came there to protest, in the name of his country, against its occupation by a military force. (Hear.) He came there also to ask a simple question, namely, how was Ireland to be governed? (Cheers.) He would not ask who was to govern it, although he might have his preferences. There was nothing new in the system that had been adopted by the present Government towards Ireland.—No one could deny that no country in the world had inflicted such evil, had occasioned so much persecution, or committed so many crimes upon another, as England upon Ireland. The noble lord, the member for London, had ably and frankly admitted that fact, and it had been attested by the almost unanimous voice of the country, and of that House. (Hear, hear.) He would not go further back in the history of his country than the period of the union. Because he contended that from that time Parliament was wholly responsible for what had taken place. The hon. and learned gentleman then referred at some length to the condition of Ireland, pointing out the rapid progress she had made from 1782 up to 1800, and the increased consumption of all the luxuries and necessaries of life during that period. During these eighteen years, while self-governed, she had risen to an unexampled pitch of prosperity, and would have progressed onward in her march of national improvement, but for the unhappy measure of the legislative union. The great argument of Mr. Pitt and Lord Clare was, that Ireland, advancing in the scale of nations, only required to be united to her more prosperous and commercial sister, England, to increase her prosperity three-fold. The hon. and learned gentleman then referred to the works of Kohl, and other recent writers on Ireland, and also the reports of the Poor-law Commisioners, for the purpose of showing that there had been of late little improvement in Ireland, and that, on the contrary, it had retrograded to a considerable extent. For all that the house was, in his opinion, responsible, and he had no hesitation in saying that since the union almost every measure they had introduced for Ireland had been productive of nothing but evil and mischief. In the name of his country he protested against the late prosecutions, and not only against the prosecutions themselves, but the manner in which they were conducted. (Loud cheers.) There had been no instance of the exclusion of persons from the lists on the ground of their being Roman Catholics from the time of Titus Oates; nor since that period had any judge ever delivered so partial and one-sided a charge to a jury. He was glad to find it was the intention of the Government to give an additional grant for the purposes of education; but he would suggest that they should give the Roman Catholic bishops a quasi corporate character to transmit any property that might be bequeathed to them to their successors. Whatever steps the Government meant to take for the tranquility of Ireland should be taken expeditiously, and he trusted the day was not far distant when he would see Irishmen and Englishmen, Catholic and Protestant all united in one common feeling of brotherhood and affection. (Cheers.)

Sir R. Peel denied the accuracy of the hon. and learned member's statement as to the great happiness and prosperity of Ireland from 1782 to the period of the union, and quoted authorities to shew that the corruption and profligacy of the Irish Parliament had reduced that country to the condition of a petty province. The right hon. baronet then proceeded to comment upon the manner in which Lord John Russell had referred to Lord Lyndhurst, whom he eulogised in the highest terms, and ridiculed the appointment of Lord Campbell as Lord Chancellor of Ireland as being a gross affront to that country. He had always advocated the right of the Catholics to a fair share in the representation and offices of the state since the passing of the relief bill. He then referred to the clamours that had been raised against the appointment of Mr. Sergeant Howley, a Catholic. He would only say one word on the subject of the address of the Protestant Operative Association. These addresses were matters of form, and when they had come to him containing harsh and uncharitable sentiments, he had taken the liberty to rebuke them. They were charged with a desire to govern Ireland by military force, but he wished to know to whom was it owing they were unable to present reduced estimates with regard to Ireland. In March, 1843, the agitation commenced in Ireland, and that was considerably heightened by the introduction of the poor law bill, the general agricultural depression, and the alterations in the tariff. Then followed the determination to agitate for Repeal of the union. The Government resolved to rely upon the ordinary law, because, he declared emphatically, there was nothing to be deprecated so much as resorting to Parliament for extraordinary powers upon the appearance of any unusual excitement. The head of the Government under similar circumstances had introduced a coercion bill for Ireland. It was said that they had entrapped the persons agitating for a Repeal of the Union, by making no declaration of their sentiments, but he thought nothing could be stronger than the declarations they had advised Her Majesty to make on the subject. He thought he had fully vindicated the conduct of the Government with regard to Ireland, and he should not be driven by any taunts from the course he was resolved to pursue. He thought there should be identity of representation and of franchise with England and Scotland, and it was upon that principle the Government intended to legislate. With regard to the Established Church, he found it Established in Ireland for a period of two hundred and fifty years, and he should maintain it as it had been guaranteed by act of Parliament. It was upon that understanding that the Protestants had agreed to waive their objection, and consent to the Emancipation Act. These were also the opinions of Burke and Grattan, and Lord Plunket and Sir John Newport. After reviewing the policy of the Government towards Ireland at some length, the right hon. baronet observed, that if the agitation could only be put an end to in that country, he had no doubt it would make rapid strides in the cause of social and commercial prosperity, and he hoped he would live to see the day when the differences of Saxon and Celt, and Protestant and Catholic, would be at an end. Whatever station in life he might be placed in, nothing would give him greater pleasure than to see their beloved Sovereign placing her foot on the soil of Ireland, and hulling to rest all the evil passions that had so long held sway there. (Cheers.)

Lord John Russell rose to reply. He noticed some of the chief attacks in his motion by the leading members of the Government; and brought up Lord Stanley, who emphatically denied that in quoting, on a former occasion, the words, "the minions of Popery," he either adopted them or applied them to Roman Catholics." Lord John Russell then went into some particulars respecting the retirement of Lord Plunket.—"All the circumstances," said his lordship, "connected with that transaction, cannot be detailed now, but some of them I may be permitted to mention. It had been stated to Lord Melborne that Lord Plunket, at his advanced age, was desirous of relinquishing his situation. The present Lord Campbell came to me and asked, as a dissolution was depending, whether he was to stand his election as Attorney-General? I communicated with Lord Melbourne, and he informed me that he believed Lord Plunket was about to retire; he added that he would write upon the subject, and if he did retire, the Attorney General should be made Lord Chancellor. A day or two afterwards it was found that Lord Plunket, instead of being desirous of retiring, had no such intention; and I told Lord Campbell that, such being the case, neither Lord Melbourne nor I would do anything disagreeable to Lord Plunket. Lord Campbell said he was perfectly content—that he would send down his address to Edinburgh and stand his election as Attorney General. From circumstances which I need not detail, Lord Plunket subsequently retired. (Cheers from the Ministerial side.) I can assure hon. members that it gave me pain that he should have taken that course; and I regretted deeply that any thing had occurred which was painful to Lord Plunket's feelings." When the noble lord had concluded, the house went to a division upon his lordship's motion, for a committee of the whole House to inquire into the state of Ireland—

For the motion, - - 225
Against it, - - - 324
Majority for Ministers, ——99

The House adjourned at 4 o'clock in the morning.

CLOSE OF THE STATE TRIALS.

TWENTY-THIRD DAY, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9.

The Lord Chief Justice commenced his charge. He stated, that on a conference with his brother Judges, he found that their was a perfect concurrence between them all as to the subject matter to be laid before the jury.—The jury had heard a great deal of eloquence—much that was poetical, much that was passair, and much that was irrelavent. Of the question of the fact they were themselves the constitutional judges: "You are to determine and come to a just conclusion upon the fact; the law of the case you will take from the Court." He first explained the nature of the indictment; and of the single off nce with which the traversers, were charged, "conspiracy:—

For a conviction of conspiracy, the law requires that the jury should be satisfied that there was a consent either for the purpose of doing an illegal act, or coing or causing to be done, an act legal in itself, but to be brought about by illegal means. Mr. Fitzgibbon had argued that treachery and secrecy, were necessary ingredients in the crime of conspiracy; but that was a mistake in law; and a careful examination of the authorities adduced by Mr. Fitzgibbon, did not bear out his position. In the language of Mr. Justice Coleridge—"It is not necessary that it should be proved that the several parties charged with a common conspiracy met to concoct this scheme, nor that they should have originated it. Who the parties were who met to concoct the illegal agreement, it is not necessary should be absolutely proved to you; it is enough for you to see whether, from the acts that have been proved, you are satisfied that those defendants were acting in concert in this matter. If you are satisfied that there was a concert between them, (that is, an illegal concert,) I am bound to say, that being convinced of the conspiracy, it is not necessary that you should find both the traversers doing each particular act, as after the fact of the conspiracy is once established in your minds, whatever is said or done by either of the defendants, in pursuance of the common design, is both in law and common sense to be considered the act of both." This doctrine might bear some modification, especially as applicable to the Reverend Mr. Tierney. If a conspiracy be formed, and a party *afterwards* join it—the Jury would consider whether or not he adopted the previous acts of the association.

Mr. Sheil had quoted, from the case of the King against Kirwan, the remark of Mr. Peter Burrowes, as counsel for the defendant, "That to assume such a right as to represent the people, or any part of them, would be an encroachment on the exclusive prerogative of the House of Commons; and that any person who should exercise the function, legislative or judicial, would be guilty of a high misdemeanor." Those were sound constitutional principles. Now, by the Coronation Oath, the Sovereign solemnly swears to govern the people of the British dominions in accordance to the statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the same."—

"We heard a monstrous deal of assertion, we heard a monstrous deal of declamation, we heard a monstrous deal of complaint of grievances, and we heard a great deal of what the law ought to be. We have heard you called upon to decide whether such a law ought to continue, as if you had any power on the subject at all. The law of the realm as it stands and is settled by the Act of Union, until that act is repealed, is the only law you can take into your consideration on this subject. This is the law which the Queen, by her Coronation Oath, has sworn to preserve; and it is idle to say that the Queen, if she thinks proper, may depart from this law, and call a Parliament of her own in Ireland, supposing her own desire accorded with the people, and set up a new law and new constitution for this country, in direct violation of the Act of Union. In passing the Act of Union, the kingdom of Great Britain ceased to exist, and the kingdom of Ireland ceased to exist, and instead of these two, there was formed one United Kingdom, under the style and title of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. It was not that there should be one King having thereafter two kingdoms for his dominion, but one King having one kingdom; and to say that the King or Queen of Ireland may be treated as the King or Queen of a separate kingdom, is absurd—seditious. Until the law be altered by the proper authority—and I don't say that it may not, while the law remains as it is—and it has been so during the whole of the year 1843 and preceding years which have intervened since the enactment of the Union—there is one King over this kingdom, incapable by himself of treating with any class of his subjects, except through the Legislature, with regard to a new constitution or new laws with respect to any part of the United Kingdom. I say, moreover, that whichever of his subjects would take upon himself to inculcate—to proclaim among the subjects of this part of the United Kingdom that he, or anybody e'se, abstracted from the Legislature, has the power, either separately or jointly by himself and a portion of the inhabitants of this part of the United Kingdom—that he, or they, independently of the Legislature, had a power of treating with the Queen for an abrogation of the existing law, and to put in its place a new law, such as we heard suggested, is guilty of a great offence—he is guilty of the crime of sedition. And if her Majesty were pleased to condescend to treat an enactment separately from her Parliament, and to adopt his suggestions, she has not the power to do so without violating her Coronation oath. * * * It would be productive of wildness, anarchy, and confusion, if every man, or set of men, abstractedly from Parliament, were permitted to say, we do not like this law, as passed by our Legislature—we think it was not properly passed—we think there were reasons which should prevail against it, and, therefore, we are not bound in conscience to obey it.

The Chief Justice explained the laws of public discussion and public meetings. "It is no crime for a man to state a grievance, or to make a mistake with regard to his political position; and he may freely communicate his sentiments to friends or strangers. He has a right to make his complaints where ver he goes, should he think proper to do so, even if he should attend a public meeting, however large: the mere fact of its being a public meeting is no reason why a man who has a grievance, or thinks he has, should not attend that meeting, make a statement of what he conceives he has a right to complain of, and so, on the principle of free discussion, endeavour to get by peaceable means as many advocates in support of his alleged grievances as he can procure. That is the morality of the law, as stated by Baron Alderson, (on the trial of Vincent,) and concerning which he said, "God forbid the country should ever be without it"; and so I say, too. But, gentlemen, in order to disseminate those grievances, he must take care not to infringe upon the rights and privileges of others; and he is the more bound to be careful as to the effect of what he does, if the assemblage which he attends is assembled and congregated in such masses and multitudes as to excite terror and alarm among the neighboring people, or among those who are bound to watch over and preserve the peace and constitution of the country. * * * Now, inorder to make a meeting unlawful, it would not be necessary that in point of fact the peace should be broken. It does not follow that because there is no breach of the peace therefore the parties attending are not guilty of the offence of exciting terror and alarm among her Majesty's subjects. If meetings to which parties went unarmed have been attended with demonstrations of physical force that would reasonably have excited fear, terror, or alarm among the peaceable subjects of her Majesty, they are illegal, whether they consist or not of an unarmed mass." Nor was an immediate breach of the peace, or the terror of mere neighbors, necessary to render the meeting unlawful. "Suppose that the persons who had collected that mass and multitude together, did so for the purpose of making a demonstration of immense force and physical power, guided and actuated by the will and command of the person who caused that multitude to assemble—suppose they had no intention of disturbing the peace, but that they met for the purpose of exhibiting to those with whom they had to do—to those who were the legal legislators of the country—that his object in calling all those people together—his object in assembling, dispersing and calling them—was to do that with the greatest possible notoriety. Suppose he did it in the open day, when all the world could see and hear him, and that his object was to overawe the Legislature, who are likely to have to consider certain political subjects in which he was interested, and for the purpose of deterring the Legislature and the Government of the country from a fair, cool, and deliberate judgment on the subject—if that were his object in causing that demonstration, then, gentlemen, I say, that this an illegal object in him, and in all who concur and agree with him in the procuring of such means."

In the forty years since the passing of the Union Act, many important acts had been passed by the United Parliament; and if that Act of Union were void, so also must be the Acts that had followed it, including the Catholic Emancipation Act, by virtue of which Mr. O'Connell sat in Parliament. Moreover, if the act were void, where was the necessity of seeking its repeal? The two things were inconsistent; and at all events, the Jury had as little right to discuss the merits of that Act as they had power to interfere with it. A speech had been quoted, delivered by Mr. O'Connell in 1840, showing that he had expressed sentiments against the Union Act—and he had a perfect right so to do—at a meeting to petition for its repeal: but this was perhaps the first time a man sought to justify himself from a present charge by citing what he had done thirty or forty years ago.

The Chief Justice proceeded to consider, with much minuteness, the evidence that had been given, beginning with an analysis of the elaborate organization of the Repeal Association; which, with its inspection and reports by Repeal Wardens to the central body, amounted to something like a well-regulated police; and the Jury would consider, whether the issue of classified cards for enrollment, and the circulation of the *Pilot*, *Nation*, and *Freeman*, among them enrolled, were for the purposes of "free discussion," or with a view of handing the persons through whom the cards were distributed in a confederation for one universal object, in popular ignorance of its purpose.

TWENTY-FOURTH DAY—SATURDAY, FEB'Y 10.

The Chief Justice continued his examination of the evidence; commenting on the large funds collected in Ireland, England, Scotland, and Ireland, for the Association. He read the resolution for the renewed action of the Irish Parliament," which declared "the people of Ireland do firmly insist upon the restoration of the Irish House of Commons;" and it propounded a scheme by which, without the repeal of the Union Act, the Queen should issue writs for an Irish House of Commons: he observed, that that "plan" for the entire alteration of the constitution and laws of the country—a plan to place her Majesty, the legitimate Queen of the United Kingdom, in the separate situation of Queen of Ireland, was not couched in language of petition, but was put forward as the *demand* of the people of Ireland: that the people were well organized and disciplined; and the demand was to be carried out according to their wishes—by whom, or how, the plan did not specify. The Chief Justice surveyed the evidence respecting the chief of these meetings, beginning with that of Mullingar, and finishing with Mollaghmast. In this brief and compressed review, the most startling expressions used by Mr. O'Connell were more closely grouped together than they had yet appeared in any summary; and the effect of the strong passages, though so often repeated, was thus considerably increased. Alluding to the scheme for bringing into disrepute the courts of justice as established by law, through the Arbitration Courts, the Chief Justice showed in what manner the "conspiracy" was to be inferred—

"Have you or have you not heard Dr. Gray coming forward and telling assembled multitudes that the time was coming when they would be taken out of the hands of those petty tyrants who at present preside in their courts? Have you or have you not heard Mr. O'Connell himself adverting to the same system at the Clifton and other subsequent meetings: recommending the Arbitration Courts and the placing thereon the Magistrates who had been dismissed! And have you or have you not heard Mr. John O'Connell making a speech recommending the same systems, and appearing himself to act under the appointment of the Repeal Association, in presiding over an Arbitration Court established in Blackrock?"

He pursued somewhat the same process in respect to the speeches of the Rev. Mr. Tierney, and the allusions which he made in common with others to the traditions of ancient battles and massacres, as tending to show that he had become a participator in the projects of the Association. The publications for which Mr. Barrett, Mr. Duffy, and Dr. Gray are responsible, were subjected to a similar process. The Chief Justice concluded by setting forth the several charges in the language of the indictment; instructing the Jury, that criminality is a thing which must be *proved* and not merely *surmised*.

The Judge having ceased, the Jury asked if the case need at once be closed, as they were very much fatigued? The Chief Justice said, their release for that night must be a matter of consent between the opposite parties. The traversers' counsel did not refuse their consent in terms, but declined to give it; and, therefore, about half-past seven the jury retired. When they had gone, Mr. Henn took an objection, that no evidence had been adduced of any act done in the county or the city of Dublin; and therefore a verdict could not be given in the case. The objection was noted by the Court. The Judges then withdrew.

Later in the evening, Mr. Justice Crampton returned, and remained in court to await the return of the jury. They re-appeared at ten minutes to eleven; and brought in a verdict of "guilty" against all the traversers, upon various counts, but stated "no finding" upon others, which they though "too comprehensive."—Mr. Justice Crampton handed back the verdict, saying that it was imperfect, since the Jury must find a verdict of "guilty" or "not guilty" upon every part and person. They again disappeared. Midnight approaching, the Attorney-General pressed for an adjournment of the Court, lest any doubt should arise from not doing so. The Judge endeavored to induce counsel to consent to take the verdict after 12 o'clock or to allow the jurors to go home. The Attorney-General persisted; Mr. Moore only said "Nothing." The Jury not having agreed at a quarter past twelve o'clock, they were once more summoned, and told that they must be locked up until Monday; which was done. Here another objection was taken by Mr. Henn, that the court had no power to adjourn after twelve o'clock. That also was noted, and the Court adjourned until nine o'clock on Monday.

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY—MONDAY, FEB. 12.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Burton, and Mr. Justice Crampton took their seats on the bench this morning a few minutes after nine o'clock, at which the Court was crowded, but not inconveniently so, as a very large force of police was stationed at the main entrance to keep off the crowd, to clear the various passages leading to the Queen's Bench, and to prevent the admission of persons not duly authorized.

The Traversers arrived at an early hour.

Mr. O'Connell, who was accompanied by his son Daniel and Mr. W. S. O'Brien, took his seat at the table of the Queen's Counsel.

Mr. J. O'Connell appeared in his professional role amongst the jurors, while the rest sat at the traversers' bar.

Mr. Justice Crampton minutely detailed to his brother judges what took place on Saturday evening, subsequent to their leaving the Court, at half past five o'clock, and recounted for the difficulty which the jury had experienced respecting the first and second counts, by observing, that they contained five distinct issues, upon which there should be five distinct findings, and did not, therefore, admit of a general finding. Having briefly described the nature of the issues, involved in the several counts and pointed out in what respects they differed one from the other, his Lordship suggested that the proper course to adopt would be to put those issues before the jury, in the distinct form in which he had now explained them.

THE VERDICT.

The jury were then called into Court; the suggestion of his Lordship was acted on; they retired, and returned at ten o'clock with their verdict, to the reception of which

Mr. Moore Q.C., objected, on the ground that one of the jurors was described on the panel as "John Rigby," though he himself had declared that his name was "John Jason Rigby."

The Attorney General observed, that Mr Rigby had been sworn as "John Rigby," and that particular notice was made of the fact at the time by the Court.

A note having been taken of the objection,

Mr. Bourke, the Clerk of the Crown, read the verdict of Guilty generally against all the traversers, excepting the Rev. Mr. Tierney, who was found guilty upon two counts only.

The following are the several counts of the indictment, with the verdict of the jury, as affecting each traverser upon each count:—

FIRST AND SECOND COUNT.

For unlawfully and seditiously conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection amongst the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to the Government and constitution; and to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects; and especially to promote amongst Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland, feelings of ill-will and hostility against Her Majesty's subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, especially in England, and to excite discontent and disaffection amongst divers of Her Majesty's subjects serving in the army; and to cause and aid in causing divers subjects unlawfully and seditiously to meet and assemble together in large numbers, at various times and at different places within Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by means of the intimidation to be thereby caused, and by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, Laws, and Constitution, as by law established; and to bring into hatred and disrepute the Courts by law established in Ireland for the administration of justice, and to diminish the confidence of Her Majesty's subjects in the administration of the law therein, with intent to induce Her Majesty's subjects to withdraw the adjudication of their differences with and claims upon each other from the cognisances of the law, and subject the same to the judgment and determination of other tribunals to be constituted and contrived for that purpose.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, R. Barrett, and C. G. Duffy, omitting the words "to meet and assemble."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, and J. Gray, omitting the words, "unlawfully and seditiously" before the words "to meet and assemble," and omitting the words "and to excite discontent and dissatisfaction amongst divers of her Majesty's subjects serving in the army."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—Rev. Thomas Tierney, from the commencement, and including the words "especially in England;" and NOT GUILTY of the remainder of the first and second counts.

THIRD COUNT.

For unlawfully and seditiously conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection among the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and constitution, and to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of her Majesty's subjects, and especially to promote amongst her Majesty's subjects in Ireland feelings of ill-will and hostility against her Majesty's subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, especially in England, and to excite discontent and disaffection against divers of her Majesty's subjects serving in the army; and to cause and aid in causing, divers subjects to meet and assemble together in large numbers at various times and at different places within Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, Laws, and Constitution, as by law established, and to bring into hatred and disrepute the courts by law established in Ireland for the administration of justice, and to diminish the confidence of her Majesty's subjects in the administration of the law therein, with intent to induce her Majesty's subjects to withdraw the adjudication of their differences with and claims upon each other from the cognisance of the courts of law, and subject the same to the judgment and determination of other tribunals to be constituted and contrived for that purpose.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, R. Barrett, and C. G. Duffy.

GUILTY—J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, and J. Gray, omitting the words, "and to excite discontent and disaffection amongst divers of her Majesty's subjects serving in the army."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—The Rev. T. Tierney, from the commencement so far as and including the words "especially in England."

NOT GUILTY of the remainder of this count.

FOURTH COUNT.

For conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection among the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and Constitution; and to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of the Queen's subjects, and especially to promote amongst the subjects in Ireland, feelings of ill-will and hostility towards the subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, and especially in England, and to cause and aid in causing divers subjects to meet and assemble in large numbers at various times and different places in Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purposes of obtaining, by means of the intimidation to be thereby caused, and by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, Laws, and Constitution, as by law established.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, J. M. Ray, J. Gray, T. Steele, C. G. Duffy, and R. Barrett.

GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney from the commencement so far as, and including, the words, "especially in England."

FIFTH COUNT.

For conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection amongst the Queen's subjects, and to excite them to hatred and contempt of, and unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and Constitution. And also to stir up jealousies, hatred and ill-will between different classes of the Queen's subjects, and especially

feelings of ill-will and hostility against her Majesty's subjects in England.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. M. Ray, J. Gray, T. Steele, C. G. Duffy, R. Barrett, Rev. T. Tierney.

SIXTH COUNT

For conspiring to cause, and aid in causing, divers subjects to meet and assemble in large numbers, at various times, and at different places, in Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by the exhibition of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, laws, and constitution as by law established.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, C. G. Duffy, J. Ray, R. Barrett.

NOT GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney.

The seventh count charges the procurement of large numbers of the people to meet together at various places, with intent, by the display of numbers, to procure changes in the law.

The 8th and 9th counts charge conspiracy to bring into disrepute the tribunals established by law, and to induce Her Majesty's subjects to submit their differences to other tribunals, thereby assuming the prerogative of the Crown.

The tenth count charges the establishment of courts to bring into disrepute the legal tribunals of the country.

The eleventh charges seditious publications and songs, and the delivery of unlawful speeches.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. M. Ray, C. G. Duffy, J. Gray, R. Barrett.

NOT GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney.

Mr. Moore applied for a copy of the verdict, for the traversers, which was ordered.

The Court was adjourned to the first day of next term (the 15th April); when it will be in the power of the Crown to call for judgment on the traversers.

Next morning O'Connell issued the following—

"TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

"Merrion Square, 11th February, 1844.

"Fellow-Countrymen—Once again I return you my most heartfelt thanks for the peace, quiet, and good order you have observed; and I conjure you by the country we all love and even in the name of the God we all adore, to continue in the same peace, quietness, and perfect tranquillity.

"I tell you solemnly, that your enemies and the enemies of Ireland are very desirous that there should be a breaking-out of tumult, riot, or other outrage. Be you, therefore, perfectly peaceble. Attack nobody. Offend nobody. Injure no person. If you respect your friends—if you wish to gall your enemies—keep the peace, and let not one single act of violence be committed.

"You are aware the Jury have found a verdict against me: but depend upon it that I will bring a writ of error, and will not acquiesce in the law, as laid down against me, until I have the opinion of the Twelve Judges in Ireland, and if necessary, of the House of Lords.

"Be you, therefore, perfectly quiet. Do no violence what-never. You could not possibly offend or grieve me half so much as by any species of riot, assault, or outrage.

"It is said that the great question of Repeal has been injured by this verdict.

"Do not believe it. It is not true. On the contrary, the result of this verdict will be of most material service to the Repeal, if the people continue to be as peaceful as they have hitherto been, and as I am sure they will continue to be.

"Obey my advice. No riot. No tumult. No blow. No violence. Keep the peace *for six months*, or *at the utmost twelve months longer*, and you shall have the Parliament in College Green again.

"I am: fellow countrymen, your affectionate and devoted servant,

"Daniel O'Connell."

There had been "excitement" in Dublin in the interval between the first retirement of the Jury on Saturday evening and the finding of the verdict on Monday. The neighborhood of the Court was surrounded by a great multitude on Saturday evening; and the first announcement of the nature of the verdict was greeted by a terrific yell. Large bodies of mounted and foot police patrolled the streets, and the troops were ready for instant service. At half past one o'clock on Sunday morning, a numerous body of boatmen paraded up High Street, seeming anxious to create a disturbance; but none arose. As the night continued, the crowd thinned; but at early day the people re-assembled. It was expected that the Jury would go to church on Sunday, and a crowd awaited their forthcoming; but the Sheriff judged it most prudent to keep the jurors within-doors, and have divine service performed for them there. Attempts to intimidate the Jury, and even to bribe one of them on behalf of the Repealers, were among the rumors. Two hours after they retired, a Liberal paper announced, in large capitals, "Conviction there will be none." A woman went into the shop belonging to one of the jurors, and offered to sell his wife a widow's *cap*, saying that it would be needed if there were a verdict against O'Connell.

An extraordinary edition of the *Freeman* published late on Sunday afternoon, contained an address from Mr. O'Connell "to the Catholic Prelates of Ireland," suggesting, "with profound humility," that perhaps it might be useful if the clergy were to take measures for insuring a continuance of the same loyal, quiet, and peaceable demeanor which had characterized the people up to that moment, and in a marked manner since the trials commenced; an assistance rendered the more necessary as the omission of several Catholics from the Sheriff's list, and their exclusion from the Jury, had given a sectarian colour to the prosecution: and it was desirable that the clergy should check every angry or vindictive feeling in their flocks. The absence of violence would render certain the success of the efforts of Repeal.

Duetus among the Distinguished.—On the 15th ult., Lord Sidmouth, at the White Lodge Richmond Park, in the 87th year of his age. He Lordship was Speaker of the House of Commons from May, 1789, to March, 1801; First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer from March, 1801, to May, 1804; President of the Council, 1805; Lord Privy Seal, 1806; and Secretary of State for the Home Department, from 1812 to 1822.

On the 10th ult., aged 71 years, his Excellency Bagbee Youssouff Bey, Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Commerce to Mehammed Ali.

The imperial family at Vienna was, on the 25th June, visited by a severe affliction, by the sudden death of Maria Caroline Augusta, eldest daughter of the Archduke and Viceroy Rainer and the Archduchess Elizabeth. Her Imperial Highness was born 6th February, 1825. The unfortunate Archduchess was to have been married in March.

On the 23d ult., Lord Wallace, at Featherstone Castle, Northumberland, aged 77.

On the 15th ult., Lord Glenworth, after a long and painful illness, in London.

Another veteran officer, whose name has been frequently identified with our naval triumphs, Vice Admiral Sir E. S. Dickson, has ceased to exist.

Lately, Lieutenant-General Sir G. Way, aged 6[illegible] years.

Lady Taunton, relict of the late Hon. Mr. Justice W. Taunton, on the 5th ult., in her 71st year.

A letter from Stuttgart announces the death, on the 31st Jan., of the Prince Louis Christian Augustus of Holstein-Langenburg, in his 77th year.

Gen. Walker, C. B., at Madras. General Walker had been 13 years in the service.

The Earl of Roseborough died on the 8th ult., at Cuxhoed House, Dorsetshire. His lordship is succeeded in his title and estates by his eldest son, Viscount Duncannon.

☞ The writ for the Montreal election is likely, at last, to fall into hands competent to execute it. It is said, that it will be directed to the Hon. C. S. De Bleury, who has professed his willingness to act. This choice of a Returning Officer is a good one.—[Quebec Mercury.]

BRITISH WHIG.

"Optier per Orbem Dicor."

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1844.

REPRESENTATION OF KINGSTON.

By Mr. Manahan's advertisement, in to-day's *British Whig*, it would appear that Mr. Harrison, the present member for Kingston, will speedily be appointed to some important office under the Crown, probably the Inspectorship General; thereby occasioning a vacancy in the representation of this good town. As the unpopularity of Mr Harrison, with all classes, is very great in Kingston, he very wisely evinces no anxiety for a re-election, but no doubt has made his market elsewhere.—What place is to have the honor of ennobling him is best known to Mons. Viger and himself—In the meanwhile the town is open, and Mr Manahan takes an early advantage of that fact. In the field also, for Kingston, is John A. McDonald, Esq., the Solicitor to the Commercial Bank; who having received a very numerously signed requisition, will probably make soon his public appearance. This latter gentleman will receive our humble support.

Against Mr. Manahan's merits as a man or a gentleman, we have not one word to say. In the devotedness of his attachment to the people and interests of Kingston we are believers; and we are honestly of opinion, that the town will suffer no disgrace or detriment by his sitting in Parliament again as its representative But there are some matters connected with his relinquishment of that seat he seems now to prize so highly, to Mr. Harrison, that we cannot palliate or forget, and which we opine will sadly mar his hopes of success.—His own version of that bad business will be found in his address to the electors, (see advertisement) and as nobody can tell a story so well as himself, we refer our readers to that document. In spite of all his sophistry, the damning fact will tell against him.

Mr. McDonald is a young man, and consequently an untried one. By those who have the pleasure of his acquaintance, he is highly esteemed, as a liberal and high-minded gentleman. In politics he is of the right stamp, neither furious Tory or virulent Radical, but sufficiently conservative to give the Governor General, and the Responsible Government advocated by him, his warmest support. Should he be returned, and of that event we make no question, should no other candidate on the conservative interest start, every probability exists that he will prove an honor to Kingston, his native town.

REPRESENTATION OF FRONTENAC.

John B Marks, Esq., the highly respected Warden of the District, has addressed the Electors of Frontenac, in this day's paper, on a subject connected with the next representation of that County. It will be remembered by many of our readers, that at the last general Election, by a little electioneering hocussing, Mr. Marks gave way to Mr. Henry Smith, Jun., who consequently became the successful candidate. Mr. Marks had great reason to complain of the manœuvre, and, at the time, openly declared his intention of contesting the County at the next vacancy. Until the time of that vacancy Mr. Marks probably would have remained silent, had it not been for insidious endeavours used by interested gentlemen, to give belief to the report that he had abandoned all intention of re-entering public life, thereby securing the votes for another interest. As this is not the time for exploiting on the merits of Mr. Marks, or those of any other gentleman who may offer himself for the County, we shall content ourselves with a declaration, that the friends to moderate, good Government, may firmly rely on having in the field, in the day of need, an advocate of their own way of thinking—one who has ever been a friend to Farmers and the Agricultural interests.

KINGSTON MINERAL SPRINGS.

To the Editor of the British Whig.

Mr. Editor,—'Tis said that when any observation is made to Mr. Bone, the lessee of the Springs, as to his robust state of health, he replies, exhibiting his very rotund person, "See what it is to drink of the Mineral Waters." It is a pity that Mr. Bone will not allow the inhabitants of Kingston to enjoy the same advantage, for I defy any one, once having reached the Springs' Hotel, to go a step further towards the Baths or the Springs, unless he be armed with a pair of Jack's seven league boot, for he must wade knee deep in mud and slush, sufficiently so to frighten him and make him turn back. Now this could be avoided by the proprietor or lessee's continuing the board walk to the Springs, a distance of fifty yards, and others, not armed like Mr. Bone with big boots, could enjoy a bath or a drink of this pinguis-producing spring, and none more than

A Water Drinker.

Kingston, March 29, 1844.

Extract from a letter to the Editor, from Montreal, dated March 27:—

"We have great stirings and doings in Montreal at present; you cannot turn round after seven o'clock, P M, without being in danger of getting a knock down. Last night Mr. Molson held a meeting in the Quebec suburbs, and a great many of Mr. Drummond's men went there, armed with clubs, &c., for the purpose of kicking up a row.

"Last night a young man and his father, named Mr. Graham, were crossing the river, about five miles above Montreal, on the ice, in a cutter, and force into an opening, and the young man sunk to rise no more."

NAVIGATION OF LAKE ERIE.

Arrival from Buffalo.—*Just as we expected, Capt. Whitaker ahead again.*—As the Buffalo papers announced that the steamboat United States, Capt. Whitaker, was advertised to leave Buffalo for this port on the 20th inst. and she not arriving here before the papers of that day came round by land, we had made up our mind that Capt. Whitaker had been baulked for once; but lo! about breakfast time yesterday, up came the steamboat United States in gallant style to our wharf, being the first vessel out of Buffalo this season.

The States left Buffalo, according to her advertisement, on Saturday afternoon, the 9th. After proceeding some five or six miles, she found herself completely surrounded by the ice which a strong head wind had blown down: here she was obliged to remain during Saturday night and most of Sunday; towards the close of the day the wind had somewhat moved the ice so as to allow the boat to turn round, and at about 5 o'clock she returned back to Buffalo. With characteristic perseverance and energy, Capt. Whitaker put out again on Thursday, and came through in triumph. We understand that the boat encountered ice 100 miles this side of Buffalo, though it had to cut its way through about forty miles only!

The United States has had a thorough overhauling and repair since last season. A new and spacious cabin has been erected upon the upper deck, with twenty odd, large, airy, and elegant state rooms. Her arrangements are now equal to those of the best boats of her class.

The U. S. had a fine lot of passengers, several of whom were our own citizens, who unite in bearing testimony in favor of Capt. W. and his boat.

It will be recollected that Capt. Whitaker, with the Steamboat Columbus, was the first out of Buffalo last season, arriving here the 8th of May.—*Detroit Free Press, March 18.*

Facts and Scraps, original and select.

☞ Religious Firebrands.—By a circular lately received by us, signed "John Redpath," we perceive that Canada is threatened with a visitation by two clergymen of the revolted Church of Scotland, the Rev. Drs. Cunningham and Burns, who have been deputed by their brethren in Scotland to raise religious dissensions in the United States and Canada. This brace of firebrands are to enter Canada at Niagara, on the 9th proximo, and make a regular tour down to Quebec, stopping one or two days in each town. In Canada, both Upper and Lower, the utmost harmony exists between the Government, the Scotch Ministers and their congregations, but what will happen after this threatened visitation has taken place, is in the womb of futurity. We are not advocates of Lynch Law, but were we to hear that the first Presbyterian Congregation to whom these men addressed themselves, were to rise in a body and tar and feather them, it would not greatly militate against our notion of what is right.

☞ The Weather still remains cold with frosty nights. The ice in the bay and harbor is now impassable for man or beast, but shows no indication of clearing out. The navigation cannot remain shut much longer, for the first strong westerly wind