

wrestled with the fair, good form. Here, there, anywhere, their demon faces, lowered and moped and mowed round the gold-moulded face; and with their pointed claws and swooping wings they sought to tear the good spirit down, and to exult over its fall, with looks of bitter, jeering hatred. But they could not—the spiritual light, flickering in long pencils from the forehead and the eye of the mild spirit, seemed, although it was so pale, and apparently so heatless, to scorch the wings and shrivel up the limbs of the assailant spirits; and at length, drawing up its grand form, it threw its arms abroad, and with the motion, as though at the waving of a wand, the mist demons shrunk and shrivelled and writhed in impotent malice at the feet of their conqueror, who stood over them—as an angel trampling upon fiends!

And as the dreaming boy saw this, an unbidden thought came upon his mind, and he knew that the fierce struggle was symbolical of

INTELLECT WARRING WITH THE ELEMENTS.

The Politician.

The Irish State Trials.

[We take the following extracts from the Speech of Mr. O'Connell, in his address to the Jury.]

OVERTURES FROM AMERICA AND FRANCE.

It appears by this report also, how emphatically I informed the Americans that we were anxious for sympathy from them, but that we would take no part in the slightest degree, disparaging of our allegiance. But that is but still more strongly when you recollect the denunciations I made of the American slave owners. Did I not denounce the slave owners as enemies of God and of man—as culprits and criminals? Did I not compare association with them to association with pickpockets and felons? Did I not use most emphatic language to express my denunciation of the horrible traffic in human beings—of the immorality and all the frightful horrors that belong to that system? Oh, if I was a hypocrite, would I not have passed over the topic with a few soft words, and have accepted their sympathy? Gentlemen, you have it in a newspaper also that the democratic party in France, headed by Monsieur Ledru Rollin, offered us sympathy and support. It is a considerable party—it is a powerful party—it is the party that hates the English—the party most of all ferocious against England, a hatred which arose from the blow their vanity got at Waterloo. You have my answer to that offer. Did I seek his support or the support of his party? Did I mitigate and frame my answer in a way that I should appear unwilling to accept that support, but really allow myself to accept that support—I refused the offer—I rejected their support—I refused the offer—I cautioned him against coming over here, for we would do nothing inconsistent with our loyalty; and is that the way in which my hypocrisy is proved? Gentlemen, it was not that party in France alone that I defied. Even at their present monarch I have hurled my defiance. To be sure, the attorney General, with great ingenuity, introduced a report of the Secret Committee of the House of commons in Ireland in 1797, and he said we were acting on that plan. They were looking for French assistance—they had French emissaries in France—they had probably persons representing the French here. Acting on that plan! Imitating the conduct of the United Irishmen in 1797! Oh, gentlemen, it was directly the reverse. It may be said I speculated on the restoration of the elder branch of that family—Henry the Fifth, as he is called. I would be very sorry to wait for the repeal of the Union till that occurs (laughter)—not that I disparage his title—for my opinion is, that Europe will never be perfectly safe until that branch of the Bourbon family be restored—restored under liberal institutions. But I refused any, even the slightest assistance from that party—I hurled the indignation of my mind against the man who would force the children of France to be educated by infidel professors. There is another matter in my life—my opposition to the Chartist. Recollect, gentlemen, that when the Repeal association was in full force, the Chartists were in insurrection in England—that they were entering in hundreds, thousands into the manufacturing towns of England. Recollect, gentlemen, that there is something fascinating to all the poorer classes in chartism. Oh! if I was playing the hypocrite, would I not have been mitigated in my tone respecting them? I did denounce them. I kept the Irish in England from joining them. The very moment a Chartist subscribed to the funds of the association, his money was handed back to him, and his name struck off our list. Now, if my object was popular insurrection, good Heaven! would not any man in my situation have wished to have strength. And, my lords, I do firmly declare that it is my conscientious conviction that if I did not interfere, Chartism would have spread from one end of Ireland to the other. Gentlemen of the Jury, these were the societies I succeeded in driving from Ireland, and am I to be charged with a conspiracy for this? Another point to which I will call your serious attention is this—it has been my constant aim to pay the most devoted allegiance to the Queen. I have never made a speech which did not breathe the most dutiful and affectionate loyalty to her person, crown, and dignity.

INCREASING POVERTY IN IRELAND.

There is scarcely a trade in Dublin concerning which I could not—did I not fear to trespass at too great length upon your attention—give you details equally distressing; for, alas! equally

authentic details showing a daily decrease of employment, and a daily increase of misery and distress—showing how men who were once opulent manufacturers are now reduced to absolute beggary—showing this fact, which is more eloquent than a thousand arguments, that, whereas before the Union there were sixty eight thousand operatives in Dublin, there are at present not more than four thousand. The Liberties of Dublin, once the seat of manufactures and of wealth, have degenerated into the habitation of the decayed or unemployed artisan; the abode of fashion has now become proverbially the abode of vice, and poverty, and of disease. What has become of the house that was once the noble mansion of Lord Powerscourt family. It has been a stamp office—it is now the counting house of a respectable firm in the cotton, silk, and woollen trade. What has become of Lord Moira's house—that house which had been once the residence of the Plantagenets in this country? Alas! are you not well aware that it is now the Mendicity? And that magnificent edifice, the Belvidere House, what sad adversities has it experienced? It cost £28,000 in the building—the stables alone £3,000—but the whole premises were the other day sold for a school to the Jesuits for £1,1000. And are these melancholy spectacles, day by day, and hour by hour, to be displayed before our eyes, and we are to make no effort to retrieve the fallen fortunes of our country? Are the men who would restore her to her pristine prosperity to be menaced with a dungeon? are the men who endeavor to succor and defend her to be branded as malefactors and conspirators? It is to you gentlemen, that I appeal for a solution of this proposition.

MEANS FOR ACCOMPLISHING THE REPEAL.

Well, gentlemen, I now come to the means by which we were to receive the Repeal of the Legislative Union. The means are pacific, and I would not adopt any other means for the accomplishment of that sacred object. It was said that the meetings were not commensurate with the objects in view—that the object was one that could not be ascertained if the entire Irish people had not called for the Repeal of the Union. A charge of that description should not be made when the Irish people demanded it. The words of Grattan were, that the demand was made, backed by the voice of the Irish. I re-echo that word, and the minister was bound to obey that call. We have made the experiment. We did not do so without the enunciation of the voice of the Irish people. We have that voice from one end of the country to the other, the voice was gone abroad, and it only remains for the Irish people to call for the restoration of their Irish parliament. When I brought the question before the House of Commons the members who supported it were small—only one Englishman, and not one Scotchman; but what was the change since that time with respect to the measure? And was it not idle and absurd in the last degree to say that anything was intended save the regeneration of the country by the most peaceable means? The Learned Gentleman then argued, at great length, that there was no constitutional power in the Irish parliament to agree to the Union. I now come back, he proceeded, to the evils of the Union, and I would look to every man to exert himself for repeal. Would it not cure the odious evil of absenteeism? It was calculated, by an able man, that £9,000,000 a year pass out of this country. The Railway Commissioners reduce it to £6,000,000. Take the reduced amount, and ask did ever a country suffer such an odious drain of £6,000,000 of absentee money—£6,000,000 pounds raised every year in this country not to fructify it—not to employ the people of the country, not to take care of the sick and the poor, or desolate, but 6,000,000 are transplanted to foreign lands—sent there, but giving no return—leaving poverty to those who enriched. Take 6,000,000 for the last ten years—look, now, at 60,000,000 drawn from this unhappy country—take it for the next six years. Can you, in conscience, encourage this? There is a cant that agitation prevents the influx of capital. What is the meaning of that? We do not want English capital—leave us our own 6,000,000, and we shall have capital in abundance. There is again the Woods and Forests—that department receives 74,000 a year out of Ireland in quit rents, &c. How was that expended for the last ten years? Between the Thames Tunnel and to ornament Trafalgar square. We want an additional bridge for Dublin. Why have we not the 74,000 pounds for that purpose? Have we not as good right as that it should be expended on Trafalgar square. If we had the parliament in College-green, would that 74,000 pounds be sent to adorn a square in London? Have we not sites and squares enough in Dublin for the purposes of public utility? There are other evils attending this continued drain on the country.

EXPENSES OF PRIVATE BILLS IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

I ask you, is it not a sad consequence of the Union, the enormous expense incurred in obtaining any private bill, in London, respecting property, railroads, or any other matter it may be necessary to obtain for. Here is the expense of going to London, the loss of time there, and the heavy cost of passing any such bill through a committee. What has lately happened in your own neighbourhood! The Dublin and Drogheda Railway Bill cost £30,000 before it was passed. If the Parliament was in Dublin, £1,000 would be more than it would be necessary to expend upon it, and I defy any man to carry a private bill there, particularly if there should be any opposition to it, without a proportionate expense. Can anything be more frightful than the expense of election committees. Every witness must be taken to England,

and must be kept there, and if he should be sent back before his examination, or otherwise out of the way, you have a chance of losing your seat as well as all your expenses. Is it nothing that the entire of this expense should be circulated in London, and not one farthing of it in Dublin, and not a single Irish lawyer receives even a solitary fee out of it, while such vast sums are expended in the complicated machinery of bringing a petition before a committee of the House of Commons in London. Every shilling goes into the pockets of the English barristers practising there. Gentlemen, the expenditure of public establishments in this country before the Union produced a considerable mitigation of the tax on. What is now become of all these boards? Where is the Treasury Board?—transplanted to England. The Customs Board?—transferred to England. The Stamp office, and others, are greatly diminished, and progressing to extinction—even the Old Man's Hospital is extinct. Is this principle of centralization fair, which produces all those advantages to England, and all this misery in Ireland.

THE CONCLUSION.

We live in the most fertile country in the world—no country is in possession of such harbours, the earliest historical mention of us, which is made by Tacitus, admits that our harbours are the best, and that consequently were not crowded. The country is intersected with noble estuaries—ships of 500 tons burthen ride into the heart of the country safe from every wind that blows. No country possesses such advantages. The machinery of the world might be turned by the water power of Ireland. Take the map and dissect it, and you will find that a good harbour is not more remote from any spot in Ireland than thirty miles. Why is not the country prosperous? Oh, gentlemen, I struggle to rescue the poor from poverty, and to give wages and employment to those now idle—to keep our gentry at home by an absentee tax, after the example of the Government last year, if by no other means, and compel them to do duty to their country. I leave the case to you. I deny that there is anything in it to stain me with conspiracy. I reject with contempt the appellation, I have acted in the open day, in presence of the Government—in presence of the magistrates—nothing was secret, private or concealed—there was nothing but what was exposed to the universal world. I have struggled for the restoration of the Parliament to my native country. Others have succeeded in their endeavors, and some have failed; but, succeed or fail, it is a glorious struggle—it is a struggle to make the first land on earth possess that bounty and benefit which God and nature intended.

[The following is the conclusion of Mr White-side's address to the Jury. The speech of this gentleman, all parties agree in stating, was the most brilliant delivered at the late trials.]

A nation's rights are involved in the issue—a nation's liberties are at stake. What won't what preserves—the precious privileges you possess? The exercise of the right of free discussion—free, untrammelled, bold. The laws which wisdom framed—the institutions struck out by patriot sin, learning, or genius—can they preserve the springs of freedom fresh and pure? No! Destroy the right of free discussion, and you dry up the sources of your freedom. By the same means by which your liberties were won, can they alone be increased or defended. Quarrel not with the partial evils free discussion creates, nor seek to contract the enjoyment of that greatest privilege within the narrow limits timid men prescribe. With the passing mischiefs of its extravagance contrast the prodigious blessings it has heaped on man. Free discussion aroused the human mind from the torpor of ages, taught it to think, and shook the thrones of ignorance and darkness. Free discussion gave to Europe the Reformation, which it has been taught to consider the mightiest event in the history of the human race, illuminating the world with the radiant light of spiritual truth. May it shine with steady and increasing splendor! Free discussion gave to England the Reformation, abolished tyranny, swept away the monstrous abuses it rears, and established the liberties under which we live. Free discussion, since that glorious epoch, has not only preserved, but purified, our constitution, reformed our laws, reduced our punishments, and extended its wholesome influence to every portion of our political system. The spirit of inquiry it creates has revealed the secrets of nature, explained the wonders of creation, teaching the knowledge of the stupendous works of God. Arts, civilization, freedom, pure religion, are its noble realities. Would you undo the labors of science, extinguish literature, stop the efforts of genius, restore ignorance, bigotry, barbarism—then put down free discussion, and you have accomplished all. Savage conquerors, in the blindness of their ignorance have scattered and destroyed the intellectual treasures of a great antiquity. Those who make war on the sacred rights of free discussion, without their ignorance, imitate their fury. They may check the expression of some thought which might, if uttered, redeem the liberties or increase the happiness of man. The insidious assailants of this great prerogative of intellectual beings, by the cover under which they advance, conceal the character of their assault upon the liberties of the human race. They seem to admit the liberty to discuss, blame only its extravagance, pronounce hollow praises on the value of freedom of speech, and straightway begin a prosecution to cripple or destroy it. The open despot avows his object is to oppress and enslave; resistance is certain to encounter his tyranny, and perhaps subvert it. Not so the

artful assailant of a nation's rights—he declares friendship while he wages war, and professes affection for the thing he hates. State prosecutions, if you believe them, are ever the fastest friends of freedom. They tell you peace is disturbed, order broken, by the excesses of turbulent and seditious demagogues. No doubt there might be a seeming peace, a death like stillness—by repressing the feelings and passions of men. So in the fairest portions of Europe this day, there is peace, and order, and submission, under paternal despotisms, ecclesiastical and civil. That peace springs from terror—that submission from ignorance—that silence from despair. Who dares discuss, when with discussion and by discussion tyranny must perish? Compare the stillness of despotism with the healthful animation, the natural warmth, the bold language, the proud bearing, which spring from freedom and the consciousness of its possession. Which will you prefer? Insult not the dignity of manhood by supposing that contentment of the heart can exist under despotism. There may be degrees in its severity, and also degrees in the sufferings of its victims. Terrible the dangers which lurk beneath the calm surface of despotic power. The movements of the oppressed will, at times, disturb the tyrant's tranquillity, and warn him their day of vengeance or of triumph may be nigh. But in these happy countries the safety of the state consists in freedom of discussion. Partial evils in all systems of political governments there must be; but their worst effects are obviated when their cause is sought for, discovered, considered, discussed.

Milton has taught a great political truth, in language as instructive as his sublimest verse: "For this is not the liberty which we can hope that no grievances ever should arise in the commonwealth—that let no man in this world expect, but which complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty obtained, that wise men look for." Suffer the complaints of the Irish people to be freely heard. You want the power to have them speedily reformed. Their case to-day may be yours to-morrow. Preserve the right of free discussion as you would cling to life. Combat error with argument, misrepresentation by fact, falsehood with truth. "For who knows not," saith the same great writer, "that truth is strong, next to the Almighty. One needs no policies nor stratagems to make her victorious—these are the shifts error uses against her power." If this demand for a native Parliament rest on a delusion, dispel that delusion by the omnipotence of truth. Why do you love—why do other nations honor England? Are you—are they dazzled by her naval or military glories, the splendour of her literature, her sublime discoveries in science, her boundless wealth, her almost incredible labors in every work of art and skill? No: you love her—you cling to England because she has been for ages past the seat of free discussion, and therefore the home of rational freedom, and the hope of oppressed men throughout the world. Under the laws of England it is our happiness to live. They breathe the spirit of liberty and reason. Emulate this day the great virtues of Englishmen—their love of fairness—their immovable independence, and the sense of justice rooted in their nature. These are the virtues which qualify jurors to decide the rights of their fellow men. Deserted by these, of what avail the tribunal of a Jury? It is worthless as the human body when the living soul has fled. Prove to the accused, from whom perchance you widely differ in opinion—whose liberties and fortunes are in your hands—that you are there not to persecute but to save. Believe me you will not secure the true interests of England by leaning too severely on your countrymen. They say to their English brethren, and with truth, "We have been at your side whenever danger was to be faced and honor won. The scorching sun of the East and the pestilence of the West we have endured to spread your commerce, to extend your empire, to uphold your glory. The bones of our countrymen whitened the fields of Spain, of Portugal, of France. Fighting your battles they fell—in a nobler cause they could not. We have helped to gather your imperishable laurels—we have helped to win your immortal triumphs. Now, in time of peace, we ask you to restore that parliament you planted here with your laws and language, uprooted in a dismal period of our history, in the moment of our terror—our divisions, our weakness, it may be our crime.

Re-establish the Commons on the broad foundation of the people's choice—replace the Peerage, the Corinthian pillars of the capital secured and adorned with the strength and splendour of the Crown—and let the Monarch of England, as in ages past, rule a brilliant and united empire in solidity, magnificence, and power. When the privileges of the English Parliament were invaded, that people took the field, struck down the ministry, and dragged their sovereign to the block. We shall not imitate English precedent. While we struggle for a parliament, its surest bulwark, that institution you prize so highly, which fosters your wealth, adds to your prosperity, and guards your freedom, was ours for 600 years. Restore the blessing, and we shall be content. This prosecution is not essential to the maintenance of the authority and prerogative of the crown. Our Gracious Sovereign needs not state prosecutions to secure her prerogatives or preserve her power. She has the unbought loyalty of a chivalrous and gallant people. The arm of authority she requires not to raise. The glory of her gentle reign will be—she will have ruled, not by the sword, but by the affections that the true source of her power has been, not in terrors of the law but in the hearts of her people. Your patience is exhausted. If I have spoken suitably to the subject, I have spoken as I could have wished; but if, as you may think, deficiently, I have