

KILKENY QUARTER SESSIONS.

The Quarter Sessions which began on Thursday, ended yesterday at three o'clock. The following is an outline of his worship's address to the grand jury:—The Recorder commenced his charge by alluding to a complaint made by one of the jury, as he was about to be sworn, that many persons in the city were never summoned on the grand jury, while others were compelled to attend that duty sessions after sessions. Adverting to the amount of business, his worship stated the number of cases to be twenty. Some of these, as they stood in the calendar seemed of a serious character, but might turn out, on investigation, of a less aggravating nature than they now appear. After some further observations, the Recorder said he did not feel it necessary to detain the jury by any explanation of their duties, as he was convinced from their general experience that they required no instruction on these points. He should be happy at all times to afford them all the assistance in his power, should difficulties occur to them in business.

The following convictions, out of the cases in the calendar referred to by the Recorder, took place:—

John Walsh and others—rescuing pigs—a week's imprisonment

Aune Kennedy and Margaret Flinn—riot—a fortnight's imprisonment.

Patt Maher—assault on a city constable, two month's imprisonment and hard labour.

Peter Lacy—violent assault and attempt at robbery—seven year's transportation.

Patrick Nixon—a boy stealing a watch—six month's imprisonment.

Michael Irwin, a boy—assault—one month's imprisonment.

Thus ended the Sessions of this Disturbed and Seditious city and liberties, containing a population of 25,000 inhabitants, many of whom are in a state of total destitution!

At the last Quarter Sessions, held in January, not one case was for trial, nor was there a necessity to swear a jury!!!

THE COMMON CAUSE.

From the Dublin Evening Freeman.

The cause of the people of Ireland is the cause of the people of England. Let there be no mistake on this point. With the English nation we have no quarrel. Our interests are theirs: our objects are theirs; our enemies are theirs.—We both seek good institutions, and cheap and honest government; and in the prosecution of this object we have the same obstacles to overcome, the same impediments to surmount, the same foe to grapple with. The two countries have a common enemy—that many headed tyrant the aristocracy. We are both alike victims of the insatiable rapacity and inexorable cruelty of that monster. Until we have beaten down its enormous power, there is no chance of peace, freedom or prosperity for the one country or for the other.

We are, therefore, naturally, necessarily, allies; bound together by the fastest of all ties—community of grievous wrong. And let me suppose that in seeking the repeal of the infamous act of Union, we are pursuing a separate interest. It is quite otherwise. We are engaged in that cause with the most perfect good will towards our English fellow-citizens.—What is our struggle for a domestic legislature, but a struggle for good government—a struggle for the regeneration of Ireland—a struggle for the general benefit of the empire? We wish to fight the battle hand in hand with Englishmen. The repeal of the Union is to us what radical reform of parliament is to them. The remedy of our grievances is substantially the same, namely, the establishment of the democratic principle as the basis of our laws and institutions. We both want to be the makers of the laws by which we are governed, and the voters of the taxes we are called on to pay. For this the people of England require an extended suffrage, vote by ballot, and triennial parliaments; for this the people of Ireland demand the repeal of the Legislative Union, which is in fact nothing but the adaptation of the common remedy to the peculiar circumstances of this country. We seek no separation from our gallant neighbour; we covet the fraternity of a high-minded people, we shall ever hold any attempt to sow discord or jealousy between Irishmen and Englishmen as an act of Treachery, and a proof of disaffection to the popular Standard. What has hitherto sundered us.—What, but the misrule of Whig and Tory; what, but the sway of the aristocracy; what, but the absurd and wicked system upon which the government of Ireland has ever been conducted by that implacable and eternal enemy of liberty and right. Provincial Ireland is necessarily in variance with England, an independent Ireland she will have a fast friend, a steady ally, a stay in her distress, and an ornament in her prosperity. Legislative separation will be true union. The union that exists at present is union in name, and separation in fact. That is not the true marriage which the priest celebrates, and the law sanctions. The true wedlock is where the hearts of the man and woman are united; and it is with nations in like manner.

THE IRISH ABSENTEES—THE POLITICAL ECONOMISTS.

From the Quarterly Review.

The mention of absenteeism reminds us that Miss Martineau takes up and defends Mr. McCulloch's stupendous, and, we had really thought, exploded paradox; and since that egregious doctrine is still in fashion among our rulers, we must take the liberty to say a single word on it. Professor McCulloch, and his disciples, male and female, forget wholly one very simple fact, namely—that the distress of the Irish arises from a want of food. The mass of the inhabitants of Ireland are starving; and her friends congratulate each other on the increase of her exports of corn, beef, and bacon! Is Ireland turbulent? The Lord Lieutenant threatens her with an embargo on her ports, which shall force the Irish, as the *ne plus ultra* of punishment, to eat the produce of their own fields and their fattening-stalls. And Mr. McCulloch in his turn declares, that the absentee

landlords, by creating a foreign demand for this produce, and causing eight millions' worth of her primest estates to leave her shores for the markets of London, Bristol, and Manchester, confer an extraordinary advantage on her fasting inhabitants, who have enjoyed the inestimable privilege of raising all these good things, for English epicures, upon a diet of potatoes and skim milk, varied with sea-weed and nettles! May we venture to hint to all these reasoners, that what the Irish want is the privilege, not merely of raising so many millions worth of corn, and beef, and bacon, and butter, but of eating more-over as much of it as will appease the wolf in their insides. As long as there are fertile farms, and stout arms in Ireland, so long will there be plenty of food grown in it; but the great question is for its inhabitants who are to eat it? If the landlord lives abroad his share of the produce of his estate—(and living out of sight of the distress caused by the exorbitant rents, he will generally, exact a very large one) is sent to him in the shape of food for the foreign markets, which he (indirectly, if not directly) exchanges there with the natives of the country for all the comforts and luxuries he consumes. Were he to return to reside on his estate, or at Dublin, he would exchange this produce with Irish shopkeepers; artisans, and labourers, for their services in supplying with comforts and luxuries, instead of with British or French shopkeepers, &c. And thus, were all the absentees to return, the entire amount of their rental [with the exception only of the prime cost of what foreign productions they would still consume] would be spent in the employment of Irish industry. The greater part of the food now exported to pay these rents would remain at home, and be consumed by the Irish themselves; and the landlord, moreover, when residant on his estate, would find it possible to exact such exorbitant rents as at present from the tenants among whom he lived; but must allow them to retain a somewhat larger share of the produce of their labour, and expend a portion of the remainder in employing them to improve his property. Miss Martineau, it seems, following Mr. McCulloch, actually believes and insists, that every landlord gives employment and a maintenance to his tenants by the act of taking his rents from them; but confers no benefit on those among whom he spends his rents, because he takes an equivalent from them! [p. 101.] So that if the race of Irish landlord's were extinct, and their tenants were forced to eat or pocket the value of all they grow, they would be ruined!—while the shopkeeper's of Bath or London, among whom Irish landlords now spend so many thousands a year, would lose nothing by the withdraw of their custom! Are these opinions accordant with observation, experience, or rea-