



MR. JUSTICE FITZGERALD.

Mr. DALY begged to call the attention of the House to a Petition entrusted to him upon a most important subject, involving, as it did, the conduct of one of the Judges in Ireland. The Petition was from a most useful and respectable Magistrate of the county of Galway, complaining of the conduct of Mr. Justice Fletcher at the last assizes of Roscommon and Galway. He thought it his duty to present this Petition—first, as it had been committed to his care by one of his constituents, who had a right to demand of him to do so—but he was more particularly induced to do this from the importance of the subject. The office of a Magistrate, honestly and conscientiously discharging his duty, was most arduous and disagreeable. The present situation of Ireland peculiarly required that the Gentlemen of the first respectability should accept the commission of the peace; but what Gentleman would subject himself to public attack and insult, from whatever cause it might arise, whether from caprice, the love of using authority, or from a wish to court popularity. He was induced to present this Petition, to show persons in high judicial situations, that there was a power to call them to account, and to protect those faithfully discharging their duty from the attacks of any individual, however elevated his rank or station.

The Petition was read by the Clerk. It was from the Rev. J. Galbraith, a Justice of Peace for the Counties of Galway and Roscommon, and stated several instances in which his activity as a Magistrate had been unjustifiably commented upon from the Bench by Mr. Justice Fletcher, who, among other expressions, had said, "That he never knew any good that had come from those Magistrates," &c. &c. The Petitioner dwelt on the impropriety of such language, used by one of the Judges of the Land towards a Magistrate, acting conscientiously and to the best of his judgment in the discharge of his duty; and prayed that the case might be taken into consideration by the House. The Petition was then ordered to lie on the Table.

THE REV. J. HAMILTON.

Mr. PRITCHE said, that in bringing under the consideration of the House, as he was about to do, the conduct of a Magistrate in Ireland, he was anxious at the outset to state, that he had been induced to take that step from no motive of personal hostility, but merely from the wish to discharge what he conceived to be a public duty; hoping, that if the House should agree to the proposition which he was about to make, that the most important benefits would result to Ireland, not only in the present instance, but in the warning which would thereby be held out to other Magistrates. He was sorry to believe, that in Ireland the commission of the peace was sought for by some persons (although he trusted that the number was small) as a means of ingratiating themselves with the Government, and thereby forwarding their own personal objects. On the present occasion, however, he would confine himself to the history of one whose conduct had been very notorious, and whose vicinity to his own residence had given him (Mr. Pritche) the means of being the humble instrument of bringing the subject before Parliament. Until the last four years, the neighbourhood in which he lived had been most remarkable for its peaceable and orderly character. About four years ago, they had the misfortune, he must call it, of having a curate translated to Roscrea from the North of Ireland, who did not possess a single acre of land in the county of Tipperary, or in the King's county, and very little any where else. Shortly afterwards this Gentleman was appointed to the commission of the peace for both counties; and he should like to ask the Right Honourable Secretary for Ireland, what could be the motives for appointing such a person, who, if he was rightly informed, had been obliged to leave the North of Ireland for mal practices of a nature which he would describe hereafter. It was necessary for him to report, that that part of the county of Tipperary in which he lived had hitherto been remarkable for the peaceable and orderly conduct of its inhabitants till about four years ago, when this Gentleman was appointed to the situation of Curate, in consequence of the Rector not being able to attend himself to the duties of so large a living. As long as this Curate confined himself to the duties of a clergyman, the neighbourhood had reason to be satisfied with his conduct; but the field was too small for his exertions, and he consequently had been appointed Magistrate, in which capacity he was not long till he found out treason, conspiracies, tumultuous meetings, things of armed men by night, dressed in green uniforms, with pikes, &c. Without even communicating the information to the neighbouring Magistrate, he soon took advantage of his situation to commence a correspondence with the Right Hon. Gentleman opposite, and he (Mr. P.) believed, if the truth were known, that he had deceived the Government pretty handsomely. However, the Government not believing the information which he had been giving them for two years, he at length got hold of a conspiracy to murder him. And how did he proceed? He procured an informer from Dublin, who had been in the pay of the Police-office since 1798, appointed a meeting with a country informer, decoyed three or four men to drink at a public house, when this informer produced a case of pistols loaded with powder and ball, all supplied by this Magistrate, when no one could be brought forward to fire the shot but the informer himself. But at whom did he fire? Not at the Magistrate, but at a stuffed wig prepared by himself and his wife? Next

morning, hearing of this, he (Mr. Pritche) thought it his duty to go to Roscrea to make himself acquainted with the particulars, when this Magistrate deceived him as well as the rest of the Magistrates as to the facts. He (Mr. Pritche) said to him, "his son had a great escape." "Yes, Sir," he replied. "Where were you sitting, Sir, when the shot was fired at you?" "There, Sir," said he, pointing to a table in the room. He (Mr. Pritche) immediately observed, that the men should be taken up; but Mr. Hamilton said, by leaving it as it was for some time, he would get at the bottom of all that was doing in the country, hoping, no doubt, that in the mean time some Government living should be given him. And here he must ask the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite if he was rightly informed, when he heard that this person had a promise of one? But in justice to the Government he must say, he believed it to have been promised under the impression of the propriety of his conduct. And now he came to a case of great hardship as it was possible to conceive. Fourteen innocent men were dragged from their beds at the dead hour of the night, and sent off to Clonmel, 40 miles, to be tried for their lives, where they would have remained till the following Assizes, had not the Special Commission intervened. The Crown prosecutor followed, conducted by that able lawyer, the Solicitor-General, of whom, whenever he spoke, it must be in terms of the highest praise. The Jury was one of the most respectable he ever saw impaneled; and on hearing only the evidence on the part of the Crown, acquitted the Prisoners. But what was their case? Some, who were poor, spent all they had in defending themselves. The remedy recommended by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to whom they applied for redress, was to try the case at law. And with whom? With a man who, if they got a verdict against him, had nothing to say them with! He had now, he thought, stated sufficient to account for his surprise that this person had ever been allowed to hold the Commission of the Peace; and still more, that he had been allowed to continue in it. He would therefore trespass no longer on the patience of the House, but more for Copies of the Correspondence between the Irish Government and the Reverend John Hamilton, Curate of Roscrea, and Magistrate for the County of Tipperary.

Mr. PEEL expressed his satisfaction at the fair and open statement made by the Honourable Gentleman, which was much preferable to those covert insinuations against persons of high character and situation, against which it was impossible to defend them. The Honourable Gentleman and the House would do him the justice to believe, that on this question he, and those connected with the Government of Ireland, were perfectly impartial. They had no interest whatever in mistaking the facts which had occurred, and which were these:—In November last the County of Tipperary was in a state of disorder so serious, that on the application of above forty Magistrates, six Baronies of that County had been at once declared out of the peace, and subsequently two others: One of the most atrocious murders had been there committed on the person of a Magistrate of the highest character, a man generally beloved, and whose only crime was the activity with which he exerted himself to restore the public tranquillity. In a week after that murder took place, Mr. Hamilton received information that a conspiracy had been formed against his own life. He did not get this information directly from a person who knew of the conspiracy, but from a respectable Gentleman to whom it had been communicated by a man named Dwyer, who was the first informer. Mr. Hamilton was at the same time informed that Dwyer was not a credible witness, and that his information had not been attended to by the Irish Government; but, anxious to come at the truth, if any existed in the story, he communicated the circumstance to three other Magistrates in the neighbourhood of Roscrea, and with their concurrence he devised a plan, in order to find out who the conspirators were. He sent a person to make acquaintance with Dwyer the informer, who, on returning, reported that he believed the conspiracy did exist, as Dwyer had first stated. Mr. Hamilton then despatched Dwyer and the other man, armed with pistols, to join the conspirators in their intended attack upon his (Mr. H.'s) house. In the mean time he himself kept out of the way, and a figure, dressed up like him, was placed in one of the front rooms of his house. The conspirators, attended by Dwyer the informer, and two others, who, it should be observed, had received strict orders from Mr. H. not to lead, but to follow them, proceeded to his (Mr. H.'s) house, where some shots were fired at the dressed figure, under the supposition, on the part of the conspirators, that it was Mr. Hamilton himself. These were the leading facts of the conspiracy, and he (Mr. Peel) need not observe, that the Government were utterly ignorant of the injudicious plan by which it had been discovered. He could assure the House that such a proceeding never received the sanction of the Government of Ireland; and when it was made known to the Lord Lieutenant, he expressed his decided disapprobation of it. He (Mr. P.) should then call the attention of the House to the arrest of the 14 conspirators. They were taken into custody on the outskirts of three townships, and one of them confessed his guilt, and acknowledged that the shot was fired with the intention of killing Mr. Hamilton; that it was done at the desire of others; and that the parties were bound together by an oath. On this, and the information of Dwyer and two others, the 14 men were brought to trial; but the principal witness so perjured in his testimony, that the prisoners were acquitted and discharged. The witness

who had perjured was put into the dock, and a bill of indictment sent up against him for perjury. This bill, after some consideration, the Grand Jury ignored. It was not fair, therefore, in the Hon. Member (Mr. Pritche) to have observed that this witness was a perjured man; for the Grand Jury, on their oath, after examining his case, did not even put him on his trial. He (Mr. Peel) should have stated, that, previous to the trial, a meeting of Magistrates was held, which meeting, ignorant of the device that had been made to discover the conspiracy, had memorialised the Irish Government to have a provision made for Dwyer, in case he should prosecute these men. To this memorial Government declined to attend, for a very fair and obvious reason—that they would not do any thing which would tend to bias the prosecution, or make him anxious to convict. The Right Hon. Gentleman proceeded to state, that, from what he had heard on the subject, he believed that the 14 persons tried were innocent of the crime charged against them. After the circumstances which he had stated, several complaints were made to the Chancellor (Lord Manners) against Mr. Hamilton; but he did not wish to act in the case without official information. He (Mr. P.) then inquired for information on the subject, which he received from a report of it made by Baron George (the Judge who presided at the trial). In that report Baron George expressed his strong disapprobation of the plan which Mr. Hamilton had devised; but, at the same time, he (Baron George) believed that Mr. H. himself had been deceived. He had several enemies in the country, and therefore was the more ready to credit the story of the intended assassination. It was also proved, that he was in an infirm state of health at the time he received the information. Baron George had taken every pains to inquire into the matter, and the result was, that every part of the public conduct of Mr. Hamilton was found most satisfactory, except this one. If Baron George had found his general conduct reprehensible, he would have found it his duty to represent him to the Lord Chancellor as a person not fit to hold a commission of the peace. The Lord Chancellor, with such a report before him, did not feel himself justified in removing him from the commission of the peace. The Hon. Member then stated, as the reason why Mr. Hamilton had not informed all the Magistrates in his neighbourhood of his plan for discovering the supposed conspiracy, that he was not on very good terms with many of them, in consequence of his having dismissed a constable who was guilty of extortion in Roscrea. This man was afterwards restored by the Magistrates; but in some time subsequently to that period, Mr. H. had this constable prosecuted to conviction for extortion. From hence arose a coldness of those Magistrates towards him; and it was from that circumstance alone that Mr. H. had not informed them all of the plan which he had devised. In the whole time he was in office, there was not a man more active in the discharge of his duty than Mr. Hamilton; and from the report of Baron George of it, the Chancellor, Lord Manners, could not feel himself justified in removing him from the Magistracy. He (Mr. Peel) could not support the motion of the Hon. Member (Mr. Pritche), as he conceived that the production of correspondence between the Magistracy and the Government would be establishing a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. BROUGHAM observed, that what passed in the House during the last hour must be sufficient to convince every Member of the necessity of probing the question which had been submitted to them to the bottom. He thought that when such statements as had been made, relative to the conduct of one of the Judges, were suffered to go uncontradicted, and such a charge as the present made against a Magistrate, which even the statement of the last speaker did not refute; when these were considered, they would show that all was not right in the mode of administering justice in the sister island. He could not approve of the conduct of the Lord Chancellor Manners, who had required so much information on this subject before he decided. He (Mr. B.) would wish to know, whether the Chancellor exercised the same procedure in every complaint of a Magistrate which came before him? He would be glad to know, whether in every complaint against a Magistrate which was substantiated, it was the practice of the Chancellor not to decide until an inquiry had been made into the general conduct of such Magistrate? Different, in his opinion, was the conduct of the English Judges, who never mixed political considerations in the administration of justice.

Mr. MANNERS SUTTON defended the conduct of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In having sought for every information before he decided on this subject, he did that which was his duty. Mr. PONSONBY, alluding to the Petition relative to the conduct of Mr. Justice Fletcher, which had been presented by the Honourable Member for Galway, observed, that he had in his possession a letter from that Judge which would fully reply the charge contained in that Petition, but he did not wish to read it, as he did not choose to present the Petition of any individual from being read. At the same time, he would suggest to the Member who presented it, that if he should again have occasion to present a Petition of the kind he should take some steps on it. With regard to the motion then before the House, he should only observe, that he could not see how Lord Chancellor Manners could have removed Mr. Hamilton from the Magistracy, with the report of Baron George before him. At the same time, he could not but regret that a man who could act in the way he (Mr. H.) had done should be continued in the Magistracy.

Mr. V. FITZGERALD concurred in the opinion expressed by the last speaker. He did not regret that the present motion was brought forward; at the same time he did not feel himself called upon to support it. After a few words from Sir J. NEWPORT and Mr. PEEL, which were not distinctly understood in the Gallery, Mr. DALY observed, with regard to the Petition which he had before presented, that it could be proved by affidavits. Mr. PRITCHE, in reply, observed, that after what had passed he should not press his motion. The motion was then withdrawn.

THE CASE OF MR. O'HANLON. Mr. BROUGHAM rose to present a Petition from Mr. O'Hanlon, which he would have fully alluded to in his observations on the last motion, but that he did not wish at that time to draw out the attention of the House from that particular subject. The Gentleman from whom he received this Petition was a most respectable man, who had practised at the Irish Bar, but who retired from his profession and went to reside at Newry, in the year 1796. Of the respectability of his character there could be no doubt, from a certificate which he (Mr. B.) held in his hand, signed by 230 of the most respectable inhabitants in and near Newry. Mr. O'Hanlon stated in his Petition, that he had been appointed a Magistrate, from which office he had been removed without any just cause. That, in a short time after, he received a letter from the Lord Chancellor, acknowledging that he had been unjustly put out of the commission of the peace, and reinstating him in his former Magistracy. That he continued from that time to hold the commission of the peace until (we think) the present year, when he was again deprived of it, without any just cause being assigned for it. The Petitioner stated, that his being favourable to the claims of the Roman Catholics was the only reason assigned for his dismissal from the Magistracy; and it added, that in a conversation which he had with the Attorney-General of Ireland, he (the Attorney-General) stated, that any one who supported the Catholic claims, whether with or without a *Veto*, were endeavouring to subvert the Constitution and to introduce French Jacobinism. The Petitioner also described the Attorney-General as having given his opinion strongly in favour of the Orange system. This was also, as the Petition stated, the opinion of Lord Chancellor Manners, who had declared, that Orange Societies were perfectly legal, and that a Magistrate, being an Orangeman, might with propriety sit on the Bench to judge persons accused of being Orangemen. Mr. B. could not account for the merit which the reading of this Petition seemed to excite in the Gentlemen opposite (the Ministerial side). Gentlemen should recollect, that he (Mr. B.) did not state these facts as from himself. They were the statement of Mr. O'Hanlon, and if Gentlemen conceived them to be false, they were still entitled to notice. For the man who could send such statements, knowing them to be false, deserved the severest censure and prosecution for an abuse of the privileges of the House. But he (Mr. B.) did not think them false; he believed they were true, and he would not admit that Gentlemen opposite considered them false, unless they took some steps to punish the man who used them. If this were not done, he would take it for granted they were true, and if true, it was clear that the Attorney-General and Lord Chancellor of Ireland held opinions, which, if not discontinued by the Government, would lead to the worst consequences. Adverting to the complaint in the Petition, he observed Mr. H. stated, that he was put out of the Commission of the Peace, not for being of any party, but because he wished to be of no party. The Honourable and Learned Member then adverted to the other parts of the Petition, which complained of the injustice done him, and prayed the House to take his case into consideration. Mr. B. then at some length commented on the right which the Chancellor had to expunge the name of any Magistrate from the Commission, which right, he contended, should only be exercised where a just ground existed. He then moved that the Petition be read.

Sir GEORGE HILL, wished to know whether it was in order for the Honourable and Learned Member to present a Petition, the statement in which he himself did not believe. Mr. BROUGHAM denied his having expressed his disbelief of the statements in the Petition. The Petition, of which the most material points had been detailed to the House by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, was then read.

Mr. PEEL began by adverting to the extraordinary circumstance of his being twice called in the course of the same evening to answer to charges against the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; in the one case for not striking a Magistrate out of the commission, and in the other for an opposite line of conduct. He would shortly state the facts of the present case, and then leave the House to judge whether any Lord Chancellor Manners had acted with propriety or not, and whether the charge of political partiality exhibited against him was well founded. The Petitioner had lately been a Magistrate of the counties of Armagh and Down. In consequence of a representation to the Lord Chancellor, some time in 1808, he was removed from the commission. The Lord Chancellor, however, having afterwards investigated the case more fully, admitted that in removing Mr. O'Hanlon from the magistracy he had acted unjustly, and he in consequence reinstated him. He would ask if this fact was not alone a sufficient proof, that the person who acted in this manner could not be swayed by motives of political partiality. The manner in which the Lord Chancellor Manners acted was best explained in a letter from him to the Marquis of Downshire, in answer to that which had received from the Marquis, accompanying Mr.

O'Hanlon's memorial. It was there stated, that a complaint had been preferred by the Chairman of the county of Down against Mr. O'Hanlon a short time before, and that, in the opinion of the Assistant Barrister of the county of Down, his conduct was such that he ought then to have been removed from the Magistracy. Instead of removing him, however, he had merely cautioned him not to follow a line of conduct which made it impossible for any Gentleman to act with him in the Magistracy. In Feb. last a memorial was transmitted to the Lord Chancellor by the Bench of Magistrates of the county of Down against Mr. O'Hanlon. A charge had been exhibited against a soldier for having assaulted a gentleman in the neighbourhood of Newry, and out of a Bench of twelve Magistrates and the Assistant Barrister, eleven with the Assistant Barrister voted for the conviction of the soldier, Mr. O'Hanlon alone dissenting from all his brother Magistrates, against whom he delivered a most intemperate speech from the bench. After this they presented a memorial praying for his removal. It was signed by sixteen Magistrates of the Counties of Down and Armagh; and at the head of them was the Assistant Barrister (Mr. Dawson), a different Gentleman from the one who joined in the former complaint. It stated, that Mr. O'Hanlon was in the habit of attacking his brother Magistrates with language of a most unbecoming description—that at every trial for rioting he had constantly acted as the warm advocate of one party, and the opponent of the other; and that he had frequently delivered such sentiments as were calculated to excite the lower orders to turbulence and disrespect to the laws. He had taken pains since to inquire into the character of the individuals who signed this Memorial, and he had shewn the Memorial to several Gentlemen of the North of Ireland, some of whom were at present in the House, and he had uniformly been told that they bore the most respectable character. He held in his hands a letter from the Lord Chancellor, stating, that he did not proceed to remove Mr. O'Hanlon, till he had had the opinion of Baron McClelland in favour of that measure. These were the grounds on which he had acted. It had been asserted, that previous to such removal an inquiry ought to have taken place into the conduct of Mr. O'Hanlon; and that he ought to have had an opportunity of meeting the charges against him. But he would here appeal to a Right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ponsonby), who formerly filled the same office, whether in proceeding to reform the Magistracy of two counties he adapted such a line of conduct? He should be sorry to see it laid down, that specific charges should be exhibited against any individual before he could be removed from the commission of the peace. With respect to the alleged conversations with the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney-General, the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had thought to reduce them to a dilemma—either to treat the matter lightly, or to say that they were positive falsehoods. But the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had no right to put them in this dilemma—he had no right, by a mere statement of an alleged conversation with two of the highest law authorities, to say you must come down with your affidavits to disprove it. He would tell him that he had never thought it even to inquire into this subject. A Government would indeed be to be pitied, whose Chancellor and Attorney-General should, in a conversation with an individual distinguished by their conduct, have so little discretion as to utter little less than treason against the Government under whom they were acting. He had nothing to say in contradiction of this part of the statement; and if the Honourable Gentleman chose to express his belief in it, there he must leave him.

General NEEDHAM stated that he was personally acquainted with fourteen out of the sixteen Magistrates who had signed the Memorial, and he knew all of them to be men of reputable characters, and to be men of fortune, who had always remained at their post. They had often been called upon, when that part of the Country was in a disturbed state, to put themselves at the head of the military; and he never knew an instance when Mr. O'Hanlon had made his appearance on such an occasion. He had heard a character of that Gentleman which he did not think fit to state to the House.

Sir HENRY PARNELL stated, that in Armagh and Down there prevailed the most violent religious animosities, and the Country was altogether divided between an Orangeman on one side, and Catholics on the other. While such an animosity subsisted, it was not surprising that a Bench of Magistrates, entertaining particular political opinions, should express themselves unfavourably against an individual Magistrate entertaining different political sentiments. Against these 16 Magistrates, the House had the opinion of 245 most respectable persons in Newry, approving Mr. O'Hanlon's conduct.

General HART said a few words, which were inaudible in the Gallery.

Mr. JONES thought the conversation referred to the Attorney-General and Lord Chancellor could only be the creation of a general imagination.—He had always understood that Lord Manners had conducted himself, as to win the hearts of all parties in Ireland.

Mr. HORNBY said, whatever opinion might be entertained respecting the probability or improbability of the grievance complained of in the Petition, that was not a reason for sending a Petition concerned in dissent and respectful language. He would not have the power to majority of the House over Petitions altogether unbecoming. He had not heard the statement of his Honourable and Learned Friend, but he was sure that he would not state it as his opinion that a Magistrate ought not to be dismissed, without such an inquiry into his conduct as took place in a Court of Justice. If

he had expressed such an opinion, he could not agree with him. The power vested in the Lord Chancellor to appoint or remove Magistrates was, like every power, to be exercised on responsibility; but such an exercise was different from a legal inquiry. The Persons most interested in the character of the Noble and Learned Persons ought to vote for the Petition lying on the Table. The Right Honourable Gentleman's statement fell short of what was expected from him, with regard to the cause of the dismissal. He should like to see a more satisfactory explanation of the causes of Mr. O'Hanlon's removal, shewing that he was not dismissed entirely on account of his political sentiments. If he was dismissed on account of his outrageous conduct on the Bench, he thought this proceeding against him was not strong enough. He should like to know if any of the 16 Magistrates who signed the Memorial entertained the same political sentiments with Mr. O'Hanlon.

Mr. PEEL, in explanation, read a part of the memorial, stating that Mr. O'Hanlon made use of the most violent and irritating language towards his brother Magistrates, so that, to prevent duty, it was frequently necessary to bind over nearly the whole Bench.—[A Laugh.]

Sir J. NEWPORT said, that as no opposition was made to the motion, he should not think it necessary to go at length into the question; but the present case seemed to him to be an additional fact in support of his opinion, that while Orange Societies were countenanced in Ireland, that Country could never be at peace. While these societies existed, any Magistrate on the Bench, who did not approve of them, became obnoxious to his brother Magistrates. Whoever held the Great Seal in Ireland should be careful how he listened to the representation of any Magistrate against his brother Magistrate, without inquiring whether it proceeded from those violent party feelings which might heat even the best minds. It should be the unerring endeavour of the Irish Government, to put down all distinctions of parties, which kept open the wounds which had bled so much.

Sir J. STEWART said, he had heard more of the divisions of Ireland in that House than any where else, and observed that outrages had been committed in the neighbourhood alluded to, not connected with party disputes.

Sir J. STEWART explained, that he had made a very general statement, but he believed that in the North of Ireland a great part of the Magistracy were members of Orange Associations. [Cries of No.] Sir J. STEWART could assure the Honourable Baronet he was mistaken.

Mr. PONSONBY said, the House could form no judgment on the case, as they had no facts before them. He had known Mr. O'Hanlon, who was a very respectable individual, and he had never heard any thing derogatory to his character. He did not however think that the Lord Chancellor, in dismissing a man from the magistracy, was bound to assign a reason which induced him to take that step. He thought, when he had heard the Great Seal of Ireland, had the opinion more than once, to remove any individual from the Commission without assigning the motive. It was certainly unfortunate that the removal had taken place on the recommendation of the Magistrates of the county of Armagh, a district where political animosities had just risen to their greatest height. The Petitioner had no doubt a right to complain of the exercise of the Lord Chancellor's power, but for those could not strip the Petitioner, and the Petitioner would have to pursue a different course before any decision could be formed on the case.

Mr. CHORKE observed, the Magistrate of Down had petitioned against Mr. O'Hanlon as well as those of Armagh.

Mr. BROUGHAM, in reply, observed that the statement of Mr. O'Hanlon had not been denied by any one of the friends of the Irish Chancellor. The charge against Mr. O'Hanlon had been, that he was intemperate; that he caused interruptions on the Bench, and used every possible language—that, on one occasion, Mr. O'Hanlon used such intemperate language on the Bench towards another Magistrate, and he also required intemperately, that he would be bound over to keep the peace by the other Magistrates present. Mr. O'Hanlon in his Petition stated, that his conduct had been peculiarly temperate and tranquil, though in these cases a man was not the best judge of his own temper; but it would serve to show, that standers by often formed different opinions of the temper of a speaker, than those which they themselves formed; and that Sir Fratton Parnell was not the only person who fancied himself perfectly calm, when every one else perceived him to be in a great passion. But whatever the temper of Mr. O'Hanlon had been it was to be remarked, that no measure had been taken against the other Magistrates, who were equally culpable. The safety of Ireland could not be guaranteed unless there was a Government in that Country which should not favour one party above another, but hold the balance equally over both; which should not decide on the suggestion of one party without even hearing another. It was to be remembered, that 245 of the most respectable inhabitants of Newry had signed a representation in favour of Mr. O'Hanlon, that his conduct was peculiarly impartial to all sides. The suggestion was not conclusive in opposition to the statement of the Magistrates, it disproved the assertion that there was but little division of feeling in that part of the Kingdom.

The Petition was ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON. SUNDAY, JUNE 16. Yesterday, Miss from New York and Halifax, brought by the Osborne Packet, were received at the Post-Office. The papers from New York are to the 15th, and from Halifax to the 21st May.—The intelligence of the insurrection at Barbadoes was received at Halifax, by the arrival of the St. Ann, from St. Vincent's, and had created a great sensation, as no information of its termination had arrived when the last papers were printed. It is stated through this channel, that the slaves, under an impression that their friends in England had obtained their freedom, demanded of their masters payment for their labour, which was of course refused, and that these deluded people, in conse-

quence, proceeded to the outrages which have already been narrated. The negroes set the fire of the troops and militia until the field pieces were brought up, when they fled in every direction.—It was reported that the Blacks had got possession of the island of Nevis, and some slight disposition where 30 of the militia had been ordered out to a plantation to preserve order. Lieutenant-General Drummond has resigned the command of the troops and administration of the Government of Lower Canada into the hands of Major-General Wilson, and has officially declared his intention of returning to Europe on the opening of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Letters from Bermuda, of May 6th, mention the arrival there of the Buffalo store-ship, in 43 days passage from the Downs, with stores for the navy-year. The Admiral was expected to sail for Halifax early in June. The *Martinique Gazette* contains a Decree of Count Vaograud, the Governor, by which the trade of foreigners with that island is made subject to the restrictions imposed by the Decree of August 30, 1784, and the instructions given by the French Government on taking possession of the colony in 1814. British vessels are excepted, and continue to enjoy the privileges of the Decrees of the 5th and 14th June, 1814, until otherwise ordered.

Yesterday we received the Paris papers of Tuesday and Wednesday last. They contain two telegraphic despatches; one announcing the execution of Didier, the author of the disturbances at Grenoble; and the other the departure of the Duchess of Berri from St. Lyons. It is added, that the execution of Didier produced no disturbance. Twenty-eight of the persons arrested at Paris are to be tried; and it is avowed that the object was nothing less than to assassinate the King, and the rest of the royal family, and to destroy the Government.

A FEW OF THE NAIN TRIANGLE.—The Jury, after deliberating four hours, found Bouquet, Babouf, Beaupre, and Dufey, guilty of the charges against them; Zonowitz was acquitted of delivering the libels to the press, and of distributing them, but was found guilty of assisting Babouf. They were sentenced to be transported.

THE PRINCESS CHARLOTTE.—Dr. Billie, after he had attended the Princess Charlotte yesterday morning, expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the state he found her Royal Highness in, and said she continued to mend. The unfavourable state of the weather prevented her Royal Highness from going out to take the air, nor did Prince Leopold leave Camelford-House. Her Royal Highness sat up and received visits with her Royal Consort from the Dukes of Gloucester and Cumberland. The inquiries were very numerous.

The answer to inquiries this day was, "that her Royal Highness was quite recovered, and is going out to-morrow."

The day for the marriage of the Princess Mary and his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester is finally fixed for Tuesday, the 25th inst. The Duke of Cambridge is shortly expected in England. An evening paper announces with great pomp a series of letters, which, according to its statement, are to excite the indignation of the Public. From this it may be inferred, that some mischief is intended against somebody, who is to a certain degree prejudged by this premature appeal to the popular anger. We are totally in the dark as to the real meaning of the paragraph here alluded to, but we think it necessary to warn the Public against becoming accomplices in that injustice which results from a vague and premature accusation, thus calling as it were for judgment before it states any grounds for decision.—Times.

Waterford Chronicle. THURSDAY, JUNE 20. The London Journals of Saturday and Sunday were almost wholly barren of intelligence. Such articles as the former day produced are inserted under the head of the latter day, and there is nothing in them that requires notice. On Saturday, the Waterford Harbour Bill was read a second time to the Lords, and committed for Monday, when, we trust, it was finally passed into a law. The natural anxiety of the Public to be put in full possession of its provisions still obliges us to postpone other articles, and entirely to forego those observations which some passing occurrences seem to require.—No mail due.

DEATHS.—At Framere, Mr. Richard Connell, much respected by his relatives and friends.—At Malta, General Thomas Murray.—On Saturday, of a decline, Mr. Abigail Grubb, of Clonmel.—It was reported that the Blacks had got possession of the island of Nevis, and some slight disposition where 30 of the militia had been ordered out to a plantation to preserve order. Lieutenant-General Drummond has resigned the command of the troops and administration of the Government of Lower Canada into the hands of Major-General Wilson, and has officially declared his intention of returning to Europe on the opening of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Letters from Bermuda, of May 6th, mention the arrival there of the Buffalo store-ship, in 43 days passage from the Downs, with stores for the navy-year. The Admiral was expected to sail for Halifax early in June. The *Martinique Gazette* contains a Decree of Count Vaograud, the Governor, by which the trade of foreigners with that island is made subject to the restrictions imposed by the Decree of August 30, 1784, and the instructions given by the French Government on taking possession of the colony in 1814. British vessels are excepted, and continue to enjoy the privileges of the Decrees of the 5th and 14th June, 1814, until otherwise ordered.

ARRIVED. 17th.—Venus, Louthier, Swansea, coals; Daddon, Beer, ditto, ditto; Gower Packet. 18th.—Amity, Harris, Newport, coals; Francis, Thomas, Cardiff, ditto; Newcastle Packet, Munera, Mills, Cores, ballast, Abenoa, Afton, Plymouth, ditto; Property, Roussignol, Jersey, luggage; Providence, Jones, Swansea, Cuba; Victoria, Evans, Newport, coals; Friendship, Farrow, Ltrio, coals, Cork; Victory, Jones, Cardiff, ditto.

SAILED. 17th.—Nancy, Pugh, from Llanely, Newry, coals; Freeling Packet, Passage Revenue Berge. 18th.—Hope, Llewellyn, Newport, live pigs; Mars, Evans, and Margaret, Trent, Lendon, butter, bacon, &c.; Auckland Packet; Sordford, Jensen, Arrond, ballast; Escape, Floyd, Millard, ditto; Thomas and Sally, Stokes, from Dublin, Newport, ditto; Richmond Revenue Cruiser, Bolton, on a cruise. 19th.—Wind W. past 1 morning.

AUCTION OF SWEDISH TIMBER. JOSEPH JACOB and Co. will offer for Sale, on the 19th inst., at One o'Clock, on the Quay near the Bridge, 500 Pieces of SWEDISH TIMBER, just landed from the *Amata*, Captain PATTERSON, in Lots agreeable to the Purchasers. TERMS AT SALE. Waterford, 6 Mo. 19th, 1816.

WANTED. FROM £150 TO £200 AT INTEREST, on an approved security, either by a good Judgment Debt, now exceeding £400, or by a Mortgage on Lands, amounting to a Profit Rent of about £70 a Year. For Particulars apply to Mr. RICHARD FARRELL, Mirror Office, Quay, Waterford, June 18, 1816.

TURNPIKE BOARD. A TURNPIKE BOARD will be held at DUNGAHAN, on MONDAY, the 24th inst., at the Hour of One o'Clock, to take into Consideration the Complaint of WILLIAM BOWEN, Collector of College Gate. By Order. MICHAEL MOTTISHER, Treasurer. Waterford, June 17, 1816.

FOR QUEBEC AND MONTREAL, THE BRIG COMMERCIAL, CAPTAIN ARMSTRONG, Engaged to sail on or before the 15th of July. For Freight of 30 Tons of Goods, or for Passage, apply to THOMAS NEVINS. FOR ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND, THE BRIG ANTINE CHANCE, CAPTAIN BARNES, Engaged to sail in Ten Days from this Date. About Fifteen Tons of heavy Goods would be taken on Freight. Apply to THOMAS NEVINS. June 18, 1816. CHEAP FANCY WAREHOUSE. JOHN CASHIN. WITH great respect begs to inform the Nobility and Gentry of Waterford and its Vicinity, that he has had in his Summer Assortment of FANCY GOODS, which consists of IRISH TABLES, FRENCH SILKS, and ENGLISH SATINS, all of which were selected by Mrs. CASHIN from the most eminent Houses, and on such Terms as will enable him to sell cheaply. He avails himself of this opportunity of returning his sincere Thanks for the decided Preference he has met with, and hopes his Attention to Business will insure him a Continuance. N. B. He is, as usual, well supplied with ENGLISH STRAW, GIMP, and LEIGHORN BONNETS. June 18, 1816. RUSSIA TALLOW, &c. JOHN HARRIS has for Sale, a few Hogheads of best Russia Yellow CANDE TALLOW, which will dispose of on very moderate Terms.—Also, English TANNED LEATHER, of superior quality. Waterford, June 15, 1816. ADJOURNED SALE OF QUICKSILVER. TO BE SOLD, at the Custom house of NEW ROSS, on MONDAY, the 24th inst., at Eleven o'Clock, Eight Thousand Pounds weight of QUICKSILVER, for the benefit of those concerned, taken out of the *Francis*, of Dartmouth, per the *George S. Thomas* of the Port. H. L. TOTTEHAM, Collector. Custom house, Ross, June 4, 1816.