?—Yes.

Were the accounts produced to you down to last Saturday?—Yes.

All that had been received on behalf of the company?—Yes, all that was announced in the NORTHERN STAR.

I believe I gave you my cheque books, showing what a difference that sort of account made?—Yes.

And you and I went over the cheque books, and all that was down for my hire and so on, and nothing was charged except that there was a receipt for; there was nothing charged as wages?—Nothing was charged except what was charged in the bank book. There may have been some entries for which there is no receipt; I did not go so closely into it as that.

You found receipts for cows bought at farms?—Yes.

Have you had the receipt of their sale afterwards by auction?—Yes, some cows were sold afterwards.

I believe you had the auctioneer that sold them, Mr Weaver?—Yes.

I gave you when he says I received is that which I gave credit for in the Gloucester account to a farthing?—Yes.

And an amount that I had no receipt for, for a crop purchased, £437 *8s.* 1*d.*, that you found to be correct to a farthing?—Yes.

As to everything that I took credit for in my balance sheet, I have been at O'Connorville.

I believe I satisfied you as far as it was in the power of man to do so?—Yes.

Did my balance sheets agree with the accounts of what had been expended?—I analysed both those balance sheets, and I have no doubt of the correctness of both of them.

Did I submit every man to you, carpenter, overseer, and all for the most rigid examination?—Yes.

Did you go over their books five times, if you found that you could not balance them to a farthing?—There was an account of £2 12*s.* to Mr Lord?—Yes.

Did you find that out?—Yes, £2 12*s.* I found there was a difference of that sort I searched it out.

Supposing you had been going to make up an account for myself, do you think that any person could have been more anxious, or could have given you more information than you required than I did?—No; you seemed very anxious to give me every information, and every facility was given me.

Now the difficulty you have, is in taking out the sums applicable to each estate?—Yes; you assisted me in that. I could not have done it without assistance.

Even to dividing one sum into two?—Yes; you went through the bankers' books, which I have in my pocket; the book which belonged to each estate. (The Witness produced the several bankers' books.)

I produced the timber merchant, who received £200*s.* of me; he brought me his accounts, which were very properly drawn up; I never saw accounts kept better.

This is a question that I am tender upon. Putting on one side the question of liability, I ask you, after that very close and critical examination of the accounts, both upon my part and upon your part, what is the real result that you have arrived at? I have you as witness the large sums of money I have paid me. None whatever, or I should not have put a balance sheet forward showing that to be so.

I believe I was more anxious in the matter, if possible, than you were?—You were very anxious; it was a very laborious task.

Sir B. HALL. You stated that you went over some balance sheets, and will tell me what the balance sheets were, and what they were the original balance sheets, which had been audited by persons stated to have been auditors of the Company or not?—They were not; I have not seen any of those balance sheets.

When I make use of the word balance sheets, I mean the balance sheets of Mr O'Connor's accounts, as well as the balance sheets of the Land Company. Do you mean to say that you have not seen any of the original balance sheets of Mr O'Connor, or of the National Land Company, which are stated to have been audited and signed by Mr Cuffay and Mr Knight?—I have not seen any of them.

At your last examination you said that the observation you had made with reference to the destruction of the balance sheets, was a connecting link of Mr O'Connor?—It applied to one single account of Mr O'Connor's. I asked for the originals of the two preceding accounts to the one that was placed in my hands as the final account. Those two preceding accounts were published in the "NORTHERN STAR" of one, I believe, the date is the 12th December, and of the other, August, 1847. I asked to see the original of them, in order to form a connecting link from the commencement of the affairs of the Company up to the point at which I was to complete them. I was told by Mr Hewitt, the clerk to Mr O'Connor, that those had been destroyed. Mr McGrath stood by and doubted the truth of that assertion, and they both said that they did not know where they were, and I have never had them.

Will you look to the evidence which was given by yourself at questions 424*s.* and 429, which contain the observation made by Mr Feargus O'Connor, and will you read that observation?—And which accounts I tell you you can have.

Mr P. O'CONNOR. Did I take the account from the originals from which those balance sheets were made, and from the labour-book, and the receipts I showed you?—Yes.

Did they agree to a penny?—Yes.

That was the original from which the manuscript was taken?—Yes.

You took it from the original?—From the original books.

The original books kept by the overseer?—Yes.

Sir B. HALL. Have you ever had the account produced to you by Mr Feargus O'Connor in answer to that question, which account was stated to be destroyed by the auditor of the company?—No, I have not seen it, and I do not intend to see it.

Have you read the evidence which was given by Mr McGrath?—I have not.

It was stated in evidence given by him in answer to question 707, and subsequently, that Mr O'Connor has regularly produced his balance sheets, and they were audited by persons appointed by the Committee. Did you ever see the account produced, and were kept in the possession of Mr O'Connor's self. Am I to understand that those accounts have not been produced?—They have not been produced to me.

Mr F. O'CONNOR. Be critical in this. Were the books from which the only written balance sheet was produced. Did you go over the original documents, which I have printed in the balance sheets were taken?—I can hardly answer that.

Did they correspond?—The books corresponded with the printed copies placed in my hands.

Sir B. HALL. Had you any balance sheets which had been audited by the auditors of the company and signed by them?—None whatever.

Mr P. O'CONNOR. Did you take the answer to question 746, that he can produce the original account of the balance sheet which is made up, and that they were signed by the auditors, Messrs Cuffay and Knight. Have you seen those original accounts signed?—No, I have not.

He further states in answer to question 1761, that Mr O'Connor's precise and particular man; that the balance sheet took him three days to audit; that there were about 29,000 items; and that he compared every one of them, and that vouchers were produced in the office for every farthing of expenditure except what he booked for postage, and that until the vouchers were produced Mr Cuffay would not allow him to have the balance sheet.

Have you seen anything like vouchers to that extent for the one balance sheet to which he alludes?—Not to the extent of 29,000; I have seen a large number of vouchers applying to the balance sheet which I imagine is meant there.

In answer to question 1670, it is stated that at the Lowlands Conference, held in December, the balance sheets were produced by Mr O'Connor, as treasurer of the Land Company, and that John Shaw and others were appointed auditors; have you seen the balance sheet which was so signed by John Shaw and others?—No.

Mr F. O'CONNOR. You held both the printed balance sheets in your hand?—Yes.

And you went over the books from which they were taken?—Yes.

And the vouchers?—Yes.

Were the sums from them that the written one was printed; the written one goes to the printer, and is cut up into fragments?—Yes.

Sir B. HALL. How do you know that they were so taken?—I just now begged to say that I could not tell that it was so, but the items in the books correspond with those printed in these copies.

Have you, or have you not, ever seen any of the balance sheets which were signed by Messrs Cuffay and Knight, the auditors of the Company, of that balance sheet which was handed in by Mr O'Connor at the Lowlands Conference, stated to have been signed by John Shaw and others?—No, I have not.

You stated, at your last examination, that a better arrangement of accounts has been adopted at the Land Office; will you state what that new arrangement was?—I stated that in July, 1847.

Mr O'CONNOR. Is it perfect now?—No.

Is it in good form, and are those books containing the names of the several shareholders?—I have not counted them; but there are four large volumes, in which I should think there were about that number of names.

Sir B. HALL. In answer to question 2400, put on the 2nd of June last, Mr O'Connor stated, that the balance sheet of £200,000 had been invested in Exchequer bills. Mr Allport sent in an account of £29,500, and I think the manager has £10,000, making as near £40,000 as possible, and I have seen

before that, that have been exchanged; from the beginning to the end perhaps £60,000. How much was there invested in Exchequer bills on the 27th of June, 1848?—The sum invested was £6,000. I took this from the account of Mr Allport, which shows that between February 1847, and June 1848, £37,000 had been bought and £31,000 sold, leaving £6,000 in hand. I ascertained to-day that Mr Allport's that account was in his hands, and I did not see the other, because Mr Allport was out of town, and clerk showed me the account, in which it appeared that £6,000 remained in Mr Allport's hands belonging to Mr O'Connor.

Mr F. O'CONNOR. Did you see Mr Price's Exchequer bill belonging to the Bank?—Yes.

Mr McGrath. Supposing money to be wanted for carrying on the affairs of the company, I could quite understand that Mr O'Connor, from the great interest he takes in the matter, might advance money with the intention of repaying himself. But as it appears from your statement of accounts that there is a balance in favour of the company greater than the amount due by the company to Mr O'Connor, what object could he have had in making advances to the company?—(Mr F. O'CONNOR.) The object I had in making the advances was this: my own money comes in quarterly; there were heavy demands upon the company, and I was determined not to sell any of the Bank stock, I was determined to keep all the bank money in Exchequer bills, and advance my own money as it came in quarterly. (To the WITNESS.) If those accounts had been accurately kept, in whose favour do you think, speaking after your examination of them, the great strictness, the balance would have been?—I think you have been a sufferer from inaccuracy with which the accounts had been kept.

And from not having made charges which I might have made?—If you had so charged, it would have increased the sum in your favour.

I think the single fraction of a charge for any expense I have been at from the beginning?—No, nothing whatever.

Nor for premiums to allottees?—No; that account shows everything.

Now, my friends, I have submitted to you the evidence, not of the interested Feargus O'Connor, but of the disinterested accountant, with whom I have never had ten words of conversation, except in connexion with those accounts; and it is but justice to him to state, notwithstanding the annoyance to which he has put me, that I think he was born with a ready reckoner in his hand, and a pen behind his ear. I thought I was pretty quick at accounts, but he beats me hollow.

I shall now make an observation or two, not upon the evidence, but upon the facts.

Firstly.—Mr McGrath did produce the original balance sheets, signed by Cuffay and Knight, to the Chairman.

Secondly.—No auditors ever signed my balance sheets, they signed the resolutions which the auditors submitted to the Conference; and

Thirdly.—The accountant has charged me with nearly 1,500*l.* as interest and profit upon Exchequer Bills.

Now, this was the item about which the drunken prostitute of the "Dispatch" who panders to the worst passions of man's nature was inquiring about. You will observe from the questions, that Sir Benjamin has been very critical, although he sickens one, and reminds me of a long pump with the sucker out of order, his eloquence, like the water, comes out in such dribbles. The result of the accountant's inquiry is given in these words and in these figures.

"Balance, overpaid by Mr O'Connor, £3,298 *5s.* 3*d.*"

Now, you who honour me by calling yourselves my children, what do you say to that? I know what your answer will be, but what will you say to this? Until you are all located I never will ask for a farthing of that back, but I will go on adding to it; and if I had ten millions to-morrow, and if I never expected one single farthing of it to be returned, I declare to you, "upon the true faith of a Christian," that I would expend every farthing of it in locating the poor in their own wretched boxes, upon their own Labour field. And I tell you now, despite it as you may, that I am not for blood, nor for diminishing the human family by a unit, but that I proposed my plan and I SHALL SUCCEED, to make the rich richer and the poor rich, to destroy that revolting misery which an evil system has created, and that my motto is "to live honestly and usefully and die a pauper." I live upon one meal a day; I am a frugal man, and a sober man; and I now tell you that I would not have bestowed my time upon any plan, that was not congenial to my feelings as I have bestowed my time upon this Land Plan, for twenty thousand pounds. Nay, my time is never to be measured by money; and much as I have suffered from slander and villany, I am more than repaid by the fact that it has not disturbed your confidence. In my own expenses alone this plan has cost me over £3,000, and there is no such charge in my balance sheet.

My friends, let me not be thought vain when I meet unfeigned charges by facts. In my own country I have conducted more contested elections than, I believe, any man in that country; as a barrister, and from my influence, I was entitled to large fees for each, but I never accepted even my travelling expenses. During the time of your apathy, I have supported the whole cause, and the victims out of my own purse. I never allowed a man to go to trial for a political offence, without the best advocate that the English bar could furnish, and yet there are idiots who call me an interested demagogue. If I am an interested demagogue, my every aspiration, and my every thought, is directed towards the amelioration of the condition of the working classes; and the reason I am hated is because I will not allow the traffickers in human blood, and in infant gristle, to preserve an idle competitive reserve, in order that they may fall back upon them, and make their profits out of a reduction of wages, and the destitution of the poor.

Now, my friends, I give you the evidence of Mr Sullivan, Member for Kilkenny, and also a member of the Committee, in answer to the snivelling curs who have been writing from Snigg's End to Manchester, as to the performance of the work. And let me tell you, that there is not a more critical or better judge of agriculture and buildings in England, than the hon. member for Kilkenny. Here is his evidence:—

MICHAEL SULLIVAN, Esq., a Member of the Committee, examined.

Mr F. O'CONNOR. You have visited the estates of Snigg's End and Lowlands?—I was there on Saturday last.

Did you visit many of the allotments at Lowlands, and your conversation with any allottees there?—A great number of them; I should say that we visited very nearly half of them.

And passed through all?—Yes, and passed through all.

And you saw the crops?—We examined all the crops, and we went into the houses, into the bedrooms and kitchens and piggeries, and we saw every appointment that was in connexion with the house for effectually carrying out the management of the farms.

When you say "half of them," you mean half of the occupiers you spoke of?—Yes.

Did you examine the crops minutely?—We examined the crops minutely.

What was your opinion as to the contrast between the crops that you had seen there, and the crops that you had seen in travelling?—Lowlands, or Gloucester, or the crops in the immediate neighbourhood?—I was particularly observant of all the crops I went along from London to Gloucester, as far as a railroad view would give an opportunity of judging, and I observed the crops of wheat to be particularly light; then from Gloucester we went about five or six miles in an open carriage through the country, till we arrived at the estate of Snigg's End, and from that we went to Lowlands.

Upon an inspection of the crops of wheat at Lowlands, what comparison would you say there to the crops in the neighbourhood, or to the other crops that you had seen?—The average crops of wheat, particularly in Lowlands, are decidedly the best I had seen in journeying from London to Gloucester. Or in the neighbourhood round about?—Or in the neighbourhood round about, I had seen some few fields of some few farmers that came nearly up to them. That is, I should say there were a few that came up to the average crops of Lowlands; but that it was not the case, generally speaking.

Did you see the average of the crops of wheat at Lowlands, taking every allotment, would you say it was a middling, or a good, or an indifferent crop?—I should say it was a prime crop as an average.

How did the potatoes look?—The potatoes looked

in many instances very good, in others not quite so good; they were got in some cases in a superior manner, particularly as regarded the allotment of the cabinet-maker, Lee.

You went into his house?—Yes, we did.

And remained there some time?—Yes; and remained there some time.

From the condition in which you saw the whole estate there, would you say it was richly cropped, or poor, particularly as regarded the potatoes?—I should say, taking the whole estate together, that there is an enormous amount of produce of every description upon it; that is, speaking of the Lowlands estate.

With regard to the houses, of what description did you find them?—The houses were of a very superior character, in my opinion; probably a little too much so; they are in fact too good for a four-acre farm.

Did you see the gates that had been put up in the several places?—I did.

Did you go into the schoolhouses?—I did.

In what style was the work that you examined performed?—In the most permanent and complete manner.

What was the feeling of the allottees, as far as you could ascertain it, of their present condition, and of their future prospects?—I was very curious to ascertain how parties brought from all directions of the country, entirely unacquainted with agriculture, and located in a place like that, could be content, as they were, with a few acres of land, and those agricultural parents, and I must state that in particular I was struck with one old man who had been a cotton overseer. He appeared to me to be as fully acquainted with agricultural pursuits, and to know all his farm in as complete a system of crop plan, as if he had been there many years. I do not know the names of the parties; I merely inquired their trades and occupations, and I found a framework knitter, I found a tallow chandler, I found a stocking maker, and I found every description of trade almost located there; I found a cabinet-maker, I found a shoemaker, and I found a cotton spinner; but I did not find one agricultural labourer there; every one had been a tradesman.

Mr LAWSON. How many cows did you see upon the estate?—I saw but one.

Mr F. O'CONNOR. How many pigs did you see?—I observed that the majority were turning their attention to the feeding of pigs, as being more profitable than that of cows.

I now give you a letter that I have received from the Minister Lovel Estate, and my answer:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN STAR.

CHARTERVILLE, JULY, 18th.

SIR,—In reply to Mr O'Connor's letter, contained in the NORTHERN STAR of the 16th inst., you will oblige the allottees on this estate by inserting the following in your next:—

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL LAND COMPANY.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN.

We, the allottees of Charterville, beg respectfully to submit to you the following brief observations on a letter from Mr O'Connor's letter, contained in the last NORTHERN STAR, viz. "That if there is an obstacle in the way of carrying this plan, it originates with the located members, because, if there was a million of money subscribed, and a thousand located, the fortunate thousand would imagine that they had the best title to the remainder of the funds, and this has always been my greatest difficulty. This paragraph has been so absolute in its expression, that, therefore, Mr O'Connor intends to include us therein; we beg emphatically to dissent with him on that assertion. Because we have not yet received an equivalent, to what the allottees on previous estates have received;—neither have we asked it of the directors. The only request which we have made of them, has been the same privilege allowed the loan within these limits instead of driving it off for six months. This was in their power, inasmuch as that the last Conference left it in their hands to determine the time at which the loan should be granted. This we think they ought to have done—this we think they ought to do yet, as early as possible, otherwise the result will be absolutely ruinous to the plan. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression of the directors. For out of our aid money we have had to buy seed, pay for labourers, to prepare the ground, and sow and plant it—while the allottees on previous located estates have had the whole of their aid money paid to them, clear of the expenses of putting in a great portion of their seed, which the directors have done for them. Hence it is evident that we have not had the same privilege allowed the expression

Keywords: *depression, mood, anxiety, self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-efficacy*

then upwards of 300 of the inhabitants were
n, and the number yet to be sworn in is about

Imports of 140,000 Chinese insects, for the purpose of natural history

.....

from the Queen all authority over Ireland. It pro- wa
at the same time, to abolish at once all rights of of

loyalty with respect to those who shall break their club
of alliances and join in a rebellion. But with

stated 140 names were enrolled,' On the 8th to
ly the following account was received from Lef

held on the 3rd inst., a man named Dwylo at-

pose, in order to meet this emergency.
 Lieutenant of Ireland, in concert with the Lord

government's course in Parliament and asked for the people to give their full and hearty support to the bill. He said that the people of the country were not in a hurry to give their support to the bill, but he thought that the people of the country would give their support to the bill in the end. He said that the people of the country were not in a hurry to give their support to the bill, but he thought that the people of the country would give their support to the bill in the end. He said that the people of the country were not in a hurry to give their support to the bill, but he thought that the people of the country would give their support to the bill in the end.

Mr SCULLY considered that this bill might be fatal. He denied the dissection and disloyalty which had been imputed to the Government. He did not intend to respond to remedial measures for Ireland, and he would never introduce into that country permanent peace.

The house then divided, when the numbers were—

For Mr S. Crawford's amendment 27
Against it 21

Majority against it 27

Leave was then given to bring in the bill, and it was brought in by Lord J Russell and read a first time.

Lord J. Russell. Sir, as the house has so unequivocally expressed its opinion in favour of this bill as to leave no room for doubt, I have no doubt that the Government will now agree that, under all the circumstances, it would be better that the bill should be passed immediately. (Loud cheering.) I therefore move—

That the bill be read a second time. (Renewed cheering.)

Mr O'CONNOR.—I will not take time. (Renewed cheering.)

By any further expression of opinion on my part, read that the house has so very unequivocally declared its assent to the bill.

Lord J. O'BRIEN (brother to Mr Smith O'Brien).—I wish to explain in one word the vote which I have given. (Hear, hear.) I can assure you, when I have

his intention to bring in this bill, my first impression was not to vote upon it. It occurred to me that the vote of a single individual would be but of small importance; and that the vote of a single member would be of small importance to the first to be affected by the measure. It occurred to me on my mind was that it would be more decorous to vote. But, considering that if I abstained from voting on this bill, I should be in Ireland—hear, hear, and being strongly impressed with the propriety of the proceedings being put on end for the sake of the persons who are sure to be involved in great suffering if the bill were not passed, I have been becoming to a decided vote in favour of the measure.

Mr HURZ—A great power is given by this bill to Lord-Lieutenant or the other parties who are to carry out the bill, in imposing the subject upon the subject. Now, I want to know if any record of the subject of individuals who may be arrested, in order that at the proper time we may be satisfied that the law has not been in force, (hear, hear, hear). I should like to know what is the rule in such cases. I should like to know what is the rule as I have mentioned. I think we ought to take care that the liberty of the subject is not unnecessarily in danger.

Sir G. GARR—On former occasions, when a law was actually made in force, it was provided that

[illegible]

pardonable in me to do so, after to decide an expression of the sense of the house. (Hear.) I believe that the majority being so very large and the minority so very small is entirely to be attributed to the fact that the representatives of the people of Ireland have had no voice in the matter. Surely the country is in such a imminent danger as to require all this haste. (Divide.)

Mr. MONSELL.—I will not occupy the attention of the house for more than one moment. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has spoken of the course proposed by the Government, and I have said that I am not in favour of the hon. gentleman's government as unusual; but I am sure that the Government of the State of Ireland is not unusual too. (Cheers.) I entertain the noble lord at the head of the government, and I entertain this house to value human life, not to delay the passing of this measure.

[illegible]