bill which gave any person holding a warrant under its provision the power of dragging a prisoner where he pleased—the power of imprisoning him where he pleased—the power of turning whom he pleased into a lawful gaoler and keeper of the unhappy prisoner?. (Hear, hear.) Oh! sure he was that this must be the provision of some statute and admirable equity judge—of some man raised perchance from comparatively humble rank to high place and power by his love of freedom and genius. It must be the work of some mighty and penetrating genius, for it required no ordinary ability to devise such a clause. In Algiers they had just such prisons as were rendered lawful by this bill; but British subjects had never experience of them before. If such an act were allowed to pass, there was a blight and a curse upon the liberties of England which portended ruin to the state. Oh! what a triumph did this act give the Tories over the Whigs! [Hear.] When did the Tories bring in such an act? He had entertained a political enmity towards the right hon. Baronet the member for Tamworth, and at one time a personal enmity? he was wrong in that, and frankly admitted the fact now in the right hon. baronets presence, and he began to find that he had also been wrong in much of his political enmity. This bill empowered any man to imprison another any where, and to detain him any how. But the best was to come. When the Reform Bill was set a working, it was placarded on the doors of all churches and chapels, but the proclamation of a disturbed district was to be confined to the *Dublin Gazette*. Why, if you wanted to keep anything secret, it was proverbial that the *Dublin Gazette* was the place wherein to hide it. Much had been said of military tribunals; he respected the army; there were a few superior men among the officers, a few excellent young men, and a very many indifferent and worse. But good, bad, or indifferent, Somerville's case showed to him that they were the worst judges in the world. He had found that in some military cases, particulary with respect to paymaster's accounts, the major's party was generally one way and the colonel's another. (A cry of "No, no,") Look at the constitution of this military court. It was to consist of 5 or 9 officers—take it at 5. One of them was to be a field officer, doubtless with a view to secure the perfect independence of the subalterns. But there were more precautions. No officer was to be appointed to serve on any such court martial unless he had attained the age of 21 years. That was an admirable precaution: but he must also have been two years in the army, and have learned that obedience was the first of a soldier's duties and merits. That was the constitution of the tribunal under the act, and was it for such a court that the Reformed Parliament would take the judge off the bench, where he had spent his life in the business of the law, and in studying human nature, with a view to determine the question between guilt and innocence, and when the balance wavered to let fall a drop of mercy into the culprit's scale? Were these venerable men to be dismissed as useless after their toils and labors? were their thoughts and learning—*viginti annorum lucubrationes*—to be disregarded; and was the balance of justice to be poised by a field officer, turning the twelve men out of the box? Every British subject could quarrel even with the countenances of the jury to the extent of his challenges: but let the prisoner say one word against one of the four ensigns who formed the court, and there was an end of his chance of acquittal. Those military judges had only to obey their orders, and there they were. A jury must be unanimous: and the conscientious debt of one man was sufficient to acquit the prisoner. But before this tribunal a majority of three would convict. There was your court martial! One instance of oppression he had mentioned on a former night, and he would now read the case of Sir Edward Crosbie, as related to his son E. Crosbie, Esq. by his nephew the Rev. A. Douglas in a letter dated Glebehouse, Kilcullen, August 1, 1826:—"I am glad to communicate a fact which came to my knowledge but a few days ago, and which gives decided confirmation of the generally received opinion of your lamented father's innocence; indeed there can be but one opinion on this murder of your father. Mr. Dundas, who lives near me, was, in the rebellion of 1792, aid-de-camp to his father, General Dundas, who had the command-in-chief in Ireland When the report of the Court-martial was laid before him, he saw at one glance that the conviction of Sir Edward Crosbie was against justice and truth, unsupported by any evidence; he instantly sent off an express to stop proceedings, and even to release my uncle; but the General who commanded at Carlow anticipated the reprieve he knew must come, and had my dear uncle executed at torchlight about twenty minutes before the dragoon arrived. [Hear.] He related another act of yet greater oppression, the chief feature of which was, the imprisonment of the three sons of a widow, who were cast into a dungeon because their mother demanded her right of an attorney professing loyalty, and thereby influencing the decision of a court martial. He was aware that the right hon. gentleman had denied that this bill rendered the jurisdiction of courts martial universal, but he (Mr. O'Connell) would maintain that it did. There was one section that seemed to qualify the power, but there was another and an antecedent section that appeared to render it universal, and he begged as a lawyer to tell the right hon. gentleman, that a particular affirmative did not diminish the force of a general precedent affirmative. One clause gave the bill a retrospective effect, and by the 15th and 16th clauses, there was not a single man in England that might not be carried before those courts martial in Ireland; under those clauses every single individual in that House and out of that House—perhaps it might not be a stretch of the imagination to suppose that only one individual was looked for—"Here, hear," from the Irish members—might be summoned before those courts martial in Ireland. For let it be observed, that this bill was not limited to Ireland; it wanted the limiting clause. The first principle of the criminal law was, that a man should be deemed innocent until he be proved guilty. [hear.]—But alas! what was the first measure that a reformed—a reformed!—House of Commons was about to pass? a measure which altered the old, the equitable law of the land, and which enacted that a man should be deemed guilty unless he proved that he was innocent. (Hear, hear.) If this act should be passed, an enemy might place arms in a man's house, and then give information which would lead to their detection, and unless the said individual could prove that he did not know they were there—a thing, by the way, the hardest in the world to be proved; he was liable to be found guilty by one of those courts martial. So again signals of smoke were made illegal by this act of Parliament, which mingled the ludicrous with the atrocious, and which was, in truth, the veriest compound of absurdity and atrocity that a Whig government had ever put together. A miserable cottar might be called on to prove that the smoke of his cabin three months before the accusation, was not intended to indicate the distant march of a body of troops or police. He would ask them whether, after they had passed such an act for Ireland, they could still believe that there existed a union between England and Ireland? If there did, it would be only such a union as some of the tyrants of old were said to have formed, when they tied a dead body to a living man. [hear.] To be sure, in that case the putrescency of the dead carcase affected the living being; but he would not have the reformers of this country, and the friends of liberty delude themselves with the idea that an analogous result would not take place in this instance, and that the junction of the sacrificed *cadaver* of the Irish constitution would not ultimately destroy the vitality of the existing constitution in England. A noble Lord (Ebrington) supported the bill "as a friend to Ireland"—God save Ireland from such friends! A gallant general, (Grey) had been kindly and hospitably treated in Ireland, and therefore he would destroy her liberties. A gallant captain [Berkely] had been on a hunting party at Kilkenny, in which the sportsmen carried loaded pistols for their protection, and he had therefore, motive enough for supporting the bill. An hon. baronet (Burdett) had said, the repeal of the union had been agitated as a counter proposition to reform—only one proof of the hon. Baronet's happy ignorance of the subject. He [Mr. O'Connell] agitated the repeal of the Union from 1810 to 1817, when he postponed it publicly until the emancipation Bill could be obtained. He renewed it on the success of that measure, and suspended it again in 1831, for the sake of the Reform Bill. Had the Irish Reform been a measure of justice or policy—[an hon. member here counted the O'Connells brought in by that bill]—the repeal of the Union would never more have been heard of. An hon. member, [Ward] had talked of intimidation, and instanced the trial of the murderers of Mr. Goring. The Reverend gentleman was killed ten years ago, his son was not a material witness, the jury had a doubt, and the prisoners had the benefit of it; but at the same assizes many other cases were tried, in all of which there were convictions, and the witnesses were all alive and safe. A noble lord [Duncannon] had talked of 400 cases in two months, forgeting that there had been two contested elections with anti-repeal, and of course anti-popular candidates, and that at least half the list of crimes were merely misdemeanors in election riots. This left only one hundred crimes a month for a whole county. [Hear.] An hon. and learned member [Macauley] had referred to his (Mr. O'Connell's] speeches, as the grounds of his vote—where had he read them? In the *Dublin Morning Register*, the *Pilot*, or the *Freeman's Journal*; none else were cor-