

to the church, or to the state itself—no, not even to heaven itself, can be permitted to be earned at the expense of any crime whatever; that no moral offence can, not only be not justified, or even as much palliated by any amount of advantage so obtained; and if I have any so, believe in that box, I need not repeat that doctrine, because he will have professed that doctrine himself. But why should I, as a Christian man, proclaim one thing, and practice another? But, gentlemen of the Jury, you cannot believe it. No, the entire tenor of my life shows the sincerity with which I made the announcement; I have announced it over and over again; I have announced it so often that no circumstance of my life can lead you to doubt the truth of my avowal. My Lord, it has appeared sufficiently in the newspapers—my Lord, no man ever possessed so much public confidence as I have. I say I possess it, and no man ever possessed it so long, so unreservedly. I have obtained the confidence of the Roman Catholic laity of every class; yes, not only those who are in poverty and distress and look to a change, or to an amelioration of their condition, but I have obtained also the confidence of the higher classes—of the Catholic clergy and of the episcopacy. I have obtained that confidence by the assertion of this principle, and by the sincerity with which I have adhered to it; they know with what sincerity I profess it. How long could I possess this confidence if I did not show by years of public activity and energy, and the continuousness of my public conduct, that I deserved it? Gentlemen, I stand before you, having earned that confidence which no man who ever wished to perpetrate a crime could retain. No man could continue to preserve it under such circumstances.—For nearly forty years I have held to the principle I avowed, and my sincerity has been unmitigated, complete, and entire. No, the voice of calumny cannot malign me. Oh, gentlemen, you differ from me in religion. But tell not those whose faith I profess, that they have been deceived—tell them not that they would countenance hypocrisy and treachery. You cannot believe it; an English Jury will not believe it. Europe would be made to startle at the proposition. I, a Roman Catholic, am placed here before a Protestant Jury, in the presence of the monarchs of the earth. I ask you whether you will calmly pause in a matter which includes the interests of very many Protestants of the highest respectability, or whether you will tarnish your ease by any verdict which shall throw a doubt upon the sincerity of my whole life, and upon the sincerity of my advocacy of principles which it has been the pride and boast of my existence to avow—my comfort in my declining years, and is, and will be my consolation before a higher tribunal? But no!—I do you injustice in supposing such a case. No, you are incapable of taking such a view as that. I may observe upon the almost only remaining matter. I doubt, however, whether my sincerity has been impugned—it has never been impugned—I am quite sure it ought to be. Yes, gentlemen, I do say, it is impossible for you to believe that I would desert those principles of which I boast, or that I should forsake that doctrine which has been the very lifeblood of my political existence, and that I should forsake all and enter into a conspiracy. No, I have been more successful, by acting on the principles of justice, of charity, of obedience to the laws, and a total abhorrence of force and violence. No, you cannot believe that I would desert every principle of my public life and enter into a conspiracy. No, it would be too grossly inconsistent with any thing which ever yet occurred in public conduct. But it is not on this point alone—there are other incidents in my public life which will enable you to form a better judgment of my conduct. There is not one of you in that box who does not remember the frightful state of the combination of the working and trading classes. You know that before that combination was put down, lives were sacrificed in the public streets, violence was offered to people and property from day to day, and if death did not ensue in recent cases, it was accidental, rather than owing to the strict forbearance on the part of the combiners. The public authorities were insufficient to cope with them! Now, it is said that I am a man ready to sacrifice a principle to popularity. I could easily have made myself popular among the combiners. I opposed them, I stood alone in my opposition to them; I did so at the peril of my life.—At a meeting at the Exchange, all these men were opposed to me, and I owed the preservation of my life to a policeman. You remember it all, what occurred? I contended with those who were so furiously against me, and I opposed the combination. I did all this at the expense of my popularity, and at the risk of my popularity, and at the risk of my life. Is it likely that I should take this part in order to play the hypocrite?—It was not in that case alone, that I acted thus; for what do you find recorded of me in the newspapers? Why, my persevering and perpetual opposition to Ribbonism—my condemnation of all secret societies. Have you not seen, and do you not remember my warm denunciations of such societies, to the police—my publicly calling upon them to stop the progress of Ribbonism? Oh, gentlemen, if I were a conspirator, would I not be glad to be joined by conspirators? If my means

were applied to what I wished to carry out, would I not have roused the Ribbonmen in various parts of Ireland? I had influence enough to do so, I had only to exhortation it, and nobody knows how far it would have extended had I done so. You have before you over and over again my discountenance of, and resistance to secret societies. Gentlemen, take these things into consideration, and say upon your conscience—say if you can, that that man is a base hypocrite! But you cannot say so—you would not so tarnish your consciences. But this point in my political life must have struck you:—I am, and have been, opposed to the laws for making provisions for the poor. I opposed poor laws of every kind. With the influence which I possessed, could I not have poverty against property, and have insisted upon all the poor being fed by the rich? I was tormented by my friends, I was sneered and jeered by all—by many who had joined me. I consulted my conscience. I saw the real nature of a provision which only makes more destitution than it relieves; and the effect of which must be to inflict a great burden on the property of the country. I knew it was unfit for the people, but I am bound to say that when it passed into a law I did not give it the smallest opposition. I allowed the experiment to be fairly tried, and many of those who had previously abused me, avowed that I was right and they were wrong. I am ready now to facilitate and assist its working in every way I can; but I go back to the time when it was unpopular, and when it was shouted out of society by those whom I estimated most, and whose good opinion I valued, and I appeal to that part of my life as an answer to this foul charge of conspiracy. Gentlemen, you must also recollect, for it is in evidence, the manner of my answer to Mr. Thiers' speech and address. You heard that in the evidence of Mr. Bond Hughes; and now, as I have mentioned his name, let me say one word of Mr. Bond Hughes. Gentlemen, I was one of those the most active against that gentleman, because I felt convinced at the time that he had sworn to that which was not true. Now, I am glad his name has been referred to, because it affords me the opportunity which I am proud to avail myself of, to declare that I never saw a witness on the table who gave his evidence more fairly than Mr. Hughes, and I am firmly convinced that it was a mistake, which any honest man might have fallen into, that occasioned the apparent contradiction in his evidence. I know this is not a part of the case, but I am sure your lordships will think that I am not wrong in making this public avowal. It appears by his report, also, how firmly I rejected the only ground on which we could obtain sympathy from them, and that we declined to take any support from them in the slightest degree disparaging to our religion. But that is put still more strongly when you recollect my strong denunciations of the American slave owners. You will recollect that at the time large sums of money were being collected in the slave holding states of the union, remittances were in progress, and considerable progress had been made in getting an association in Charleston, S. Carolina. Did I shrink from doing my duty upon the slave question? Did I not use the strongest language? Did I not denounce, as the enemies of God and man, those culprits and criminals? Did I not compare the associating ourselves with them as an association with thieves, and pickpockets and felons? Did I not resort to language the strongest and most violent to express my denunciation of the horrible traffic in human beings; of the execrable nature of the slave trade—and of all the immorality and frightful consequences that resulted from that infamous traffic? If I was a hypocrite I might have given them a few smooth words; but I denounced them and thereby showed that there was nothing of hypocrisy in those public principles I have always advocated, that no assistance could be accepted by us which should in the slightest degree interfere with our allegiance to our Sovereign. Gentlemen, you will recollect also that we had offers of support from the Republican party in France, headed by Ledru Rollin. It is a considerable and ever powerful party. It is that party which hates England most, with an irrational and ferocious hatred, arising most probably from the blow struck at their vanity at Waterloo—that is the party headed by Ledru Rollin. Gentlemen, you have his letter, and you have my answer. Did I seek his support, or that of his party? Did I mitigate even from the decisiveness of my answer; did I appear unwilling to repeat and readily avow it? No, gentlemen; I took a firm tone of loyalty; I rejected their support; I refused their offer; I cautioned them against coming over here; I refused everything that was inconsistent with my allegiance, and is that the way that my hypocrisy is proved to you? But not alone with that party in France did the Irish people sing of all connexion, but even as regarded the present Monarch of France, we refused all, even the slightest sympathy. It has gone forth to the world; it has been proved to you that I hurled defiance, so far as an humble individual like myself could, against the Mon-

arch who at present governs the French nation. The learned Attorney General, who with a good deal of ingenuity, introduced to your notice the report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, in 1797, and he told you that we were acting upon that plan. In 1797 they were looking for French sympathy and assistance; they had emissaries in France representing them there, and they had probably persons representing the French here; they were looking for foreign force and foreign assistance, and he tells you that our objects were those of the united Irishmen of 1797! Oh, gentlemen, they were diametrically the reverse. It may be that we look to the restoration of the elder branch of the House of Bourbon, known as Henry the 5th, but I should be sorry to wait for a repeal of the union till then. (Much laughter.) Not that I disparage his title, for I for one believe that Europe will never be perfectly safe until that branch of the family of the Bourbons is restored; restored upon the principle upon which the monarchy of 1688 was restored. But I would not disparage the claim that I for a moment laugh at; but I said this is a quarter from whence we refuse the slightest assistance, and I hurled the indignation of my mind against the man who would offer to the children of France to be educated by infidel professors, and refused them that religious education their parents wished them to receive. I will not, gentlemen, enter further into this point, but you will see from those papers my antagonism to the French government. But, gentlemen, there is another point in my conduct; my antagonism to the Chartists. You may remember that when the Association was in full force the Chartists were in a state of insurrection in England; they were coming in their hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands into the manufacturing towns of England, and you will recollect further, that there was something fascinating in the doctrines of Chartism for the poorer classes, because it proposed in truth and in substance, a violation of all the laws of property. If I had meant anything wicked or criminal would I not have befriended and supported the Chartists? On the contrary, did I not denounce them; did I not keep the Irish in England from joining them, and was there not an outrage actually committed in Manchester on account of the Irish holding aloof from them? Yes, gentlemen, I assisted the constituted authorities in England, by my influence over the Irish residing there. Why was it not given in evidence, that the moment a member of our Association joined the Chartist institution in England his money was returned to him, and his name was struck out of our books. Now, gentlemen, if my object was popular insurrection—if I was anxious for a popular outbreak; good Heaven, let any of you place himself in my situation, and ask what he could do, for the present is a charge of popular insurrection would I not wish to have strength; would I not wish to have Chartism supported. Did not I on the other hand, meet it in Dublin; did I not hunt it out of Dublin, and, if my oath were taken, I firmly declare my conscientious conviction that, had I not interfered, Chartism would have spread from one end of the land to the other. But I have opposed that, as I have opposed every thing that is inconsistent with the integrity of my political principles. Thank heaven, I successfully opposed and resisted it, and while I have a right to make you judge of my actions & motives, by referring to those leading features of my political life, I shall ever rejoice that I kept society and property from that invasion. Gentlemen, there is another part worthy of your consideration, namely, my consistent sworn allegiance to our Sovereign. You find it in all these newspapers. Her name is never mentioned but with respect, and always with enthusiasm and delight; nay, when a speech was made by her Majesty's ministers, derogatory to our objects and motives, don't you find me with most tedious pertinacity making a distinction between her Majesty and her ministers. You have heard it fifty times repeated, and at every meeting; I omitted it at none, and I made in all these cases a constitutional distinction between herself and her ministers, and the Attorney General has no right to say that there was one particle of disloyalty towards her in my observations upon the speech. Gentlemen, having taken all these precautions, having repeated these assertions over and over again, almost disgusting those who heard me even to nausea, what then becomes of the Attorney General that I spoke disrespectfully of her Majesty? My lords, I thank heaven there is not a par-

ticle in this case to taint, in the slightest degree our loyalty or allegiance. Now in London, as regards myself, I am come to that time of life that I can do nothing for me; but there is not a man in expectation in this court who has taken half the pains I have to inspire and win the allegiance of the people of Ireland.—There is one thing I think the Attorney General acted unfairly in. He read the Queen's speech, and then my newspaper speech, and the scolding ministers gave me, and then said: "Jury would not let us go on." He said that I represented the Queen as a fish-woman. What ever becomes of the case don't believe that. I confess that I feel annoyed and humiliated that such a charge should be made against me. I speak in no terms of disrespect to the Attorney General; but I utterly repudiate and deny that I ever spoke in disrespectful terms of my Sovereign, and I say it is false to impute to me an intention of applying the offensive expression referred to, to the speech of her Majesty. I did not treat it as her speech, but as that of her Ministers, who were constitutionally responsible for it. I disclaim, abhor, and hate the imputation of offering a word of anything in the least disrespectful towards my august monarch. Upon all occasions I inculcated principles of sincere loyalty to the throne, and I distinctly separated all reference in my remarks between the person of the Queen and her Ministers. I fear I have detained you longer than I had intended in referring to what has heretofore been my public conduct; but in coming to a proper estimate of my motives, it was necessary to draw attention to my acts, and though my exposures may be feeble; though my talents may be small, though my energies may be decreasing, and though my strength may be declining, and years increasing, still you will find them as now implanted in my breast, a burning love for the prosperity of Ireland; and for the liberties of my country. Well, the public meetings did take place; I do not deny it. Their object was the repeal of the Union. Was that a bad object? I deny that it was. On the contrary, it was a most useful object for Ireland, so much so, that before I sit down, I hope to demonstrate to every one in Court; the neutrality of the bench of course excepted; the absolute necessity for such a measure, and its effects on the property, commerce, and industry of our native land. I hope that many of the jury whom I address, will be induced, from the strength of the case I shall put before them, to join in calling for the facts before you, and I will be able to show to demonstration that the English Parliament has, from a remote period, governed Ireland with a narrow jealousy of Irish prosperity, and in a grudging spirit of its independence. Then I will first refer you to the history of our woollen manufactures, and to what did happen in the reign of a monarch whose memory you probably hold in very great esteem. I will now call your attentions to the transactions of 1782, which was looked upon as a final adjustment of the relations between the two countries, and when an Irish Parliament was declared to last forever. I will next direct my observations to prove the great prosperity which followed as the result of legislative independence. I will then show you that the measure of the Union was forced upon the Irish people. I will demonstrate the manifold evils flowing from it, and the bad effects on our trade and commerce, and will refer you to the existence of vast distress and misery throughout the land; and I will prove to you that the only remedy for its cure, and for avoiding separation from England, is to be found in the restoration of our native Parliament. Now, as to the ill-treatment of Ireland by England. The fact is so confessedly true, that it is scarcely necessary for me to adduce any proof of it; it is scarcely necessary for me to detain you by any remark upon this part of the case, yet I am brought here by the Attorney General because I have agitated to bring about the greatest possible blessings to my countrymen. My defence is, that the Repeal of the Union would relieve all the distress and misery which we behold, and in the performance of my sacred duty to the Irish people, I will place their case triumphantly before you. I have said that it was my duty; I am bound by gratitude, also. Once I have represented the county of Clare, with a population of 250,000 inhabitants. Once I had the honor of representing the county of Waterford, with its 300,000 inhabitants. Once again I have been returned for my native county Kerry, containing a population of 260,000 inhabitants. Once for Meath, whose