

STOCKPORT.—THE COWARDLY LEAGUERS AGAIN.—Considerable excitement and dissatisfaction exists here, in consequence of the manner in which Cobden and the Leaguers are about to treat the public. It has been intimated that a meeting on the 30th inst. to which no person can gain admittance without paying at the least sixpence. The working classes observe, and justly, too, that Cobden is bound to render an account of his "stewardship" to the people without money and without price. His cowardly backing from meeting Mr. O'Connor has been intimated to the University Extension League, and will face the working men of Stockport, and they will give him a reception he will not speedily forget.

THE PEOPLE'S TAXERS.

Of one thing the reader may rest fully assured

As soon as the "supplies" are "STOPPED," we will publish an *Extraordinary Edition*, to communicate unto him the glad tidings. The knowledge of such a wise step as that—WHEN ACCOMPLISHED I—ought to be instantly known, to inspire the drooping with hope, and to animate the apathetic. As far as we are concerned, the utmost shall be done to give it publicity. And we shall also intently watch the prior preparatory proceedings. The matter is one of no ordinary magnitude. "Stopping the Supplies" stops the machine! We have ever expected that it would come to a *dead-lock* some day or other; but *never could hope or imagine* that it was possible to prevail on its own providers, those INTERESTED in its CONTINUED WORKINGS, to throw up the drum-sticks, and cry "Hail! RUIN all together!"

It seems that we have been of those "of little faith"; and that if we wait, "we shall see what we shall see."

Well! by all means get the "supplies stopped" If that can be accomplished, all else is easy! The power that "stops the supplies" can carry the Charter; and of course those who are for doing the one are fully disposed to do the other.

MR. COBDEN'S VALOUR—THE SNEAKING
COWARDLY BOBADIL.

Founded on a lie, is it any wonder that the erection should be in strict keeping? Wonder, or no wonder, the fact is so. Based upon deceit, it has been necessary for the builders to add deception to deception; and the whole structure is nothing more, nor anything less, than a heap of rubbishy lies!

The League, in addressing itself to the different classes of society, is obliged to use different and contradictory representations, to induce each class to accord countenance and aid. It has palpably practised *deception in every case*: for it is palpable that a story *contradictory* in every part cannot be true or founded on truth. And when we find parties *shifting their ground*, according to the leading ideas and supposed interests of those before whom their measure is laid, and from whom support is courted, we cannot come to other conclusion than that the parties so acting *intend to deceive*, and that their whole conduct is one enormous lie.

When the League address the working-man, (particularly in the manufacturing districts), to *capitulate and decide* HIM, they represent that the establishment of their principle, as embodied in a measure relative to the importation of foreign corn, would give him "*cheap food, high wages, and plenty to do.*" They represent to him that the inevitable effect of this scheme would be, that food must lower in price; that "the shilling loaf could then be got for sixpence; or, what is the same thing, the shilling loaf would be as *large again*;" and that *wages* would then at the same time inevitably *rise in price*: for the effect of such a measure must be a "great extension of our Foreign trade;" that "extensions of trade call more labour into play, and *decrease* the stock in the labour market; and that when any commodity becomes scarcer in the market, the price must necessarily enhance."

When addressing the Master Manufacturers, the League represent that, to save our trade from utter annihilation, it is of all things necessary that the *cost of production should be lessened!* that it is impossible for them "to compete with the Foreign Manufacturers who have to pay *such low wages*," in consequence of the very low price of food! that the Foreigners are becoming, every day, more and more independent of us,—because they find it *cheaper* to manufacture for themselves, having so little to *pay for labour*; that it is well known that the main item in the cost of manufactured productions, is LABOUR; and that the only way to lessen the cost of English manufactured productions, so as to enable the English manufacturer to retain the Foreign market, is to beat down the remuneration of English labour to the Continental level, through *cheap food*: in all which ends, say they, will be attained by the enactment of the measure advocated by the League.

to the whole people, the League say that it will be of *advantage* to enact a measure which will assuredly *lower* the price of all descriptions of produce; and, by consequence, AND to the already overwhelming burden of taxation borne by the producers! It is capable of *demonstration* that no advantage could possibly accrue to any portion of British society from a decrease in the price of produce, whilst we have FIXED-MONEY ENOAGERS, ENOAGERS, excepting the tax-eater, and the Manufacturer fortunate enough to have his machinery employed in the satisfying of the orders given in consequence of a "extended" trade. This the League well know: and they therefore well know that it is a gross delusion; a big, thumping lie, which they seek to palm upon the people, when they represent that INCREASED TAXATION will be of benefit! They seek to deceive and cajole the several classes in turn, by addressing to them representations, conflicting and contradictory, but cunningly devised to catch the self-interested of each; and they then seek to deceive and impose upon the whole in a mass.

This "*great fact*" is no less apparent, if we descend from generalities to particulars; if we leave their principles and their reasoned-out-consequences, and examine their *mode* of conducting the agitation they are engaged in. In whatever light we may choose to view their conduct, we shall find it all of a piece—rank fraud and obsequy.

They pretend to deplore the vast amount of suffering and want inflicted on the toilers through the grinding system of taxation and loan-jobbing combined with the legislative application of Eric Trade principles. They "deeply commiserate" the starved condition of the machine-supplanted labourer, and affect great fear for the safety of society itself, but the causes of the evils working destruction are not ascertained, and an adequate remedy applied; they, in the spirit of seeming candour, they propound their nostrum,—the establishment of the *freedom-of-action* principle; tracing the evils with which we are afflicted, and their consequences, to the action of the principle of *restraint, regulation, and protection*; a principle which they have cantingly named "*Monopoly*;" a principle which was once embodied in the whole polity of England; and under which thorough embodiment England became a *desert* over the whole earth for power, practical freedom, and plenteous-condition. Their measure is puffed off as an unfalling panacea, which will restore us to "national health." But in propounding this measure, they *affect* to court inquiry. They don't wish to dictate, or to dogmatize; but they court investigation, and public discussion. *There* is their plan; *there* are their reasons in its support; if anybody controvert the reasons, or demonstrate the inefficiency of the plan! If so, let them come upon the public stage, and let the public judge between them."

What a fraud! What a gross deception! What a lie! They affect to court public discussion; they never affect to deplore that their opponents will not meet to adduce their "strong reasons"; nay, they even cause it to be believed that their opponents shrink from the challenges that have been given; and all this at the very time that the League are carefully avoiding public discussion, even when that avoidance involves the discreditable and dishonourable shirking out of their own challenges, accepted on their own terms!

A grosser humbug, or greater fraud, never yet existed, than this same League.

Look at the recent conduct of the COBURN of the League, in respect to the affected anxiety to meet a public discussion : and judge from the sample the veracity and quality of the whole sack.

It is well known that Mr. F. O'CONNOR has been one of the greatest and most successful opponents of the League. It is well known that he has contributed very much to cause the working people to stand entirely aloof from the Free Trade agitation; nay even to take an antagonistic position in relation to it.

It is well known that that gentleman has had more

than an ordinary share in working an entire revolution in the minds of the working people, respecting the value of the two principles, *freedom of action*, and *trade regulation*: a revolution so complete, that almost to a man the working classes espouse the former, and oppose the latter: so much so, that the Free Traders, in their appeals to public opinion, are no longer to meet with closed doors, under the protection of paid-for ticket admissions. It is also well known that Mr. O'CONNOR has always held himself in readiness to bring his "reasons" forward and long, to investigate the whole matter before the public, with the best men the League could produce: and it is a well known fact that hitherto he has been unsuccessful in such efforts, save once when he caught Mr. A'LAND at Halifax, and so convinced A'LAND's own audience of the worthlessness of the League's cause, that the entire meeting, every man in it, voted his accordance with Mr. O'CONNOR's views! Excepting that single occasion, (which will never be forgotten by those who were present), not one of the Free-Trade Champions,—so anxious and so desirous for discussion!—has been able to get "down to the scratch." Whether the trouncing that A'LAND got was enough for the entire "set," does not appear: but it is not to be denied.

The very next twelvemonths did Mr. O'CONNOR formally challenge the League. He dared the whole of the town, the best man they could pick, to meet him in a public place, and show them the enactment of their "one" measure would be of *advantage* to the shopkeeping and working classes; he engaging to carry conviction that such measure would be of *POSITIVE INJURY* to the public places of our large towns; and thousands of them posted upon the public walls. Wherever the League went, for many months, that challenge met their eyes. AND YET THEY DARED NOT TO ACCEPT IT!! It was continually flung in their faces; the taunts respecting it and their shrinking, were bitter and severe: yet all would not do. The League—so ready to discuss; so anxious for public investigation; so desirous to enlist public opinion: *no men*,—whose efforts had been marred by the exertions of the man who now offered himself as fair game,—dared not to meet, and expose his sophistries; they bared his flimsily-covered fallacies; and *convinced* those who had hearkened to him that he had neither sense nor right on his side. The League men dared not do this! although they were constantly presenting it as a most easy task; and the consequence was that public opinion was more and more estranged from them, and the necessity for the League Meetings to be held with closed doors more stringent.

to get "more." This necessarily brought the League's spouters out before their own friends at their meetings. Even *(here the moral effects of the unaccepted challenge were plainly apparent. The show of valour in the unaffected readiness to meet discussion, contrasted unfavourably with the fact that discussion had been shirked. The ghost, too, of the challenge would most unopportunistly present itself at the League Banquets, spite of all efforts to "lay it" off. Many a League orator has been brought to a dead stand, when dealing out "fustian" by the yard, by some unlucky wight "popping the question."* "Why did you not meet Mr. O'CONNOR?" Many a fine round period, and many a bundle of high sounding phrases have been spoiled by such means, and the matter was becoming so pressing and annoying that the *CORPUS* determined to get rid of it, if possible, by a dash. He thought he could take such a position as would remove the *odium* then attaching to himself, for cowardice and shirking, of other shoulders. He therefore cunningly beat about for a form in which to present the question, so that—as he calculated—it never would be accepted to and THEN HE could rate the "shirker" most soundly for his "bounce" and his "cowardice."

To accomplish this, it was necessary that he should appear as the challenger. As the matter stood, I was bound to say "off" or "on." The question was as fairly and as comprehensively put as was possible. The measure CORDEN is *hired* advocate is represented as one that will be advantage to all classes; but particularly to the working and shop-keeping portion. This conclusion was frankly and flatly denied; and therefore insisted ought to have joined. CORDEN's opponent offered to prove that the measure he is so well-paid for advocating would be a *POSITIVE* injury to those two classes. What more could be desired, if the object had been to give the public an opportunity to judge of the merits of the case? Ah! but no. This would not suit the League. To meet, or to offer to meet, an opponent on such terms, would be destruction of "Remember the fate of ACLAND!" "Remember that if we have one amongst us 'cunning of fence'; or worse calling a 'debater' remember that if we have a man at all deserving that character, ACLAND is the man. Cool in temper; abundant in words; full of clap-trap; power of *face* unsurpassed; and tricky, artful, dexterous; all this is ACLAND; and yet remember his fate! No, no; no meeting with Mr. O'CONNOR! The only course left therefore is to frame a challenge as shall make it *impossible* for him to accept it! Let us but manage that, and then we have him; and won't we let the spoons know it!" Accordingly, when CORDEN was asked at Leeds at the Leeds ticket meeting, *why* he did not accept Mr. O'CONNOR's challenge, he demurred to the terms of it; but ventured one of his own. "I was ready, desirous, anxious, to meet in the open air, before the people, any man, Mr. O'CONNOR, any body else, who would defend the Corn Law, and undertake to show that they ought not to be repealed!" Loud were the shouts; uproarious were the cheers; enthusiastic were the claps, that followed this announcement.

At Bradford, the same game was played. Poor SMITH, having been unfortunate enough to go amongst the ticketed crowd, put the question to the hired League orator: "Why he shrunk from public discussion?" and though poor SMITH was thrown down the stairs for his temerity, yet the question touched that COMDEN was obliged to notice it. He did so in the following fashion:—

The challenge was that Mr. Deargun O'Connor prepared to make a public speech, touching this question.—Would the repeal of the Corn Law and the establishment of Free Trade be of immediate benefit to the working classes? This is a mere evasion and subterfuge, which will expose it. I do not pretend to be an economist, but I can argue intelligently in the future tense, say what might, could, would, or should happen; do not pretend to soar into the regions of fancy and speculation, and prophecy about events and consequences, about which we are all equally ignorant. I have to deal with facts, which experience and observation plainly attest:—I point to the misery and distress that have been every where rife, in the West Riding as well as other places; I refer you to the thousands of pauper children, who are daily being sent to the workhouse, and who are daily being starved, as stalked through your streets—to the ruin of the capitalist and the degradation of the working man; and I say the Corn Law is unjust and ought to be immediately repealed. (Great applause.)

Now, I say, I hear. WHERE IS THE MAN THAT WILL MEET ME AND OPPOSE THIS PROPOSITION. Let any man meet me, I CARE NOT WHERE, in the West Riding or elsewhere, ONLY IT SHALL BE IN PUBLIC, IN THE OPEN AIR, AND I WILL ARGUE WITH HIM, AND HE SHALL be ought to be maintained. But no; they won't do this."

Such were the boastings of the cock on his own
midden! How vaunt! How full of prowess!
How anxious to fight. "Twenty more; kill 'em
kill 'em!" "Twenty more; kill 'em! kill 'em!"

But this was not all. It was not alone at Leec
and Bradford that *Babadi* bounced. He did the
same at Derby, as the following account, which
has reserved for this occasion, will show. It will
also show how the "twenty more; kill 'em! kill
'em!" man *shrunk* from the stern gaze of honesty
and sunk into his seat with a face of *crimson*!! We
might he!

[illegible]

Still it failed. The challenge was accepted. There was no beating about the bush; no trickery; evasion; no falsification of the terms of the challenge as in CORDEN's case, when he pretended to describe Mr. O'CONNOR's, and declined to meet him. There was none of that sort of work; but a plain setting forth of CORDEN's challenge in his own words, and an acceptance of it in the following manner:—

"I, WITHOUT CIRCUMLOCUTION, ACCEPT YOUR CHALLENGE upon your own conditions, which are that you are to prove THAT THIS CORN LAW IS JUST, AND OUGHT TO BE IMMEDIATELY REPEALED."

Here was a *fiat*! The dodge had not availed. The thrice called-upon, had answered to the call. He proclaimed his readiness to appeal to the public and to abide by the public decision.

Great was the dismay of the League! Lyng "brounce" had not served them. The *trick* he had attempted was seen through and spoiled. The cat was fairly put among the pigeons.

What was to be done? Meet the *challenged* according to offer? O! no. "Remember ye ARLAND." "No meeting! no discussion! no appeal to public opinion!" Then how are we to get rid of the mess we are in?" "By LYING! by falsification; by fraud; by villification."

Accordingly every League Journal was set to work to announce the important fact that "O'CONNOR had at last appeared in his true colors as a champion of the bread-taxing landlords, defender of the Corn Law; and that he had *challenged* Mr. COBDEN to discuss the question with him; but that Mr. COBDEN had something better to do, than to engage in controversy with a Lord's Tool."

How characteristic! How strictly in keeping with *LIES*, how could it be expected to anything but *LIES* in ought appertaining to League! Lying and deceit is their vocation: in this instance, well did they follow it.

The silly cry of "landlord's tool!" was soon set at rest. In a letter to the *Leeds Mercury*, Mr. O'Connor put the *quietus* on that song. He detailed measures regarding the landlord class, and the relations he would establish between landlord and tenant; and these were so much in accordance with the supposed interests of the landlord class, that of the League organs, the *Hull Advertiser*, quo them, and tries to *alarm* the landlords by show what there is in store for them should ever Chartist rule! and beseeches them, in most imploring care to throw themselves into the hands of the League state-off the "Destructive"! Curious sort of "landlord's tool" this!

Well, but how did *Nobodid* Act! He surely not shrink from the combat! He who was so of mettle; so anxious to break a lance; surely he not shrink! surely, surely he did not shrink who had cried, "*Where is the man that will meet me!*" "*let any man meet me, I care not who!*" only it shall be in public, in the open air," who exclaimed "*twenty more*; kill'em, kill'er!" surely he did not turn tail on his own profession, belie his own offers! I faith he did! True to calling; full of deception to the throat; crammèd bursting with fraud, he did REPUSE to STANDE in his own OFFER. The "courageous" coward slunk sneakingly away! All his "valour" evaporated! HE DARED not to ENGAIGE in the ENCOUNTER!

And what was his reason for so declining : or shrinking? "He could make better use of his time than while discussing with such a man as Feargus O'Connor. Make better use of his time! How? By fleeing the knowing ones of their cash! By getting together the £100,000! Does he fear that a public examination of his nostrum; a public exposure of his fallacies; a public stripping of his pretensions would so open the eyes of the GULLS, that his breeches pockets would be closed, and the "cash withheld! Is it in this sense that *Bobadil* "better employment" is to be understood?

It would be difficult to understand it any other supposition. If he be sincere in his expressed desire for public enlightenment, if he even wish to remove that which describes as the "GREATEST OBSTACLE" of the way of himself and his confederates, in-
tation cannot conceive of any "better" mode "employing his time" than in proving Mr. O'CONNOR before the people, to be a public deceiver, and worthy of confidence or notice. CORDEN said Aberdeen that Mr. O'CONNOR was his "GREATEST DIFFICULTY," he also said that "unless the people down Mr. O'CONNOR, he would destroy the cause which the people were contending." Then does not CORDEN aid "the people" to put O'CONNOR down! Why does he not try to remove his own "GREAT DIFFICULTY"? Why does he adopt the only effectual means to accomplish this, the holding up the man in his true colours before the gaze of an honest and discriminating public? How could "his time" be made "a better use" than in the performance of this imperative public duty! Ah! to talk of a thing, and to do it, two different things. "Remember poor ACLAIR! It may be very desirable to remove the "GREAT DIFFICULTY" out of the way: but 'WHO'S TO BELL THE CAT'? Not Bobadil! Not the shrinking coward. Not the man of bounce!

But is this matter to stay as it is? Will the people permit it? Will they submit to be so insulted and abused? Will they allow themselves to be thus treated? They have been appealed to. COWDEN has been their champion in this question. He has said "let no man meet me, I care not where; ONLY IT SHALL BE IN PUBLIC; in the open air." He has called the people to "put down" Mr. O'CONNOR, or "would destroy their cause." He has described it as a vile hireling, in the pay of the Tory Landlord. He has declared that he has proof of this. And now when he has so appealed to the public; when he has called for public judgment;—he declines to meet the public, to produce his evidence!! Is this to be tolerated? Is this the way that the people are to be treated? Is this the way that public agitations are to be carried on? Emphatically we say NO. COWDEN has called upon the public to interfere. He has desired them to "put down" his political opponent. The public then have a fair and undeniable right to demand that he keep faith with them! They have a clear duty to perform: compel him to come before them, to adduce "evidence;" or to "PUT HIM DOWN!"

On the public we earnestly call, to perform its duty. Demand of COBURN, every time he pres-
himself before you, or *to* *feels* to do so in a "hole-an-
corner," why he has broken faith with you? Tell
him that you are interested in getting to know both
what he is, and what Mr. O'CONNOR is; and that
he has made charges to you, and called upon you for
JUDGMENT, you insist on his coming to the trial, af-
proving his accusations. Tell him he must
this, or consent to be considered a lying sal-
derer; a bawling falsifier; a cowardly, sneal-
ing, pitiful poltroon. Insist on his appearanc-
Tell him it does not now remain with him
to say whether "his time can be better occupied
the judging of that now remains with you. Rec-
no denial. Follow him close. Follow him to
"snuggeries." Go to his "ticket meetings." They
the only places where you can find him. Treat
gently, at first. Question him quietly, but plain-
Receive his answer. If that answer be, as it may
be, in the affirmative, there leave it, till the pre-
liminary arrangements for the "meeting" are ma-
If the coward declines,—then "put him down."
Hiss him! Hoot him! Drive him off the pub-
stage. Let him know that the public "time can
better employed" than in listening to his coward
slanders.

"Teach COBURN that you fully appreciate him
you do the League: and that you know both to
MIGHTY GREAT LIES.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

**THE TRIALS.—THE PRESS.—AND THE
DODGERS.**

How to "take the sting out of events" should doubt-
less be matter of important consideration with the
Statesman; but one of still greater importance to our
mind is, how to put the sting into events; and as

presume the policy of Statesmen, like all other things
has undergone a great change to keep pace with the
progress of events, we imagine that we recognize in
the conduct of our rulers, a thing of that new policy
which is hereafter to become a substitute for the new
modern fashion. The repetition "ad nauseam"
Mr. O'Connell's wholesale stereotyped rap speeches
had, long previous to the State Prosecutions, the
sedative effect of allaying that excitement which
while fresh and feverish, they had created in the
mercenary minds of Irishmen. The angry bubble has
subsided, and was followed by a gentle simmer, which

would ultimately have terminated in a mere cost and calculating deliberation as to the next *SAFEST* STEP; when behold the pot is once more set boiling the sum is taken off; the wordy obscurity in which the "Liberator" so ingeniously clouded his real intentions is destroyed; the gross bodiliness is torn from the spirit. Mr. O'CONNELL himself was beginning to ask for an extension of time. Eighteen Hundred and Forty Three was not only not to be the BEYOND YEAR! but in Eighteen Hundred and Forty Four it was only to be within the reach of those who chose to clutch it. The "monster meeting," sanctioned while Parliament was assembled, and declared by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland to be legal, were drawing to a close; and all promise of a quiet termination to the annual agitation; when behold! our rulers put "the sting into events" and canonized where they intended to destroy. In truth it required the critical mind, the judicious selection and pruning hand of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL to present to the world, in a condensed and comprehensive form, the real spirit of Mr. O'CONNELL's speeches, which, as we have before observed, the

gentleman had contrived to wrap in much obscurity. It remained for the ATTORNEY-GENERAL to furnish the world with a compendium of the valuable portion of Mr. O'CONNELL's several orations : and that he has succeeded may be gathered from the impression now so generally created in minds of all political shades, that never was there a more unjustifiable attempt to destroy a political foe by the sting of the "ORDINARY LAW!" Never was there placed upon record a more unfair, ungenerous, unnecessary, and uncalculated for prosecution than that with the expense of which the country is now saddled ; while the means of conducting it, the machinery for carrying it on, and the means resorted to by the Tory press for bringing it to a successful issue, have been mean, cowardly, fraudulent, and unconstitutional. The world was led to suppose that a "conspiracy" really did exist; not such a "conspiracy" as was published in Mr. O'CONNELL's several speeches ; but a "secret conspiracy," a "real conspiracy," a "dark and dangerous conspiracy;" and what does it all end in? Why, that the Government reporter was accommodated by Mr. O'CONNELL with ample means for furnishing his employees with all that transpired. The "pictorial" edition was not only lithographed by, and designed by, but was literally invented by, Mr. HOLBOURN, PRINTER TO THE GOVERNMENT! Indeed the evidence upon this head is so truly characteristic of the "ORDINARY LAW" of Ireland, that we cannot refrain from making it somewhat more conspicuous than a mere place in our report will ensure for it. THOMAS PACKER, in the employment of HOLBOURN the Government printer, mind, gives the following amusing account of the pictorial edition :—

"Mr. Freeman to witness. Look at the next line on the card. Witness—That is Orlan Podish—laugh. Where did you get his likeness?—Witness—From my imagination—great laughter. Who suggested the name to you? Witness—Mr. HOLBROOK suggested the name of Freeman—Witness—That is right. Where did you get it?—From an old French engraving in the possession of Geraghty, the bookkeeper Who brought you that?—Mr. HOLBROOK brought it. Where did you get it?—From the same place. The cards—I believe it was Mr. HOLBROOK's who had them. Look at the next?—That is Hugh O'Neil—laugh. Where did you get that likeness?—I think I composed it—laugh. Look at the next?—That is Joseph Dathan—

No doubt King DATMAN also was composed by PACKER and HOLBROOK! The Government is now, if their Irish SOLICITOR-GENERAL would but be guided by the same rule, in a dilemma. They "must have conviction," but after such "evidence," of whose utility will it be? Meantime, the sluggish monster into which our Statesmen have contrived to put the nation, draws its slow length along."

We must now have a word with our "liberal" contemporaries upon points of principle. These gentlemen are, for the most part, loud in their denunciation against the admissibility of "evidence" not taken from very extensive notes of picked short-hand writers. "Like case like rule"; and "what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," are good, very good maxims; and in support of them we beg to refer our "liberal" friends to the fact, that throughout the whole of the Chartist prosecutions, the Crown lawyers argued, the Bench admitted, and the LIBERAL PRESS JUSTIFIED the admissibility, not of the notes of picked men, or of even those who had been employed in the profession; but THEY ADMITTED THE EVIDENCE OF POLICEMEN, who spoke, in some instances, nine months after the transaction had occurred, and from pencil notes taken while in the midst of a bustling crowd, and amid great excitement! Nay, THEY ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE THAT WHICH WAS HEARD BY ONE MAN, AND WRITTEN BY ANOTHER MAN SOME DAYS AFTERWARDS! the memory of the hearer being refreshed by the hints of the writer, who was not within six miles of the spot! The description of evidence upon which Chartist victims were convicted is too notorious to require much comment; but if our friends wish for a case or two strictly in point, we can furnish them. At Liverpool, then, the whole evidence against several Chartist prisoners was the short-hand notes of a Mr. Clarkson, who was no reporter at all, and who, we believe, so far from incurring the censure of any of our "Liberal" contemporaries, secured the patronage of our friends of the *Manchester Guardian* by the service rendered to the Government at Liverpool. How foolish, then, for those who "live in glass houses to fling stones"; while we, thank God, are at perfect liberty to smash all their false lights.

Now, we have another word, though apart from the evidence, yet very minutely connected with the case: we mean for the CHARLEMONT "conspiracy" now on foot. It appears that the present Earl of CHARLEMONT, son of the Earl of the same name, who was Commander-in-Chief of the Irish Volunteers in 1782, would, as his father did before him, take advantage of passing events to ensure the future success of the Whig party. It is absolutely necessary that the Irish mind should be kept directed to the single object placed before them. That object is—Total Repeal. "No Surrender"! In the language of Mr. O'CONNELL "WHO DARES SPEAK OF COMPROMISE?" Such is the object. For that object the Irish mind has been roused and organized; and to its attainment it must and shall be directed. A meeting has recently been held at Lord CHARLEMONT'S house, with the Duke of LEINSTER in the chair; the proposed object of which meeting was, to take steps to ally existing excitement and save the country; but the real object was, to turn excitement to Whig purposes, and to damn the country with another ten years rule of the "base, bloody, and brutal" Whigs. That this meeting was intended as a new nest egg for the Repeal Association to lay their eggs upon for the next year is manifest. Mr. SMITH O'BRIEN has convinced us of that. In speaking of the assertion of national rights in the Conciliation Hall, on Monday last, where he occupied the Chair, he says: "I see that national feeling advanced in the rising movement in favour of Federalism. I see it advanced in the meeting which took place last week in Charlemont House." Can there now remain a colourable doubt upon the mind of a single man with a single particle of brain, that Mr. WILLIAM SMITH O'BRIEN has been very ingeniously affixed to the Repeal carriage, as a brake to stop its progress! or rather as an engineer, to drive it backwards! The object of the Association is Repeal. The Irish people, the English people, and the American people have given their money to

THE TRIALS.—THE PRESS.—AND THE DODGERS.

be seen at the Police Office, to vary in Pattern on
in Sizes so as to fit each Man.
Estimates to be sent in, sealed, addressed to the
Clothing Committee, on or before Thursday, the 1
of February, at Twelve o'Clock at Noon.
By Order,
EDWARD READ, Chief Constable
Police Office, 19th of January, 1844.

Q—You are sure of that?—Sure of it! I never did any such thing in my life.

A—You read the *Carlisle Patriot*, in 1839?—Yes.

Q—Look at this (handing him a printed document), have you any recollection of that?—I have not the slightest recollection of it.

Q—Was it not published in the *Patriot* as a leading article? I do not know. I have no recollection of it.

Q—Can you say that that did not appear in your paper?—I cannot say.

(Continued from our Sixth page.)

But it may have appeared—It may, Sir; I cannot say it did not.

The article to which I call your attention says—"We regret in the most ardent manner that the conduct of the magistracy in compelling us to give evidence against the prisoners." Do you remember those words?

—Do not.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—Mr. Henry—I think I am entitled to ask him to swear that this was not inserted in the paper with his sanction?

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

—The article was written by Mr. Henry.

Have you contributed articles in verse to any publication?

—Yes, I have.

—Did you contribute to the *Nation*?

—Yes, I did.

—To what papers were you in the habit of sending verses?

—To the *Limerick* paper I have named.

—And your poetry, I am to suppose, bore some conformity to the principles of the paper to which you contributed?

—In nine cases out of ten such was not the case.

—But you admit that in the tenth case it might, perhaps, be the fact?

—It might, perhaps.

—Were the reports you sent to the newspapers similar to your contributions to the magazines?

—No, they were not.

—To what magazines do you contribute?

—There was a sketch of mine some time since in the *University Magazine*.

—That was a tale of fiction.

—Yes, but it was not intended to pass for true?—Yes, it was not.

—Those who would be foolish enough to believe it true?

—I do not intend to be so.

—Was it not intended to convey an accurate account of what passed at the Kilrush Petty Sessions?

—Some of what was published did convey that.

—You intended they should all appear in the newspapers as true?

—Yes.

—And yet they were not true?—Some of them were true.

—You were in the habit of writing to the *Nation*?

—Yes, I was.

—Did you ever get a letter from the proprietors of the *Morning Herald*, asking me to come up here as their Irish correspondent?

—Yes, I did.

—Was it a place where a man must have a little income to be himself smooth?

—Yes, I think so.

—I have one hundred and fifty guineas a year from the *Morning Herald* as their correspondent?

—Yes, I do.

—Did you go to do for that?—To send a letter every day, having references to the leading topics of political interest, and whatever the local papers advertised.

—You were daily to read the morning papers in Dublin, and to make a summary of them?

—Yes, I was.

—Would you be good enough to take up the first of these papers produced, that of the 30th of May?

—Yes, I will.

—Did I understand you to say this was the note you sent to the *Morning Herald*?

—That was my daily letter.

—Now, mind, I don't ask you about the subject of what is written in those scraps of paper, but you are those the identical scraps of paper you forwarded to the *Morning Herald*?

—The very identical papers.

—Now show them to me. (Witness handed them to the Court.)

—The manuscript was written on both sides of the sheet. Did you send these identical papers for the purpose of being set up in the office of the *Morning Herald*?

—I did.

—When did you begin to attend the Association meetings?

—About eight or nine months ago.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

—Did you see any of the papers of the Association?

—Yes, I did.

meeting, nor had he the ability of taking notes, and, therefore, I want to show that what he did do was copied verbatim from the morning papers of the next day, and sent off by him, although he tells the jury he wrote the pieces of paper at the meetings.

Judge Burton—I see your object very clear.

Judge Crampton—Mr. Fitzgibbon, I am to understand that you intend to give the paper in evidence?

—No, I do not.

Judge Crampton—Then I am at great difficulty in this case in allowing this sort of examination.

Mr. Brewster—I if he puts in the newspaper as evidence I will withdraw my objection, but unless he does so I must object.

Mr. Fitzgibbon—I am here at present to show that I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

—I will not give the paper in evidence.

