RAMSEY'S Waterford Chronicle

[Price Four-Pence] SATURDAY, JANUARY [illegible], 1811. [Number 11,0[illegible]9

TO BE LET,

FROM THE TWENTY FIFTH OF MARCH NEXT,
OR THE INTEREST SOLD,
For Three Lives and Thirty One Years,

WOODLANDS HOUSE, OFFICES, walled GARDEN, ORCHARD, and twenty two Acres of GROUND, beautifully ſituated on the River Suir, within four Miles of Waterford. Application to be made to Richard Uſsher, Eſq. at Woodlands.

(S) January 9, 1811

CAUTION.

I DO HEREBY CAUTION THE PUBLIC againſt taking my Promiſſory Note, paſſed to John Lynch for ONE HUNDRED POUNDS, now due and in ſaid Lynch's Hands, as ſame was paſſed without my Value or Conſideration.

MARY BURKE.

Carrick-on-Suir, Jan. [illegible], 1811. (3)

In the Matter of William M'Craith, a Minor.

PURSUANT to an Order of His Majeſty's High Court of Chancery of Ireland, made in this Matter, bearing date the 26th day of July laſt, I will, at One o'Clock, on Friday, the 25th day of January next, at my Chambers on the Inn's Quay, in the City of Dublin, proceed to Set the Houſe and Demeſne of Ballingown, in the County of Waterford, for ſuch term during the minority of the ſaid Minor, as ſhall appear moſt beneficial.—Dated this 18th day of December, 1810.

E. W. WESTBY.

N. B. The Tenant is to enter into Security by recognizance in the amount of Three Year's Rent for the payment thereof.—Any Perſon wiſhing for further particulars will pleaſe to apply to Meſſrs. Maunſell and Greene, Solicitors for ſaid Minor, 25, Holles Street, Dublin, or Cappoquin, or Tallow, County Waterford.—Perſons applying will pleaſe to pay poſtage.

TO BE LET,

AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN,
Or the INTEREST, and all the MACHINERY Sold,

THE Extenſive CONCERNS, ſituated in John's-ſtreet, in the City of Waterford, lately in the Poſſeſſion of Thomas Pearſon.—For Particulars ſee Hand Bills, which may be had at the Office of this Paper.

Application to be made to Arthur Birnie.

September 8, 1810

TO BE SOLD,

ONE THIRD SHARE of about £300 per Annum, [illegible] out of the Paper Mill, and Bolting Mills and [illegible] with the One-Third Share of the Ground, the [illegible] and Timber growing thereon, ſituate at Whelan's-bridge, a moſt beautiful Situation for a Lodge thereon, and a valuable riſing intereſt.—Apply to Samuel [illegible], Eſq. Attorney, or the Printer.

(S). November 24, 1810.

BY ORDER OF MAJOR GEN. FREEMAN, DEPUTY BARRACK MASTER GENERAL.

MR. PARKER, Barrack Maſter, will receive Written Propoſals from any Perſon inclined to keep the NECESSARYS of the Permanent Barrack cleanſed Monthly. Particulars may be known, on Application to Mr Parker, Barracks.

Waterford, Jan. 7, 1811.

WILLIAM HAMY,

RESPECTFULLY begs leave to acquaint the Nobility, Gentry, and the Public, that he has removed from No. 11, Euſtace-Street, to No. 20, Dame-Street, (exactly oppoſite Euſtace-Street,) and has now ready for the Inſpection of his numerous Friends, a New and Extenſive Aſſortment of JEWELLERY, PLATE, and WATCHES, &c. manufactured under his immediate Inſpection, which he will ſell on as moderate Terms as any reſpectable Houſe in the Kingdom.

Watches of every Deſcription carefully repaired.

The higheſt Price is given for Diamonds, Pearls, Gold, Silver Coins, &c.

No. 20, Dame Street, oppoſite Euſtace-Street.

(3) January 1, 1811.

WATERFORD MARKET PRICES—JAN. 5.

Butter, firſt Quality,	£5 12s. [illegible]	per Cwt.
——— ſecond,	5 7s. [illegible]	
——— third,	5 2s. [illegible]	
Tallow, rendered,	about [illegible]	
[illegible] (rough)	6s. 6d. – [illegible]	
[illegible] (country)	[illegible] 0d. – 7s. [illegible]	
Burnt Pigs,	42s. 0d. – 44s. [illegible]	
Meſs Pork,	95s. 0d. – [illegible]	
Beef,	[illegible]	
Oatmeal,	17s. [illegible] – 18s. [illegible]	
Flour, firſt Quality,	——	per Bag
——— ſecond,	[illegible]	
——— third,	[illegible]	
——— fourth,	[illegible]	
Wheat,	[illegible]	per Barrel
Barley,	[illegible]	
Oats, (common)	[illegible]	
——— (potatoe)	[illegible]	
Malt,	[illegible]	
Coals,	[illegible]	
Tallow (rough)	[illegible]	
Potatoes,	[illegible]	per Stone
Beef,	[illegible]	
Mutton,	[illegible]	per lb.
Veal,	[illegible]	
Pork,	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	
Train Oil,	[illegible]	

Corn Returns for the week ending on Saturday.

[illegible]

> "There is one ambition at leaſt, which I will not renounce but with my life. It is the ambition of delivering to my poſterity thoſe rights of freedom which I have received from my anceſtors."—Earl of Chatham, 9th January, 1770.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,

After the noble Speaker of theſe words, no man has ſo good a right to make uſe of them as I have. They expreſs a principle on which I have acted and I reſort to them as my own. In my judgment, every rational man in theſe kingdoms has as good a right to deliver his opinion on the fundamental principles of the conſtitution, now brought into queſtion, as any Peer or Commoner who takes a ſeat in either of the chambers of Parliament. For myſelf I might perhaps claim ſomething more from age, long experience, and long unblemiſhed public ſervice; but ſtill more from the ſchool I was bred in, and from the ſociety of many eminent men, whom I have had the honour to live with, and the miſfortune to ſurvive. This is all I contend for. I ſpeak to the nation, and not for any intereſt of my own. My concern in any thing that may happen now, is very unlikely to laſt long. If they will not liſten to the voice of truth and reaſon, they ſhall hear it. No man, who now aſſiſts or concurs in doing wrong, ſhall have it to plead that he was left without information and knew no better. My concluſions will be ſtated in their place. They are founded on principles which want no proof, and cannot be diſputed.

1. I aſſert that the Crown of theſe kingdoms is hereditary, and is not, or ever was, elective.

2. That the Crown is not a bare inheritance, but an inheritance accompanying an office of truſt, and to be executed, not for the perſonal excluſive benefit of the King, but of that body politic of which the King is the head.

3. That nothing elſe but an act of the legiſlature can transfer the Crown, or alter the ſucceſſion to it.

4. That the Government of this kingdom is by King, Lords, and Commons.

5. That the Lords and Commons, without the King, are not and cannot be a Parliament.

6. That no two of the component parts of the Legiſlature are competent to perform any legiſlative acts whatever. Were it otherwiſe, the two acting powers might aboliſh the third; or, without aboliſhing the name, might annihilate the functions.

7. That on the natural death of the King, the ſucceſſion of the next heir is inſtant without a vacancy. The Crown devolves on his head by demiſe, without any act of his, and without the conſent of any other power, party, or perſon, whatſoever.

It is admitted, I preſume, that with an heir-apparent, to whom no legal or natural incapacity is objected, the Lords and Commons would have no right to chuſe a King—I ſay, not even himſelf. But it is contended that they have a right to chuſe a Regent during his Majeſty's inability to execute the duties and functions of the Royal office. It follows then that the Crown, or office of the King, is hereditary on the natural, and elective on the civil death of the King. When any reaſon is ſet up in ſupport or explanation of this diſtinction, it will be time enough to ſhew the folly of it. Till then, I content myſelf with affirming, that there is no principle in our conſtitution more completely recognized and indiſputable, than that the office of King is not elective. The heir apparent ſucceeds to the office in one caſe, as he would do to the title in the other. Why? Becauſe it is the wiſdom of England to provide againſt the poſſibility of a diſputed ſucceſſion, whether to the title or to the office. All other magiſtrates are choſen for their merits or qualifications. The office of the Chief Magiſtrate alone is too great an object of ambition to be left open to a conteſt. In the abſtract idea of election, one may ſee a poſſibility that the beſt would be choſen. But it is in vain to talk of theories, with the example of Poland before us.

I know it is agreed, even by thoſe who ſay that the Lords and Commons in a convention have a right to diſpoſe of the Regency, that the Prince of Wales muſt be Regent; and, if that were all, as the opinion would be loſt in the fact, it would be of little moment what they ſaid. The purpoſe for which the claim is advanced, is not to deprive him of the title, but to diſarm him of the powers of a Regent, and to diſable or diſtreſs him in the execution of his duties. Yet who is there ſo ignorant, as not to know that the prerogatives of the Crown are not veſted for his own ſake in the perſon who wears it, but to inſure the execution of his office; and then I aſk, what power has the Conſtitution reſerved to any ſet of men, to ſtrip the crown of thoſe prerogatives, or even qualify or impair them? Shew it if you can, and produce your evidence. In a caſe of ſuch importance, I will not ſubmit to authority, and leaſt of all, to the authority of a party, which perhaps means or expects to benefit by the deciſion. They who can wholly refuſe may grant upon conditions. The Lords may ſay, you ſhall have no more Peers. The Commons may ſay, you ſhall have no power to diſſolve us.—The Miniſters of courſe will not ſubmit to be diſpoſſeſſed; and this is the Executive Government which they are willing to eſtabliſh in the Prince's hands.—Do they mean to admit that the king, uniting with a convention of the Peers, could aboliſh the Houſe of Commons, or even diveſt them of any one of their privileges? Could the King and the Commons, I will not ſay *aboliſh* the Houſe of Lords, but could they take away their juriſdiction in the laſt reſort, or in trials by impeachment? He who is mad enough to anſwer theſe queſtions in the affirmative, may aſſert, that whenever his Majeſty is unable to diſcharge the duties of the Kingly office, the rights, powers, and prerogatives of that office may be modified, curtailed, or annihilated by the other two powers of the Legiſlature, granting that a Legiſlature can exiſt one moment without the Crown. The perſon who held ſuch language might deſerve to be hanged, but not for inconſiſtency.

In arguing theſe follies, has any man aſked himſelf this plain practical queſtion: Let the Executive Government be what it may, is not this a period of difficulty and danger beyond any, to which the country was ever expoſed before? And is it in the greateſt poſſible difficulties, that you would intruſt your Government with the leaſt poſſible powers? But ſay, that it is the opinion of the Lords, or of the Commons, that reſtrictions ought to be impoſed. How are you ſure that they will agree in that point? and, if they diſagree, have you conſidered the conſequence? On occaſions in ſome degree ſimilar, but infinitely inferior in importance, when neither Houſe would give way to the other, the remedy was in the Crown, viz. to diſſolve the Parliament. But if the ſame difficulty occurred now, there would be no remedy for it: for, without a King or a Regent, there would be no power to diſſolve; but there certainly would be a diſſolution of all Government. Inſtant ſucceſſion reſolves all difficulties, and makes all fictions unneceſſary. To deface the King's image on the coin is felony. To ſubſtitute any other is treaſon. The Prince is the image of the King; and, in the language of the conſtitution, the King himſelf calls him, *Eadem perſona nobiſcum.*

I ſet out with aſſerting, that the Lords and Commons, granting them to be ſtill the two houſes of Parliament, have no right to abridge or alter any of the acknowledged rights or prerogatives of the Crown in the abſence of the King, or of his true repreſentative. I now mean to go much beyond that propoſition, and in doing ſo, I ſtand on the conſtitution of my country, which I have ſtudied as long, and I believe as carefully, as any man in it. I affirm, becauſe I am convinced of it, that, if every man in the three Kingdoms could be called upon to give his vote for doing that, which I ſay, cannot be done by the Lords and Commons, or otherwiſe than in full parliament, and gave it ſo accordingly, no conſequent act could of right be founded on that vote. Why? Becauſe the laws and conſtitution of England forbid it. I am not talking of deſperate or extreme caſes. Neceſſity, unavoidable and irreſiſtible, muſt be left to provide for itſelf. True wiſdom, even then, will do nothing beyond what the inſtant exigency requires; and will return as ſoon as poſſible to its regular eſtabliſhed courſes. Neither do I deny the *power* of the people to do what they will. Undoubtedly they may tear down their temples and tribunals, and murder their teachers and their magiſtrates. They have a phyſical force to aboliſh their laws, and to trample on the inſtitutions of their forefathers. But, remember, the man who pulled down the building, and buried himſelf in its ruins, was blind as well as ſtrong. The quality of an immoral act is not altered, the guilt of an enormous crime is not diminiſhed by the numbers that concur in it. The moment the people did theſe things, they would ceaſe to be a nation. To deſtroy their Conſtitution is beyond their competence. It is the inheritance of the unborn as well as theirs.—What we received from our anceſtors, we are morally and religiouſly bound, as well as by our laws, to tranſmit to our poſterity. Of ſuch enormous violence on the part of the people, I know there is no danger. Will they ſuffer any other power to do that in their name, which they cannot and ought not to do for themſelves. I heard it from Lord Chatham, "that power without right is the moſt odious and deteſtable object that can be offered to the human imagination. It is at once *res deteſtabilis et caduca.*" Let who will aſſume ſuch power, it ought to be reſiſted. Brave men meet their fate; cowards take flight, and die for fear of death.

PHILIP FRANCIS.

[Mr Sheridan, in the courſe of his ſpeech, reported in our laſt publication, delivered the following animated eulogy on the character of his departed friend, Mr. Fox.]

One word to the Honourable Gentleman, Member for Yorkſhire, and in addreſſing myſelf to him, I admit his own excuſe for being induced to riſe upon the inſtantaneous feeling with which he was animated at the alluſion made to the character of his departed friend (Mr. Pitt). I aſſure him that I moſt ſincerely applaud the zeal, and appreciate the warmth which provoked him, and though I at all times profeſs my diſinclination to enter on any invidious compariſon between the reſpective merits of thoſe whoſe failings are conſigned to the ſilence of the grave, I have, however, my claim to that ſpecies of panegyric which that Hon. Gentleman has pronounced upon his departed friend. I may be allowed to do juſtice to the memory of him, whoſe amiability of mind both to attach friends and to appeaſe enmities, was admitted by that Honourable Gentleman. But I muſt own, that when he adverted to that great character, I did not expect from him ſuch parſimony of praiſe; I did conclude that he who had, during his whole political life, made one meaſure (the Slave Trade) the very object of his ſoul, without which his conſcience could never be at reſt—on which he placed his happineſs in this life, and reſted his hopes of hereafter—I ſay, I did expect that he would have done at leaſt juſtice to the memory of the Stateſman under whoſe auſpices that great object was accompliſhed, and to the pure and diſintereſted conſiſtency with which he uniformly advocated, and ultimately preſſed its adoption—(Hear! hear!) No man, it was true, more eloquently arraigned the injuſtice of that diſgraceful traffic, than that departed character, the theme of the Honourable Gentleman's (Mr. Wilberforce) full panegyric; but it was remarkable that on this point, he that could carry in this Houſe every other thing, was ſure to be defeated by the ſuggeſtions of Mr. Secretary Gradual (Lord Melville.—Hear! hear!) But what my departed friend (Mr. Fox) profeſſed out of place, in power he ſupported. He would admit no compromiſe, but hazarded the ſecurity of his government to evince his ſincerity of principle. It was he that retrieved the nation from that turpitude and deadly ſin, which the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Wilberforce) conſcientiouſly believed to affect every individual of a nation which admitted ſuch a traffic; what he thought to be the ſalvation of the empire, my friend accompliſhed; and if ever there was that man, in whoſe heart the memory of another ſhould have been canonized with ſuperior attachment, I ſhould have thought it was the memory of Mr. Fox in the heart of the Honourable Gentleman (Cries of hear! hear!)

Juſt as the Houſe was riſing on Friday night, Mr. W. SMITH begged to be allowed to ſtate one thing before the Houſe roſe. He obſerved that it had been noticed in the public prints, and had alſo been alluded to by a Noble Lord in another place, that an agreement had taken place between Miniſters and the malt diſtillers, by which it was ſettled that matters ſhould continue to go on as if the Act had not expired. His Noble Friend, in alluding to this ſubject, had been pleaſed to ſay, that the effect of this agreement had been to create a great and diſgraceful ſpeculation and that it was a moſt improper agreement between the parties. He did not wiſh to enter into the ſubject at preſent—he ſhould only ſay, that he believed his Noble Friend was in a great miſtake, when he ſaid that the agreement had produced a great and diſgraceful ſpeculation. It had quite a contrary effect, and had gone greatly to prevent all ſpeculation, particularly in grain, on which, but for this agreement, the ſpeculation which muſt have been expected, would have produced a very rapid and conſiderable riſe. He only wiſhed to ſay, that in this reſpect at leaſt, his Noble Friend was miſtaken.

When the report of the loſs of the Elizabeth Indiaman, lately wrecked off Dunkirk, reached that town, the Engliſh priſoners confined there, of whom the number is conſiderable, requeſted leave to aſſiſt their countrymen in diſtreſs. This requeſt, we regret to hear, was not only refuſed to them, but even ſuch of the French as were diſpoſed to afford aſſiſtance, were not ſuffered to interfere!—So great is the hatred and jealouſy of an Engliſh ſailor, even of the money remitted for the uſe of the priſoners, they do not receive more than ſeventeen ſhillings in the pound!

A Letter has been tranſmitted by Lieutenant Robert Preſton Campbell, of the Royal Marine Artillery, to Major Minto, Commandant of that corps, at Chatham, dated Cadiz Bay, the 26th of November 1810, reporting the death of two Officers of that corps, in the following terms:—

"Sir—It has moſt unfortunately fallen to my lot to convey to you the unpleaſant intelligence of the death of Lieutenants Thomas Worth and John Buckland, of the Royal Marine Artillery, who were killed on the 23d inſtant, by the ſame cannon ſhot, when moſt gallantly attempting to deſtroy a flotilla of the enemy's gun-boats in the harbour of St. Mary.—The attack was made by the gun and howitzer-boats, in the latter of which were employed the whole of the men compriſing our detachment. The boat which Lieutenant Buckland commanded was in a ſinking ſtate, when he was taken out of her by Lieutenant Worth. Their remains were depoſited in the ſame grave, followed by all the Officers of the Britiſh and Spaniſh forces, and the whole ceremony has been conducted with every mark of honour and reſpect. The general ſervice has ſuffered a ſevere loſs by their diſſolution, and I have to lament being deprived of two moſt valuable friends, who are univerſally regretted by thoſe who knew them."

[The following are the moſt intereſting parts of the ſpeeches of Mr. Grattan, the Maſter of the Rolls, and Mr. Sheridan, on Lord Porcheſter's Amendment.]

Mr. GRATTAN ſaid, in order to conduct the nation well, the Executive Magiſtrate ſhould be in poſſeſſion of all the Prerogatives, whether he executes them in his own name or in the name of his Sovereign. Now I ſubmit, that the duty of this Houſe upon the preſent occaſion is to ſupply the preſent deficiency by putting in activity and action the powers of the Executive Magiſtrate. How far then is he to exerciſe the Royal Authority? Is it to ſign papers?—No. It is that he may exerciſe them competently to the difficulty of the occaſion. You muſt create a perſon to exerciſe the power of Majeſty, inveſted with ſuch Prerogatives as are competent to the ſafety of our country in times of difficulty and danger. The Right Hon Gentleman himſelf who propoſed this Reſolution, gave up his principle when he admitted that Peerages might be granted to individuals who had performed Naval or Military achievements. Having given up a portion of the queſtion, it now, I think, belongs to him to give up the remainder; becauſe the giving up the principle in the one caſe ſhould make him give up the rule in the other. (Hear, hear.) Let us know when the Executive Magiſtrate is to put forth his functions. Let us know to what extent he is to do it. Will theſe Gentlemen be reſponſible in their perſons for the conſequences that may enſue from their taking away ſuch a branch of the Executive power of the country, ſhould bad reſults actually ariſe from their conduct? It is not the way to ſtate the caſe, to ſay, that office, or that Peerage is unneceſſary to be granted; it is, whether the prerogative of granting the office, or creating the Peerage, be or be not neceſſary for the Regent to poſſeſs. To have a weak Government and a ſtrong Oppoſition is not always neceſſary in Parliament?—(Hear, hear, hear.)—It is not enough that the removal of this prerogative is neceſſary for the reſtoration and ſafety of the King; nor is it ſufficient to ſay that we do not deſign to do any injury to the State. It is not enough that we make the Regent a Penal Regent, without granting to him any conciliating and remunerating faculty which attaches to the Monarchy. We, by following ſuch meaſures, alter the very complexion of the Britiſh Monarchy, and we reduce the great Magiſtrate, who, in the name of his father, is to manage the affairs of the country, to fill the office of a Penal Magiſtrate, who can make Articles of War, who can puniſh, and who has a right to execute the Revenue Laws of the country, but who has not the power to do thoſe things which caſt that grace and amiability which belong to the throne, not as an object of love, but as an object of power, in this country. Suppoſe that thoſe Gentlemen oppoſite can prove that it is perfectly ſafe for the country to deprive him of theſe Prerogatives, yet ſtill it is abſolutely neceſſary for them to prove that it would be requiſite for the reſtoration of his Majeſty to power, and the ſecurity of his perſon. Now, Sir, I aſk, whether it be neceſſary, in order to facilitate the King's reſtoration to power, that the Regent ſhould not have the right to make Peers? It is no doubt neceſſary that the care of the Royal Perſon ſhould be given to the Queen, and that there ſhould be no embarraſſment or impediment, as ſoon as he is able, to aſſert himſelf in all his ancient functions; but is it neceſſary, in order to effect theſe objects, that the Regent ſhould not have the authority to make a Peer? Do Gentlemen mean to ſay, that his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales is capable of entering into a conſpiracy, or that he could find Peers or Commoners capable of ſupporting him in a conſpiracy againſt his Royal Father, ſuppoſing he was baſe enough to induce them? The very Bill you have ventured to bring in, precludes the poſſibility of ſuch a ſuſpicion being entertained, for it enacts that his Royal Highneſs the Prince ſhall be Regent. He does not take it by birth. If you declare his qualification, then you cannot declare him capable of crimes that would diſqualify him to be Regent. You cannot take the benefit of two propoſitions, by firſt aſſerting his power, and then declaring his incapacity. Although I think that the influence of the Crown is increaſing, yet I would never conſent to take it away for one year, and then to reſtore it to the reigning Monarch afterwards with all its abuſes unfettered. If in addition to theſe Reſtrictive Powers, you transfer from him the management of the Houſehold, you not only create another Reſtriction, but you create another political Regent.—The one will be the Regent of the Government, and the other the Regent in oppoſition to it. I have not the leaſt reaſon to doubt or queſtion the qualifications of her Majeſty, but I muſt ſay that it is a bad law that can only be corrected by the virtues and good qualifications of the Queen.—(Hear, hear, hear.)—Now, if that Council, which is to be under her controul, be not the Council of the Regent, they will be a hoſt independent of the Government, and acting in direct defiance of the Regent of the Government, and averſe from the meaſures that he might deem neceſſary to adopt. I do decidedly object to the propoſed plan for that reaſon; and alſo for another. It appears to me that the complexion which you will now be giving to the character of the Regent, and the impreſſion which you will make upon the public mind, will have an effect upon the government of the country, when he ſucceeds to his father. If you diſable him by parſimony, not to be of ſervice to himſelf, nor to the country, you induce the people to imagine not only that he will be a bad Regent but a deceitful King.—(Hear, hear.)—The one King will be found diſabled by his infirmity, and the other King rendered odious by theſe Reſtrictions. I do think that it is utterly impoſſible to ſeparate theſe queſtions as to the Regency, and the care of His Majeſty's perſon; but at the ſame time I agree that the feelings of His Majeſty may be adverted to, yet it is ſurely a diſgrace to His Majeſty when they talk of his feelings in the manner that they have done.—What do they ſuppoſe that His Majeſty's feelings will be upon his recovery of his underſtanding?—Not an anxiety about the ſituation of his country, but an anxiety about the liſt of his domeſtics; and that, ſhould he find any one of them gone, they venture to ſuppoſe that he will relapſe!—They firſt ſuppoſe that his feelings are ſo contemptible, and then they make that contemptible idea a meaſure of his own Legiſlation!—(Hear, hear.)—You firſt ſuppoſe that the feelings of His Majeſty *will not be loyal*, and then you propoſe Proceedings in Parliament *not Conſtitutional!*—(Hear, hear, hear.)—The true concluſion is, that the ſickneſs of a King is the proſperity of his people!—(Hear, hear, hear.) That Parliament provides for his Government ſo as to make him efficient and competent in his illneſs; but denies him that conſolation when he awakes from his trance, which I hope he will do ere long. If theſe meaſures be adopted, he will find himſelf ſurrounded no doubt by his domeſtics, but at the ſame time grieved with the miſfortunes of his dominions.'—(Hear, hear, hear.)

The MASTER of the ROLLS ſaid, it had become neceſſary for His Majeſty's Miniſters to proceed to provide for the ſuſpenſion of the perſonal exerciſe of the Royal Authority; and he did conceive that when a precedent exiſted, they would not have been juſtified in wantonly departing from it, and coming down to that Houſe with a mode deviſed by themſelves, without the ſtamp of experience, or the authority of legiſlative ſanction. For his own part he was free to confeſs, that he attached high value to the precedent eſtabliſhed in 1788. He was willing to concede that it was not a finiſhed precedent, and he would put out of his conſideration of the queſtion, the approbation of His Majeſty; but, he thought, that in receiving the concurrent authority of the Two Branches of the Legiſlature, the opinion of Parliament diſtinctly pronounced, it poſſeſſed as high a claim to their regard as the precedent of the Revolution, on which they relied ſo much—and in the caſe of the Succeſſion Act, if it had happened that all thoſe who were named in it had died on the day after the Bill received the ſanction of Parliament, yet he was of opinion that it would ſtill have exiſted in full force and authority, as the intention and deſign of Parliament. He would examine the propoſition which was before them.—It was allowed, he ſaid, that they might deſignate the perſon on whom the perſonal exerciſe of the Royal Authority was to devolve; but they were to do no more; they had no right to interfere any farther, they could not go into any conſideration of expediency. He did not now argue about the ſeparation of the parts of the prerogative: theſe arguments might be good for their purpoſe; but if he could demonſtrate the danger of granting, and the inconſequence of not granting, certain parts of the Prerogative, it would be ſufficient for his purpoſe. He would be anſwered, perhaps, that they could not trench on the Prerogative in any of its parts. But was this objection founded on any fixed rule or law? It would apply, indeed, if the Crown was vacant, if they had a King to appoint, as at the time of the Revolution, for the Conſtitution had determined the Kingly Functions. But is the power of the Regent, or any ſubject appointed to the Royal Authority, fixed or defined by the Laws of the Land or the Conſtitution of the Realm?—Let them ſhew that it was the caſe—let them ſhew him that the office of Regent was as clearly defined as that of King, and there was no longer any room for argument.—They might appoint a Regent, and leave it to the Courts of Law to define his powers; but where was the law? And if there exiſted no ſuch a law, it threw them back again on the right. They acted now, becauſe the public ſervice required that they ſhould act; but were they to exerciſe no diſcretion? He admitted, that all the powers might be given, or ſome withheld, for there was no certain courſe of precedent; but in the preſent caſe, it was propoſed to inveſt the Regent with all the Royal Functions but two, and they thus came as near as they could to the Kingly Authority. What had been urged on the ſubject of expediency was plauſible, and it reſolved itſelf into this—whether there was more danger in conceding full power to the Regent, or withholding it? If it was proved that it was neceſſary, then it ſhould be granted; but if the power, though uſeful, was not common nor neceſſary, the danger of giving it ſhould be put in the oppoſite balance, and it ſhould be withheld. As to the power of granting Peerages, the danger was not, that it would prevent the King from returning to power, but that it would cramp him when he ſhould reſume it.—The caſe of the King and the Regent were very different—the former could not conceive the idea of a private ſituation, the latter was to return to the rank of a ſubject. He would certainly impoſe fewer Reſtrictions on the Heir Apparent, the temptations to the abuſe of power would be leſs in the Prince of Wales; but the arguments here were general, and ſuch a proceeding might enable ſome future Regent to ſay that they had acted invidiouſly towards him.

Mr. SHERIDAN ſaid, ſince the very able and luminous ſpeech of an Hon. and learned Gentleman on his ſide (Mr. Leach) had only been contended againſt by the laſt ſpeaker, he took it for granted that the Houſe had heard all the legal arguments from that ſide of the Houſe. As for the other Learned Gentlemen, on hearing the obſervations of his Hon. Friend, they had ſat

"In deathlike ſilence, and in dread repoſe,"

till now, when their oppoſition to it might be conſidered as concentrated and given through one organ to the Houſe. As for the precedent of 1788, the caſe was ſo totally different, that he firmly believed, if the perſon who led to the adoption of the opinions that prevailed (Mr. Pitt) were now alive, he might, without a breach of political conſiſtency, vote againſt the meaſures now propoſed.—(Hear, hear.)—The Right Hon. and Learned Gentleman oppoſite (Mr. Secretary Ryder)—for all theſe Gentlemen had two appellations, and were entitled to that of *learned*, in addition to the uſual denomination applied to the Members of that houſe—that Right Hon. and Learned Gentleman had in his view of the queſtion, referred to a book written by Lord Grenville; and expreſſed his ſurpriſe at an Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Williams Wynne) holding opinions different from thoſe contained in that book. He might ſay, "O! that my friend had not written a book;"—(Much Laughter.)—but ſince it was written, he muſt ſay there was nothing in it that could be held to pledge all thoſe connected or generally agreeing with him. The Right Hon. and Learned Gentleman ſaid, he was ſurpriſed at his Hon. Friend (Mr. Wynne's) holding contrary ſentiments; but did he ſuppoſe that Lord Grenville, when he wrote that work in 1788, conceived he was writing an anſwer for his friend in 1810?—(A laugh.)—If he had, he would have been more cautious in the wording of it.—(Much Laughter.)—But to return to the queſtion. The argument on the other ſide was the precedent, the whole precedent, and nothing but the precedent, of the year 1788. This was now a time to ſpeak out, and how (doing ſo fairly) could they deſcribe this vaunted precedent? It was ſet at a period of diſgrace and ignominy; the work of virulent faction—(Hear, hear, hear.)—on both ſides he did not mean to deny it, and was ſo ſhameful that it ought if poſſible to be forgotten. For himſelf, he was aſhamed of the part he had taken in the debates and contentions of that time. He had the Bill of 1788 in his hand; and in itſelf it ſhewed moſt clearly that it ought not to be taken as a precedent. It pretended to be a meaſure "*to aſſiſt*" His Majeſty in the execution of his Royal Functions, and was a *humbug* without truth from firſt to laſt!—(A laugh.)—He had ſhared in the diſgrace of being on the Committee to examine into precedents in 1788, and he believed the Hon. Member for Yorkſhire (Mr. Wilberforce) was the only other Member now living who had been on that Committee, and the Committee on the preſent occaſion. But their examination into precedents was a mere farce—they had found every thing cut and dry prepared for them; and what with bad Latin and bald French, their Report of the two Precedents they found prepared for them was ſuch that it could never be acted on, or any weight aſſigned to it.—The Right Hon. and Learned Gentleman called on them to ſhew reaſon for giving all the Regal Power to the Regent; but had he ſhewn any reaſon for withholding any part of that power? The precedent on which he built, ſo far from being a guide, ought, in his mind, to be looked to as a beacon and warning to them to keep clear of the rocks on which the Monarchy and the Conſtitution had been wrecked—(Hear, hear, hear.)—It was alſo argued that they ought to be influenced by the ſanction given to thoſe proceedings by his Majeſty on his reſtoration to health. No argument could be more foul and unfair than this, for what did they mean by his Majeſty's Approbation? His Majeſty thanked them for the care they had taken of the Conſtitution, &c. but this was not approving of all their meaſures. But what was his Majeſty's ſpeech?—It was either his private opinion, or given on the reſponſibility of Miniſters.—If the former, it was unparliamentary to uſe it in argument; and if the latter, it was only the approbation of Miniſters of their own act.—The Right Honourable Gentleman then adverted to the Houſes again putting the Great Seal in activity, which he characteriſed as a piece of mummery and folly; and then noticed the arguments of Lord Caſtlereagh for the Peerage Reſtriction, and againſt the Houſehold. He was not averſe that the Prince ſhould have two ſtrings to his bow.—(A laugh). He had taken down the Noble Lord's words, who ſaid, "Suppoſe I were Regent;" a thing by the bye not very likely to happen, even though every ſubject had as good a right as the Prince (A laugh).—"If I were Regent (ſaid the Noble Lord) I would be glad to have this power withheld from me, in order to prevent any contentions that might ariſe between me and my Miniſter." This was one way of eaſing a Regent, by taking from him the power of granting Peerages, in order to prevent diſpute and diſcord with his Miniſter! All he would have to ſay would be, "Let us have no diſſenſions, my Dear Miniſter, the Parliament has provided for all theſe appointments, and left us nothing to do or care about."—This was, indeed, a contrivance to put the Regent on a bed of roſes, but at the ſame time as he ſaid before, it extinguiſhed Royalty. Another *learned* Gentleman had argued that they were bound to conſider the perſonal character of the Sovereign; and that parliament was loſing its conſequence, from parties contending againſt one another.—He acknowledged that the people looked with diſtruſt to all parties; and for this reaſon, that neither of them had performed the promiſes of reform held out to the public.—But what was the ſituation of gentlemen oppoſite? They were ſo conſcious that they poſſeſſed neither principle nor talent to entitle them to the ſupport of the country, that they moſt properly and modeſtly refrained altogether from aſking it!—(Hear, hear, hear.) He alluded to the condition of that body now under the name of the Houſe of Commons, and to the condition of that called the Executive Government. As for the former, he held that it was no Houſe of Commons, or any thing like it; and the latter, it had been maintained more than once from the oppoſite ſide, that no public miſchief could enſue from the taking upon themſelves the exerciſe of the executive authority. Why, the body of Directors they ſaw oppoſite to them, had dared to ſay no public miſchief could enſue from the ſtate of the Executive, as they would take upon themſelves to adminiſter its functions!—They had not ſo good a claim to Supreme Authority as the five Directors who aſſumed the government of France in the year 1795: They were as ſelf conſtituted as thoſe Directors, as Carnot, Rewbell, Barras, and their colleagues. Carnot was a great engineer, but the Junta oppoſite had no character of that deſcription among them!—(A laugh.)—As for Rewbell, he, like moſt of the gentlemen oppoſite, was a lawyer.—(Much laughter.) There was yet another doctrine that had been advanced, which was as ſtrange as that to which he had juſt alluded; it was the notion that the two eſtates grew ſtronger as the third eſtate was removed—nothing could be more fallacious than this—nothing could be more pernicious! So far from its being well founded, the truth was, that the eſſence of the third eſtate ſo completely pervaded and entered into every other branch or part of the conſtitution, that its abſence paralyzed the other two eſtates, and rendered them, inſtead of ſtronger weaker than it would be if they exiſted in full vigour. Without it they were a ſheer hulk, bereft of rigging, maſts, or rudder. They had a Speaker to be ſure, in the chair—that was a great condeſcenſion on his part—but it happened in 1788, that a new Speaker was choſen, and Mr. Grenville, on whom the voice of the houſe conferred that high ſtation, doubted whether he could take the chair or no. Even now it was a doubtful point, whether or not he was really ſpeaker. In other reſpects what were they? Had they any of their conſtitutional committees? Had they a committee of trade? Had they a committee of religion? No; they were devoid of all theſe matters, which would ſhew them to be a Houſe of Commons.—Did they ever print their votes? No; the clerk, indeed, might take down ſhort notices of them, in order that they might be printed afterwards, when full conſtitutional authority appeared to give directions to that effect; but the fact was, that they had neither the ſhape or the appearance of a parliament. They might by a political juggle, apply the Great Seal; but this was nothing more than a mere trick of Legerdemain, by which they could aſſume the front and ſemblance of a parliament.—Whatever we thought of ſuſpending governments was immaterial, when compared to what might be the arguments of an arch enemy whoſe ſoul was occupied with the idea of our humiliation, and whoſe whole mind was on the ſtretch to catch reaſons to injure us. That liberty which had been ſaid to cheriſh the cottage and limit the throne, he had turned to depopulate the cottage, and erect more thrones in Europe than it ever ſaw erected before. He has created them every where? and what a triumph muſt it be for him, when he addreſſed his vaſſal kings, complaining of being made only the inſtruments of his cruelty and oppreſſion, to be able to tell them that in Britain the ſame ſyſtem was purſued, and to the Supreme Executive authority was given only the rigours of his majeſty, without the power to diſpenſe favours or rewards!—He (Mr. Sheridan) felt for thoſe whom the tyrant enthroned, but caſhiered as ſoon as he obſerved they had done any thing to gain the affection, of the people over whom they were appointed. This was not his ſervice; he placed them on a pillar which he called a throne, and he placed a whip of ſcorpions in their hand for a ſceptre.—It was impoſſible for language to overrate the dangers of the conteſt we were engaged in.—We had yet to maintain a glorious ſtruggle for the beſt and nobleſt condition of human ſociety.—He begged of them not to make the deſperate experiment of trying what, at ſuch a criſis, could be done with an executive, ſent forth, armed with half a ſhield and broken ſpear, to defend the right's of nature's ſelf and the cauſe of our creator.—Loud cheers and applauſes from every part of the houſe.

There are no fewer than twenty-ſix members of the two Houſes of Parliament who have places in the Royal houſehold. The four great officers of the houſehold have places under them to the amount of near 10,000l. a year; and the expenditure, of which they have the direction, is above 400,000l. a year.

The following are the number of officers of the houſehold having ſeats in the Lords or Commons Houſe:—

Bed Chamber Lords	12
*Lord Chamberlain	1
Lord Steward	1
Maſter of the Horſe	1
Groom of the Stole	1
Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Penſioners	1
Captain of the Yeoman Guard	1
King's Vice Chamberlain	1
Groom of the Bed Chamber	1
Gentleman of the Privy Chamber	1
Treaſurer of the Houſehold	1
Comptroller of Ditto	1
Printer	1
Queen's Chamberlain	1
Vice Ditto	1
* Now Vacant.	—26

WATERFORD—Printed and Publiſhed by the Proprietor,
ARTHUR BIRNIE, Bookſeller, Quay.

myſelf the power of diſpenſing, for that purpoſe, with the expreſs proviſions of the laws by which my official duties are regulated.

But if your lordſhip ſhall think it proper to ſubmit this difficulty to the conſideration of the two Houſes of Parliament, they have declared, that with them reſts the right and duty to provide the means of removing it. With them reſides, under the preſent exigency, the power to command thoſe official ſeals, the uſe of which would conſtitute an imperative and unqueſtionable authority to the officers of the Exchequer; with them reſts the diſcretion of judging in what other manner they may think it more fit to provide a ſufficient warrant or ſanction for any iſſue which they may determine to be requiſite for the public intereſts; and I certainly ſhould not fail to defer to their pleaſure with entire ſubmiſſion, and to execute with the moſt implicit obedience, any orders which I ſhall receive from your Lordſhips, under the ſanction of their authority.

I have the honour to be, &c.
(Signed) GRENVILLE, Auditor.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS, JANUARY 5.

CONFERENCE WITH THE COMMONS.

Lord CLIVE, accompanied by ſeveral Members, were introduced to the bar, when he delivered a Meſſage from the Commons, requeſting a conference with their Lordſhips.

The LORD CHANCELLOR put the queſtion, which being carried affirmatively, the Meſſengers of the Commons were informed, that their Lordſhips had agreed to hold the deſired conference, and that the ſame ſhould be preſently held in the Painted Chamber.

The Meſſengers having retired from the bar, a Deputation was appointed to manage the Conference on the part of their Lordſhips.

The Houſe then adjourned during pleaſure.

After a few minutes had elapſed, the Deputation returned, and the Houſe reſuming,

The LORD PRESIDENT (Earl CAMDEN) acquainted the Houſe, that the deſired Conference was held with the Commons, who communicated certain Reſolutions voted by that Houſe, to which they requeſted the concurrence of their Lordſhips, and which he moved might be read by the Clerk.

The Reſolutions voted laſt night by the Houſe of Commons were then read, viz

"Reſolved, That for the purpoſe of providing for the exerciſe of the Royal Authority during the continuance of his Majeſty's illneſs, in ſuch manner, and to ſuch extent, as the preſent circumſtances, and the urgent concerns of the nation, appear to require, it is expedient that his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales, being reſident within the realm, ſhall be empowered to exerciſe and adminiſter the Royal Authority, according to the Laws and Conſtitution of Great Britain, in the name, and on the behalf of his Majeſty, all Authorities, Prerogatives, Acts of Government, and Adminiſtration of the ſame, that belong to the king of this realm to uſe, execute, and perform, according to the law thereof, ſubject to ſuch limitations and reſtrictions as ſhall be provided.

"Reſolved, That for a time to be limited, the power ſo to be given to his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales, ſhall not extend to the granting of any rank or dignity of the Peerage of the realm to any perſon whatever, except ſuch perſon or perſons as may perform ſome ſingular naval or military atchievement. That for a time to be limited, the ſaid power ſhall not extend to the granting of any office whatever in reverſion, or to the granting of any office, ſalary, or premium, for any other term than during his Majeſty's pleaſure, except ſuch offices as are by law required to be granted for life or during good behaviour.

"Reſolved, That ſuch parts of his Majeſty's private property as are not veſted in truſtees ſhall be veſted in truſtees for the benefit of his Majeſty.

"Reſolved, That the ſaid power ſhall not extend to the granting of any part of his Majeſty's real or perſonal eſtate, except as far as relates to the renewal of leaſes.

"Reſolved, That the care of his Majeſty's Royal Perſon, during the continuance of his Majeſty's illneſs, ſhall be committed to the Queen's moſt Excellent Majeſty; together with the ſole direction of ſuch portion of his Majeſty's Houſehold as ſhall be deemed requiſite and ſuitable for the due attendance on his Majeſty's ſacred perſon, and the maintenance of his Royal Dignity; and that for the better enabling her Majeſty to diſcharge this important truſt, it is alſo expedient that a council ſhall be appointed to adviſe and aſſiſt her Majeſty in the ſeveral matters aforeſaid; and with power, from time to time, as they may ſee cauſe, to examine, upon oath, the phyſicians and others attending his Majeſty's perſon, touching the ſtate of his Majeſty's health, and all matters relative thereto."

The Earl of LIVERPOOL then moved, that this Houſe do to-morrow reſolve itſelf into a Committee, to take into conſideration the State of the Nation; and that the Reſolutions now communicated to their Lordſhips by the Commons, be referred to the ſaid Committee—Ordered.

ISSUES OF MONEY.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL then obſerved, that as the ſubject of iſſues of the public money had been recently touched upon in debate; and that ſome miſconception may have obtained upon that important topic—it was propoſed that the real ſtate of that caſe ſhould be known, and in that view he would move—

"That there be laid before the Houſe a Copy of the Warrant from the Lords of the Treaſury to the Auditor of the Exchequer. And alſo that a copy of the Correſpondence between the Lords of the Treaſury and the Auditor of the Exchequer, on the 31ſt of December, be laid before the Houſe."

Lord GRENVILLE ſhortly obſerved, that he had no objection to the motion.

The queſtion was then put, and it was ordered accordingly.

The houſe then adjourned till to-morrow.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4.

STATE OF THE NATION.

The Order of the Day being moved,

The Earl of LIVERPOOL ſaid, that in calling the attention of the Houſe to the reſolutions which were then before them, he ſhould take an opportunity to ſay a few words, without intending any diſreſpect to the Illuſtrious Perſon ſo nearly allied to the Throne, and who was the ſubject of the Reſolutions. A King holds all his rights in truſt for the people; he does ſo by law, and his office is permanent. A Regent, on the other hand, is called to aſſume a temporary power, which makes a difference between the power of the King and that of a Regent. The principle on which he ſtood was, that the intereſts of the one being permanent, that alone was a ſufficient ſecurity; but the other being merely temporary, it ſhould be looked at with conſiderable jealouſy. The limitations propoſed were only to exiſt for 12 months, and after Parliament had ſat for ſix weeks, in order to give time to conſider the propriety of removing theſe reſtrictions. All the other reſolutions he would paſs over, but he muſt fairly own that he thought the houſe could not agree to the fifth, in the ſhape in which it had been brought up to the Houſe. In every former inſtance of Regency it was cuſtomary to confide the care of the Sovereign's perſon to the Regent, but in this it had been agreed on all hands that the cuſtody of his majeſty's perſon ſhould be given to the Queen; and for the comfort of his majeſty, it muſt follow of courſe that the care of the Houſehold ſhould be in the ſame hands. His Lordſhip concluded by moving that all the reſolutions be agreed to as they came from the Commons, except the fifth, to which he propoſed, by way of amendment, that the houſehold officers of his Majeſty ſhould remain as they now are, for a time to be limited.

The EARL of CARLISLE was of opinion, that the Executive Power ſhould be delivered over unimpaired to the perſon whom, under ſuch circumſtances, they ſhould think fit to appoint to it.

The MARQUIS of LANSDOWNE ſaid, that the houſe was going to abſolute creation of a power new to the conſtitution. It had been ſaid, that in the courſe of a year it would be ſeen how the Regent managed the Houſehold; but would they ſay, that the man over whom they intended to place no reſtrictions, as far as related to the management of our fleets, our armies, and millions of Public money, that he was unfit to arrange the affairs of the Houſehold? His Lordſhip then concluded by moving, as an amendment, that all the words in the firſt Reſolution, "ſubject to ſuch limitations and reſtrictions as ſhould afterwards be provided," ſhould be left out.

Lord SIDMOUTH ſtrongly ſupported the meaſure of reſtrictions.

Lord ERSKINE contended, that there could be no danger from granting the full powers of Royalty to the Regent, for fear of his Majeſty being prevented, on his reſtoration to health and full vigour of mind, from reſuming all his former functions, as in ſuch a caſe they had the authority and ſecurity of Parliament itſelf for his being reſtored to his full powers of Government, when he ſhould be reſtored to his full powers of mind.

The LORD CHANCELLOR aſſerted that the Regent, in former precedents, did not poſſeſs any thing like the powers which it was propoſed by this Act to inveſt the Regent with. If the reſtrictions were not paſſed, he contended that his Majeſty would not poſſeſs the ſame advantages which the meaneſt of his ſubjects could enjoy.

Earl SPENCER aſſerted the free and unreſtricted exerciſe of the Royal authority.

The Earl of SELKIRK ſupported the amendment.

The Earl CLANCARTY ſpoke in favour of the reſtrictions.

The Duke of NORFOLK ſupported the amendment.

Lord HOLLAND entered at large into the precedent of 1789, and contended that the reſtrictions ſought to be impoſed on the Prince were unconſtitutional in the extreme.

Lord GRENVILLE entered into a hiſtory and defence of his conduct on the former queſtion of Regency. He contended, that the two Houſes of Parliament poſſeſſed the right of providing for any defect, whether in the Legiſlature or the Executive, and that their powers were only bounded by the neceſſity of the caſe. His opinion with reſpect to Reſtrictions depended on their nature and expediency. He oppoſed that which regarded the Peerage, and preferred a general reſtriction to exceptions. With reſpect to the Reſolution relative to the Houſehold, he gave a decided preference to the propoſition which came from the Houſe of Commons, over that which was brought forward by the Noble Secretary of State.

Lord HOLLAND ſpoke in explanation.

Their Lordſhips then divided, and Strangers were excluded, when there appeared on the Marquis of LANSDOWNE's Amendment—

Contents	105
Non Contents	102
Majority againſt Miniſters	3

We underſtand that the Earl of LIVERPOOL moved an Amendment on the 2d Reſolution, conformable to the idea held out by Lord GRENVILLE, to make all Reſtrictions to the Peerage on an equality.

Their Lordſhips divided, when there appeared—

Contents	106
Non Contents	100
Majority in favour of Miniſters	6

Their Lordſhips then divided on the Earl of LIVERPOOL's Amendment to the 5th Reſolution relative to the Houſehold:—

Contents	97
Non Contents	110
Majority againſt Miniſters	13

The Houſe reſumed—and we underſtand that Miniſters moved that proxies ſhould be allowed to be taken on the Report's being received; a conſiderable diſcuſſion aroſe, which ended in a diviſion, when there appeared—

Contents	99
Non Contents	102
Majority againſt Miniſters	3

The Report was then brought up, and the Earl of LIVERPOOL moved the ſame Amendment as he did in the Committee, which was negatived without a diviſion, and the Report was of courſe agreed to.

Their Lordſhips adjourned at half paſt five o'clock, to this day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 3.

ISSUES OF MONEY.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER roſe to ſtate to the Houſe, that a ſerious difficulty had ariſen between the departments of the Treaſury and the Exchequer, about the iſſue of money for the uſe of the army and navy. He ſhould therefore confine himſelf to moving for ſuch papers as he thought would be ſufficient to put the Houſe in poſſeſſion of the circumſtances, and he wiſhed to-morrow to ſtate the matter to a Committee of the Houſe. Thoſe papers were, the Copy of the Warrant from the Lord High Treaſurer to the Auditor of the Exchequer, dated on the 31ſt of laſt December, together with all the correſpondence relative thereto. He thought he perceived that his motion would be oppoſed on the other ſide, as being made without notice, (No, no, from the Oppoſition Benches.)

Mr. PONSONBY ſaid, that the Right Hon. Gent. was indeed very much miſtaken in ſuppoſing that it had been the intention of Gentlemen on that ſide of the Houſe, to object merely for want of notice of a motion of ſuch urgency. He hoped, however, that the Right Hon. Gent. would now move for every paper which would be neceſſary to enable the Houſe perfectly to judge of the caſe which was to come before it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER felt thankful to the Hon. Gent. on the other ſide for their forbearance on this occaſion. He thought he ſhould be able to ſhew ſufficiently to the Houſe, that no public inconvenience had reſulted from this difficulty not having been earlier brought under their conſideration. If the Houſe ſhould think it neceſſary to have ſomething more formal than the ſtatement, he would endeavour to procure other documents to ſupport it. The caſe was ſhortly this.

The Act, called the Exchequer Act, requires that iſſues of money from the Exchequer ſhall only be made by the authority of the Great Seal, the Privy Seal, or the directions of an Act of Parliament. It appeared to the Lords of the Treaſury, that, as certain ſums of money had been expreſsly appropriated by an Act of Parliament for thoſe particular ſervices, the Exchequer on iſſuing thoſe monies on the warrant of the firſt Lord of the Treaſury, would have been ſtrictly juſtifiable, as iſſuing it under the directions of an Act of Parliament. This had been the common practice of the Exchequer; but, nevertheleſs, upon conſulting the Attorney and Solicitor-General upon the legality of iſſues under ſuch warrant, they were not of opinion that under the ſtrict conſtruction of the words of the Act ſuch payments could be conſidered as payments under the direction of an Act of Parliament. In order, then, to give legality to the warrant, he next applied to the Great Seal; but, although the officer to whom the Great Seal is entruſted, was moſt perfectly ready to take the full reſponſibility on himſelf of any act which the duties of his office might require; yet, it was found that there were no inſtances of any money iſſued upon warrants under the Great Seal for public ſervices of this deſcription, or for any other purpoſes but what were connected with the Great Seal, or the office of Lord Chancellor. He then found it neceſſary to ſee whether the Privy Seal could not be obtained, for if it was, there was no doubt of the legality of the warrant, and if it would have been the duty of the Exchequer to have iſſued the money, although the perſons were to be hanged who made ſuch uſe of the Privy Seal. He at firſt thought that the keeper of the Privy Seal was the only perſon reſponſible; and that officer was, as well as the reſt of his majeſty's miniſters, perfectly diſpoſed to encounter the reſponſibility of every act which the public ſervice might require to be done in his department. It appeared, however, that he was not the only reſponſible perſon; for by the act, the Clerk of the Privy Seal muſt be atteſted by his ſignature. His Majeſty's Miniſters would have wiſhed, as far as it could poſſibly be done, to take the whole of the reſponſibility upon themſelves; but this could not be done, and the clerk of the Privy Seal appeared not only indiſpoſed to give his ſignature, but ſaid he was bound by virtue of his oath to refuſe his ſignature. This was a difficulty which it was not eaſy to ſurmount, nor could it be expected that even the reſolutions of the Houſe of Commons would overcome the religious ſcruples of a conſcientious man. It appeared neceſſary, then, to paſs an Act of Parliament to ſuſpend *pro tanto*, either the oath or the neceſſity of his ſignature. If the Houſe wiſhed a corroboration of this ſtatement, he would endeavour to procure, before to-morrow, a letter from Mr. Larpent, ſtating his objections to affixing his ſignature.

If the Houſe wiſhed the papers to be printed, he would move accordingly,

Mr. TIERNEY ſaid, that from what had been ſtated, he was very deſirous to ſee the correſpondence between the Rt. Hon. Gent. and the Clerk of the Privy Seal.

Lord TEMPLE ſaid, that he hoped the Houſe would not think it neceſſary to have theſe papers printed.

The converſation on this ſubject then ended, and the Houſe adjourned.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4.

ISSUE OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Mr. PERCEVAL moved, that there be laid before the Houſe the copy of a letter from the Clerks of the Privy Seal, ſtating their reaſons why they had not paſſed warrants for certain ſums of money for the payment of the army and navy.

Mr. PERCEVAL moved, that the Houſe ſhould reſolve itſelf into a Committee to take the correſpondence into conſideration.

Mr. TIERNEY objected to ſuch a Committee in the preſent ſtate of the country. That Houſe was not now a Houſe of Parliament; and therefore could not go into a Committee for the conſideration of pecuniary matters.

Mr. PERCEVAL admitted it would be better to refer this buſineſs to the Committee on the State of the Nation; and he would be ready to do ſo, had not ſuch Committee been put off till Tueſday next.

Mr. TIERNEY obſerved, that it had been acknowledged that nothing ought to be done by the Houſe but what was ſtrictly neceſſary. He ſaw no objection to going into a Committee on the ſtate of the nation this day. If another courſe were adopted, the Houſe might go into a Committee for any purpoſe whatever.

The SPEAKER ſaid it was not, however, uſual for the Houſe, when an order had been made for a Committee to ſit on a certain day, to alter that order, and to advance the term of ſuch a ſitting. If the Houſe were willing to alter that uſual mode of proceeding, it was not for him to interfere. During the ſuſpenſion of the Kingly power, the Houſe was certainly bound not to proceed farther than neceſſary; yet the Houſe would recollect, that during the ſuſpenſion of Regal functions at the Revolution, and, and at the Reſtoration, a great variety of matters had been ſubmitted to the Houſe, and tranſacted by them; and eſpecially money matters, in the latter inſtance. The Houſe, comparing theſe precedents, might form an opinion on the way they were to act. They had, in fact, no other rules but the neceſſity of the caſe.

After ſome obſervations from Mr. Adam, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Ponſonby, and others, the motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair was carried *nem. con.* and the Houſe reſolved into a Committee of the whole Houſe.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER begged clearly to be underſtood, that the warrant iſſued by the Treaſury, ſolely and entirely related to the iſſue of money already granted by Parliament for particular ſervices. He thought that the King's ſignature would, in this caſe, if in any, be conſidered as a mere matter of form. Men intruſted with delegated authority, were not on the ſuſpenſion of Kingly powers to apply to Parliament in every caſe, nor could they. The preſent was a caſe of moſt urgent neceſſity, money was wanting for the ſea and land forces, and no money could be iſſued. The Right Hon. Gent. concluded by moving Reſolutions, the ſubſtance of which was as follows:

"That it was neceſſary, that the ſums voted and appropriated by Parliament ſhould be iſſued.

"That it was expedient that the Lords of the Treaſury ſhould be empowered to direct ſuch an iſſue by their Warrant, and that the Auditor of the Exchequer ſhould be authoriſed and commanded to obey their Warrant of the 31ſt of December, and ſuch other Warrants as they ſhould in future iſſue in like manner.

—On the queſtion being put,

Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT approved the conduct of the Miniſter, which he thought the beſt that could be adopted.

Lord TEMPLE ſaid, the exigency of the caſe on which the Right Hon. Gent. founded his mode of proceeding was to be attributed ſolely to himſelf. He denied that the clauſes of the act could, at any time, diſpenſe with the forms eſtabliſhed in the Exchequer Office. But for the conduct of his noble relative, the Right Hon. Gent. would not have been in a hurry to ſupply the deficiency of the Executive Power, as long as he could have procured money to proceed; and he would call the attention of the Houſe to the ſtate in which the country would have been plunged, with all its reſources at the uncontrouled command of Miniſters.

Mr. ROSE juſtified the conduct of the Miniſters.

Mr. PONSONBY ſaid, he would praiſe a Miniſter who took upon him the reſponſibility which promoted the welfare of his country, but he would ever [illegible] on that Miniſter, who took on himſelf reſponſibility for the wounding of the Conſtitution.

Mr. DUNDAS ſupported the Reſolution.

Sir A. PAGET defended the conduct of Lord Grenville.

Mr. YORKE contended that the proceedings in Parliament had ſanctioned all that was now propoſed.

Meſſrs. Tierney, C. Wynne, Whitbread, and Horner, oppoſed the Reſolutions.

The original queſtion was then carried, and the Report of the Committee read and agreed to. After which the Reſolutions were ordered to be ſubmitted to the Lords this day.—Adjourned.

LONDON.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4.

The following is the bulletin ſhewn this day at St. James's Palace:—

Windſor Caſtle, Jan 4.

"His Majeſty continues as well as he was yeſterday. (Signed as uſual)

We have received Spaniſh papers to the 13th laſt, containing a Decree of the Cortes, aboliſhing all ſupernumerary places and employments.

Some French and Dutch papers to the 30th ult. have been received. The accounts from Amſterdam of the 25th, we regret to ſtate, confirm the loſs of his majeſty's ſhip Minotaur, of 74 guns, Captain Barrett, on the Dutch Coaſt. It appears that ſhe ſtruck on the Sands near the Iſle of Boſch, in a tremendous ſtorm, on the evening of the 22d; and that of the crew, 110, or at moſt 120 only, including a Lieutenant, were ſaved.

Accounts from the North of Germany ſtate, that official notice had been given at Hamburgh, Lubeck, and Bremen, of the determination of the French Government to annex the whole of thoſe cities to France, from the 1ſt of the preſent month.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5.

"WINDSOR CASTLE, JANUARY 5.

"His Majeſty has paſſed another quiet night, and remains very much in the ſame ſtate as for ſome days paſt. (Signed as uſual.)

Conſiderable reinforcements have failed within theſe few days from Portſmouth and Plymouth for Portugal. The wind has been fair ever ſince they ſailed.

We are ſorry to learn, that during the dreadful gale of laſt night from the North Eaſt, not leſs than twenty ſmall fiſhing, and other veſſels, have been loſt at Graveſend, and in other parts of the river.

Waterford Chronicle.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10.

Since our laſt, the London Journals of Friday and Saturday have arrived—No mail due.

In our laſt publication, and after the moſt careful examination, we gave what we believed to be an accurate account of the reſult of the debate in the Commons, on the amendment moved by Lord Porcheſter, which went to inveſt the Regent with the full and unreſtricted functions of Royalty. In that ſtatement we were borne out by all the London Journals, with the exception of the *Courier*, whoſe ſingle authority we could hardly venture to ſet in oppoſition to numerous and at leaſt as reſpectable teſtimonies. It has, however, ſince appeared, that theſe teſtimonies were in error, as they have themſelves acknowledged; and we embrace the firſt opportunity of doing juſtice to the *Courier*, and of placing the matter in its proper light. For this purpoſe, it will be neceſſary to re-ſtate part of Mr. Perceval's fifth Reſolution, together with the amendment moved to it by Lord Gower.

By Mr. Perceval's fifth Reſolution it was ſpecially provided, "that the care of his Majeſty's Perſon ſhould be committed to the Queen, and THAT HER MAJESTY SHOULD HAVE THE POWER TO REMOVE FROM, AND TO NOMINATE AND APPOINT SUCH PERSONS AS SHE SHOULD THINK PROPER TO THE SEVERAL OFFICES IN HIS MAJESTY'S HOUSEHOLD, and to diſpoſe, order, manage, &c." To this Reſolution Lord Gower moved the following amendment, viz. "that the care of his Majeſty's Perſon ſhould be committed to the Queen, TOGETHER WITH THE SOLE DIRECTION OF SUCH PORTION OF HIS MAJESTY'S HOUSEHOLD AS SHALL BE DEEMED REQUISITE AND SUITABLE, &c."—It will be recollected, that all the Reſolutions, except the fifth, were carried by Miniſters on the firſt night of diſcuſſion, that one having been reſerved by Mr. Perceval as the ſubject of debate for the ſucceeding night. It was then moved by Mr. Perceval, when the amended Reſolution of Lord Gower was carried by a majority of 13. On the third night of inquiry, when all the Reſolutions were brought up, no diviſion took place on any propoſal from the Oppoſition, as had been erroneouſly ſtated with reſpect to Lord Porcheſter's amendment; but Mr. Perceval moved an amendment upon the laſt, the fifth and favourite Reſolution of his, which went to do away Lord Gower's alterations, and to reſtore it to the ſtate in which it was originally propoſed. It was upon this, and not upon Lord Porcheſter's motion, that the Houſe divided, when this ſame Reſolution, which had been negatived the night before by a majority of 13, had nearly been recalled to life, having had only a majority of 3 againſt it. It is added, that Mr. Perceval, in bringing this Reſolution once more before the Houſe, *had nothing else in view than* [illegible] *recording upon the Journals the* [illegible] *as at firſt propoſed.*

[illegible] the *Courier*, in which we [illegible] facts neceſſary to [illegible] underſtood. When the Houſe comes to a diviſion, the gallery is cleared, and the Reporters of debates obliged to withdraw, ſo that they have no means of information left, except to gather the reſult of the votes as well as they can.—This circumſtance at once accounts for the error that was committed, and proves, as is indeed been aſſerted and not denied, that the *Courier* ſent forth what may be called an official and Miniſterial Bulletin upon the occaſion, materially differing, however, from their uſual documents of this kind, as it has conveyed to the public ſomething like information. The majorities of 13 and 3 are pointedly contraſted, as a ſymptom of returning ſtrength, and as an alluring bait to ſoldiers who are prudently ſhy in thoſe hot and dubious battles. But the moſt extraordinary part of the whole proceeding is the aſſertion, that Mr. Perceval only wiſhed to have his words recorded on the Journals of the Houſe. We take it as given by the Miniſterial papers, and not as actually the avowed intention of a Member of the Houſe; and in this view of it we aſk, was this really all that was in contemplation? Was not the Houſe thinner than when the motion was firſt rejected? Might not ſome of its opponents have been abſent, never ſuſpecting its reſurrection from the dead? Might not the new attempt have been premeditated, and its ſupporters duly ſummoned to the onſet? Is there no art in politics—no ſuch thing as taking an enemy by ſurpriſe? Suppoſe that Mr. Perceval really intended to bring this abortive offſpring back again to life, what would have been the conſequence?—A mere ſimple record, that it once had exiſtence, occupied all the talents of St. Stephen's for a whole day, and then conſigned its parent's name to immortality. No ſuch thing as this. It required no ſecond examination to diſplay its qualities, and Mr. Perceval needs no ſuch monuments of his fame. If this very critical majority of three had been abſent, the Reſolution muſt have been entered on the records of the Houſe in its native form, and tranſmitted to the Lords for their approbation, as the regular and ſanctioned deed of the Commons. In all this there is much food for reflection, and here we leave the ſtory.

We now turn to other Miniſterial defeats, over which no ambiguity appears to be ſuſpended. The whole Reſolutions, which will be found in our columns as altered by the Commons, underwent a long diſcuſſion in the Lords on Friday, the 4th, in which all thoſe opinions and arguments, already before the public in a variety of forms, were advanced and maintained by both ſides of the Houſe.—The general reſult was, the defeat of Miniſters on no fewer than four different diviſions. Some of the London Journals confine the number to three; but the *Courier* ſtates them as we have mentioned, and it is ſcarcely to be ſuppoſed, that it would willingly commit an error on ſuch an occaſion. The firſt diviſion was on Lord Lanſdowne's amendment, for leaving out the words "Reſtrictions and Limitations," which was carried by a majority of 3. The next defeat occurred on the ſubject of the King's Houſehold, with reſpect to which Lord Liverpool moved to reſtore the words as they originally ſtood, ſo as to take the whole of the Royal Houſehold out of the hands of the Regent, in the ſame way as Mr. Perceval had propoſed to amend the fifth Reſolution in the Commons: on this motion there was a majority of 13 againſt Miniſters. A third defeat was on a motion by Lord Moira, viz. "That the whole Report on the Reſolutions be now brought up;" immediately upon this Lord Kenyon moved an adjournment, againſt which a very general cry roſe in the Houſe, and Lord Liverpool declared that, if they came to a diviſion, he ſhould call Proxies: a diviſion, however, was reſorted to, and the motion for an adjournment loſt by a majority of three. The fourth defeat was on the queſtion, whether proxies ſhould be taken, or not, on which there was alſo a majority of 3 againſt Miniſters.—The report was then brought up, and agreed to without a diviſion. There was another diviſion in the Houſe, in which Miniſters had a majority of 6, and which occurred on the following ground. On the queſtion reſpecting the reſtriction of granting Peerages, Lord Liverpool moved to leave out that part of the Reſolution which gave the Regent power of conferring them on Naval and Military officers. On this point Lord Grenville ſaid, that, in conſiſtency with his declaration, he muſt vote with Miniſters, as he preferred reſtricting the granting of Peerages altogether, rather than that there ſhould be invidious diſtinctions. Miniſters, therefore, ſupported by Lord Grenville and ſome of his friends, had a majority of 6 in favour of Lord Liverpool's amendment. The Reſolutions reſpecting the King's private property, and the granting of places for life, were agreed to without a diviſion. After the five Reſolutions were gone through, the Marquis of Lanſdowne ſaid, "though the Committee had clearly decided by the firſt Reſolution, that the Prince ſhould be appointed Regent without Limitations or Reſtrictions, yet, as by the next Reſolution they had agreed there ſhould be a Reſtriction on him for a certain time (ſix months only, as far as we can learn from the Reports of the diſcuſſion) againſt the creation of Peers, the firſt Reſolution was, therefore, inconſiſtent with the ſecond. He, therefore, declared that, though he had a majority on the queſtion, and that Miniſters were beaten, he would withdraw his amendment, and, on the Report being brought up, agree with the Reſolution as it came from the Commons. Lord Lanſdowne's proceeding on this head accounts for the circumſtance of Lord Porcheſter's amendment not having been preſſed to a diviſion in the Commons, and at the ſame time ſhews, that the Oppoſition are willing to bind the Regent by ſuch limitations of his authority as they do not deem to be unconſtitutional, or injurious to the great intereſts of the Empire. Their opinion, however, cannot decide the queſtion, and it will continue to be the doctrine of many, that the Royal Prerogative ought not for an inſtant, nor in any one of its legitimate functions, to be ſuſpended.

Our Readers have now before them a clear, and, as far as we are able to diſcover, a correct ſtatement of the iſſue of the diſcuſſion in the Lords. It announces ſo complete an overthrow of Miniſters as to render their ultimate fate a matter of almoſt moral certainty. Even the ſingle inſtance in which they triumphed is evidence of their feebleneſs and inſtability, for on that occaſion they were ſupported by ſome of the moſt ſtedfaſt friends of the Prince, without whoſe aid they muſt here alſo have fallen to the ground. But we muſt leave the ſubject, as an occurrence, which will excite the attention of the public in no common degree, calls for ſome particular though brief obſervations.

Miniſters are involved in a new and ſerious difficulty, in conſequence of the Sign Manual being wanting to direct the iſſue of public money from the Exchequer. The plain ſtatement of the caſe is as follows. No public money can be iſſued, except on warrants under the Great Seal, the Privy Seal, or by Act of Parliament. There is no Act of Parliament to meet the preſent emergency; the Great Seal is only uſed for iſſues of money for civil purpoſes; and the Privy Seal, the only mode left, is crippled of its authority by the conſcientious ſcruples of the Deputy Privy Seal (Mr. Larpent) whoſe ſignature is as neceſſary to give validity to ſuch warrants as that of the Lord Privy Seal (the Earl Weſtmoreland) himſelf, who, it ſeems, has no ſuch ſcruples. After a conſiderable demur, it was recommended by Lord Grenville to the Miniſter, that he ſhould ſubmit the caſe to Parliament. This courſe has been adopted, and three Reſolutions on the ſubject, moved by Mr. Perceval, have already paſſed the Commons, and have been ordered to be tranſmitted to the Lords for their concurrence. The firſt expreſſes the neceſſity, in the preſent juncture and during the ſuſpenſion of the Royal Authority, that various ſums ſhould be iſſued for the Navy, Army and Ordnance; the ſecond provides that the Lords of the Treaſury ſhould iſſue their warrants to the Auditor and other officers of the Exchequer; and the third, that the ſaid officers be authoriſed and commanded to pay the ſums of money contained in the ſaid warrants. Such is the ſimple but deeply important event, which has been produced by the protracted delays of Miniſterial ambition. There can be no doubt about the reſult of the application to Parliament, for no party, at ſuch a criſis as the preſent, will throw impediments in the way of the public ſervice; but what a view does this tranſaction give of the extent to which Miniſters have gone, and would ſtill go, in the exerciſe on their own authority of the prerogatives of the Crown? And what an irreſiſtible condemnation does it afford of the procraſtinating meaſures which have been purſued?

The documents which this event has produced are inſerted at large; and they will be found peculiarly intereſting. Although this is hardly "a time to laugh," yet we cannot help mentioning a ludicrous coincident noticed by an Engliſh Journal.—Mr. Larpent, who refuſed to put his Seal to the warrant, is the Licenſer of Plays, and the Gentleman violently attacked, a conſiderable time ago, as a Methodiſt by Mr. Theodore Hook, in the Preface to his Farce intitled *Killing no Murder*. In the preſent inſtance, ſays the paper to which we allude, he has thrown the performance of the Company calling themſelves his Majeſty's Servants into the ſame confuſion, by refuſing his licence to their *laſt Act*.

The Reſolutions of the Commons, on the above ſubject, came under diſcuſſion in the Lords on the evening of Saturday, and although the reſult was not known at the departure of the poſt, there was ſuch a general concurrence of opinion, (mixed indeed with ſevere remarks on the conduct of miniſters) that its paſſing was a matter of certainty. On the ſame evening, the Regency Reſolutions, as ſent down from the Lords, were re-committed for Monday in the Commons, to which day the Houſe adjourned.

The *Stateſman* of Saturday ſays, that a confidential meeting of Miniſters, with the exception of Lord Wellesley, took place the day before, when Mr. Perceval, aware of his defeat, propoſed that he himſelf would move an Addreſs to the Prince, to aſſume the Regency without reſtriction, and to accompany the Addreſs with his own reſignation: this propoſal was rejected by the Members preſent, who ſaid there was ſtill a chance of his Majeſty's recovery.

A correſpondence, between the Miniſters of Napoleon and Joſeph Bonaparte, is ſaid to have been intercepted in Spain, containing the details of a plan for the annexations of the Spaniſh and Italian Peninſulæ to France. It is added, that Joſeph Bonaparte was to have met the fate of his brother Louis. Not having ſeen the correſpondence itſelf, we cannot venture to paſs any judgment on its value; but we may obſerve, that experience has thought the public the value of incredulity on ſuch ſubjects.

Talleyrand is ſaid to be reinſtated in the favour of his Maſter. The interference of Fouche in the negociation with England is ſaid to have been the cauſe of his diſgrace.

The *Dublin Correſpondent* of Tueſday ſtates, that recent letters from Paris bring accounts, that Bonaparte ſtill purſues his rigorous meaſures againſt American Commerce, and that theſe will be continued till the revival of the Non-Intercourſe act againſt England.

It was very confidently aſſerted in Dublin, that the Marquis of Stafford would ſucceed the Duke of Richmond, as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

R. S. Carew, Jun. Eſq. has offered himſelf a Candidate as one of Repreſentatives of the County of Wexford. His Addreſs to the Electors, which is ſhort, is in a ſtyle far ſuperior to the general run of appeals of this kind. The following ſtriking extract from it is entitled to whatever additional publicity we can give it; and we truſt, that there is not a heart in the Empire which will not cordially approve of the ſentiments it contains. The Citizens of Waterford in particular will hail with pleaſure this evidence of the mild but firm and independent virtues of the Father riſing into brightneſs in the Son:—

"By an active and honeſt diſcharge of my Truſt and by a line of conduct conciliatory to all my Fellow Subjects, by allaying public animoſities, and thereby promoting the proſperity of my Country and the ſtrength of the Empire at large, I conceive I ſhall beſt entitle myſelf to your Future Favour. I wiſh to be judged by my *Actions*, not by my *profeſſions!*"

The firſt account of ſalaries under the four great Officers of the King's Houſehold, as given in our laſt page, made them amount to only 10,000l.; Engliſh papers, arrived ſince that article was printed, have corrected the miſtake, and raiſed them to 100,000l.

Tueſday afternoon, about three o'clock an accidental fire broke out in the premiſes of Mr. Tizard, haberdaſher on the Quay; but owing to the active exertions of Cor. Bolton, Eſq. our worthy Mayor, and of Mr. T.'s neighbours, together with the prompt arrival of the Corporation Engines, it was ſpeedily ſubdued.

On Friday night laſt, a boat laden with herrings, and having on board three fiſhermen, and two men from this city, the purchaſers, left Paſſage for Waterford. On their voyage up the river the boat is ſuppoſed to have ſwamped, and all on board to have unhappily periſhed, as ſhe has ſince been found bottom upwards, and as nothing has yet been heard of the unfortunate people who were on board her when ſhe ſailed.

WEXFORD, JAN. 7.—On Thurſday night, a moſt audacious attempt was made to rob the Bank of John Redmond, Eſq. At about half paſt 10, 3 men, genteelly dreſſed, rapped at the door; one of them, a tall thin man, with a handkerchief over his eyes. They ſeized the ſervant maid who let them in, bound her hands behind her back, tied her legs, gagged her, and thruſt her into the coal-hole, meanwhile threatening to ſhoot her if ſhe uttered a word. Meſſrs. Brennan and Fortune, two confidential clerks who live in the Houſe, returned home at a quarter after twelve from a party with whom they ſpent the evening. They were let in by theſe fellows, who immediately attacked them. Brennan they bound and gagged, took him up ſtairs, and laid him on a bed. Fortune fought with them, and was ſubdued. They bound and gagged him alſo. He received ſix wounds in the head, one on the thumb, and a black eye. Brennan diſengaged himſelf and leaped from a window nineteen feet from the ground, by which his knee was hurt, and ancle ſprained. Before Brennan returned with the guard, the robbers had eſcaped. The villains left behind them a ſledge, a wrench, two chiſels, three gags, and a cord.

WATERFORD PORT-NEWS.

ARRIVED,

5th—Laurel, of and for Lancaſter, Eimett, London, mr goods; Samuel Packet.

6th—Andromeda of Dublin, Quinn, Liverpool, rock ſalt; Minerva of Barmouth, Roberts, Liverpool, m. goods, for Dublin; Camden Packet, Nuttall.

7th—Prudentia, of and for Stockholm, Byrtx, Liverpool, ſalt, &c.

8th—Seagull, Milford, Morgan, two Mails; Induſtry, of and from Bideford, Day, ballaſt.

SAILED.

6th—None.

7th—None.

8th—Betſey, Liſbon, Nugent, wheat; Earl Leiceſter Packet—9th, Wind E. at 8 Morning.

PROCTOR, AND WAKEFIELD,

GRATEFUL for the Encouragement they have received from their Friends and the Public, inform them, they have juſt received, per the Betſey, and Surpriſe, an Extenſive Variety of the moſt Faſhionable TEA URNS, PLATED GOODS, CUTLERY, and OIL CLOTHS, of a ſuperior Quality, and daily expect a further Supply, per the Beſs, from Liverpool, which, together with a general Aſſortment in the HARDWARE and IRONMONGERY Line, they have now for Sale, at their SHOP, and WARE ROOMS, on the Quay, they are determined to ſell upon the moſt reaſonable Terms.

N. B.—SMITH'S WORK EXECUTED IN THE NEATEST MANNER.

Waterford, 1ſt Mo. 9th, 1811.

TO BE LET,
FROM THE TWENTY FIFTH OF MARCH NEXT,
OR THE INTEREST SOLD,
For Three Lives and Thirty One Years.

WOODLANDS, HOUSE, OFFICES, walled GARDEN, ORCHARD, and twenty two Acres of GROUND, beautifully ſituated on the River Suir, within four Miles of Waterford. Application to be made to RICHARD USSHER, Eſq. at Woodlands.

(5) January 9, 1811.

CAUTION.

I DO HEREBY CAUTION THE PUBLIC againſt taking my Promiſſory Note, paſſed to JOHN LYNCH for ONE HUNDRED POUNDS, now due and unpaid Lynch's Hands, as ſame was paſſed without any Value or Conſideration.

MARY BURKE.

Carrick on Suir, Jan. 9, 1811. (2)