



In his absence, by the terror of his family—  
I am in his absence, by the terror of his family—  
I am in his absence, by the terror of his family—

On which charges the Court came to the following decision:

"After a due and attentive consideration of the evidence produced against the Prisoner, with what he has offered in his defence, the Court are of opinion, that the Prisoner, Captain Ralph Smyth, of the 7th Dragoon Guards, is not guilty of the first Charge, inasmuch as the report made by him to the Commanding Officer of his Regiment was neither false nor unfounded; and they do, therefore, most honourably and fully acquit him of the same.

"The Court are unwilling to animadvert on the evidence of Lieutenant Robb, as its nature, on a perusal of the Minutes, will be sufficiently apparent; but they cannot help remarking, that the whole of these embarrassing circumstances have originated in his unilitary proceeding, in putting Mr. O'Donnell in possession of Captain Smyth's Official Report to his Commanding Officer.

"With regard to the second Charge, the Court are of opinion, that the Prisoner, Captain Ralph Smyth, is not guilty, and they do, therefore, most fully and honourably acquit him of the same.

"The Court conceive it incumbent on them to enter more fully into the reasons on which this, their opinion, is grounded, than they otherwise would have done, for the purpose of endeavouring to extricate both the Prisoner and the Corps from the embarrassing situation in which they have been so long placed; in doing which they feel anxious to confine themselves as much as possible (in as far as relates to Mr. O'Donnell) to such observations as will tend to place their view of the subject in a clear and distinct light.

"In consequence of the non-attendance of all the witnesses expected from Ireland, the Court have been obliged to refer to a variety of papers laid before them, and having selected such as bore more immediately on the case as exhibited in the Charges, and the said Documents having been authenticated by both Parties, the Prisoner, as well as the Prosecutor, they, on a deliberate and careful consideration of the same, are of opinion, that the Report made by Captain Ralph Smyth to the Commanding Officer of his Regiment was absolutely required in the execution of his duty, as Captain of a detached Troop; that the said Report was solely military, and did not contain the shadow of a reflection on the character of the Magistrate, Mr. O'Donnell; that, under that impression, the Prisoner was most fully justified in refusing to resort to the extreme measures proposed by Mr. Hayes on the part of Mr. O'Donnell; that the subsequent conduct of Mr. O'Donnell was most violent and unprovoked, and was evidently intended to force Captain Smyth to a compliance with the proposed duel.

"The Court cannot but remark on the selfish line of conduct adopted by Mr. O'Donnell, who first challenging Captain Smyth without the slightest provocation, on his refusal to accept the challenge, addressed to him the most intemperate and abusive language; and, having thus placed Captain Smyth in a most embarrassing situation with respect to his brother Officers, by a convenient subterfuge declined affording him an opportunity of extricating himself from it, and refused, for real injuries and insults offered, that satisfaction which he had himself demanded for a supposed and imaginary grievance.

"That Captain Smyth was guilty of error, the Court will not deny; but they think that error consisted in not immediately reporting to his Commanding Officer the message received from Mr. O'Donnell, and calling on him for his support, when an Official Report made by him in the course of his duty, as Captain of a private patrol, was attempted to be made the ground of a private quarrel.

"The Court, therefore, after a dispassionate review of the case submitted to their investigation, can see no reason why Captain Smyth should not return to his duty in the 7th Dragoon Guards, restored to the esteem and regard of his brother Officers."

"His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, has been pleased to approve and confirm the Finding and Sentence of the Court.

"The very proper and satisfactory manner in which the Court have expressed their sentiments on this subject, renders it incumbent upon the Officers of the Regiment to dismiss from their minds the impressions of the prejudice of Captain Smyth's honour and character, which they appear to have imbibed from the violent and unwarrantable conduct and unfounded accusations observed and expressed towards him.

"The Prince Regent considers the conduct of Lieutenant Robb, in having originated this unpleasant transaction, by his unnecessary and mischievous communication to Mr. O'Donnell of Captain Smyth's Report, to be highly reprehensible and deserving of censure; and his Royal Highness therefore desires, that Lieutenant Robb may be severely reprimanded in the presence of the Officers of the 7th Dragoon Guards, and admonished to be more circumspect in his future conduct.

"The Commander-in-Chief directs, that the foregoing Charges preferred against Captain Ralph Smyth, of the 7th Dragoon Guards, together with the Finding and Sentence of the Court, and the Prince Regent's Commands thereon, shall be

entered in the General Order Book, and read at the head of every Regiment in His Majesty's Service. By command of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief,  
HENRY CAULFIELD, Adjutant-General.

MR. GRADY AND MR. QUINN.

The following letter has created much interest in the political circles. It was not read in the late debate respecting this Gentleman:—  
COPY OF MR. GRADY'S LETTER TO MR. QUINN.

DEAR SIR,  
Belfast, 19th August 1849.

My dear Mrs. W. Quinn.—By a letter I this moment have from my husband, I learn that he has fallen altogether in the object of his journey, by letters from Mr. Quinn, and the friends of my son, to take a further journey, in order to have a consultation with them, in the event of such failure. Gracious God! what is my destiny, or what sufferings have I been born! Am I again to be plunged in an interminable warfare of fighting and writing, against those whom I considered my best friends, by the detestable politics of the County of Limerick? Are my family to be equally the victims of those who support, and of those who oppose? And is it from W. Quinn that I am to suffer this, the most intolerable stroke of all? W. Quinn, upon whom, for the moment he lived with me in his younger years, at Adare, in sickness and in health, I bestowed all the tenderness of a parent! W. Quinn, whom my husband supported with all his influence for three contested elections! W. Quinn, who acknowledged in my house, after sitting up the whole of an anxious night, on the eve of the Election of 1837, that, if he were returned, he would never that return to my husband, who, by his counsel and influence, secured for him (though his counsel and influence, secured for him) the acknowledgment of the Government itself! He acknowledged this in the presence of his uncle, Colonel Quill, and of his cousin, John Fitzgerald; and the Chief Baron and the Chairman of the County can both attest the fact. Is it W. Quinn, whom my husband's exertions have raised to power, that is to exercise that power, the moment he shall be able to do so, to plunge my family into the same? It is not the Honourable Mr. Quinn, because it is not in any man of honour to have coldly calculated upon my misfortune, while he was warmly soliciting my support, and urging me to painful exertions of influence against his own cousin general, and the friend of his powerful relations. No! a man of honour, such as I most suppose Mr. Quinn to be, would have frankly told him, I will not ask, for I cannot accept your support, because of the circumstances in which I am placed; I am determined upon opposing you on an injury; I am resolved upon being your enemy; and I will not resort upon you (even though my election should turn upon it) the exertions of friendship.

"But nothing has yet been done; let us therefore, in this important interest, discuss the matter with moderation. By the letters my husband had from Limerick, the facts seem to be as follows:—  
"Mr. Quinn appears to have got himself into a state of those deliriums, too incidental to party struggles. During the heat and canvass of a party struggle, he promised office to two persons; that is to say, he promised one to put him into office; and he promised the other not to put him out; and, to compromise this dilemma, after the Election was over, an arrangement was proposed, by which the office was to be broken up; but my son rejected the compromise as derogatory. What then is to be done? In the one, who has been, by himself and his deputy, 15 years in office, to the satisfaction of the whole County, to be turned out, in order to provide for the other; or is the other to wait for some more moderate opportunity of promotion? The former alternative would be violent and unparliamentary; the latter of every day's practice, and less oppressive, so far as it respects the abstract propriety of the question, without reference to the parties. But I shall next beg you to consider the parties in their respective relations to Mr. Quinn. In what relation did the other stand to Mr. Quinn 18 years ago, when Mr. Quinn was living with my husband and his family at Adare? In what relation did he stand to him immediately previous to the Election of 1837, the most critical moment of Mr. Quinn's political life, when my husband's prompt and vigilant exertions secured him in his return for the County? Or put the obligations Mr. Quinn owes to my husband entirely out of the question, and weigh the parties in the scale of the last Election. The one sacrificed nothing, perhaps, because he had nothing to sacrifice; the other, at Mr. Quinn's most pressing solicitation, sacrificed kindred, powerful connections, habits, and affections, till then uninterrupted; and is the sacrifice of him to be the measure of Mr. Quinn's gratitude and his justice? The thing is impossible: I'll speak no more of it.

"I have yet this consolation to rest upon, at least for a while; my husband left this with the most determined resolution, that nothing should urge him to hostilities, and I know his inflexibility when he is resolved; nevertheless, I conjure you to exert your influence in such a way, as to rescue us all from the confusion and warfare into which we may be precipitated by one imprudent and irrevocable measure. It is foolishly said, that women should never interfere on these occasions; but the real folly is, their not interfering when their motives are obviously prudent, and where they may have reason for ever to congratulate themselves upon such interference.

"I have spoken to you, my dear Mrs. Quinn, with great freedom, but I shall make no apology, because there are cases where such freedom is a duty, and it is not only the duty but the privilege of a wife and a mother. Neither shall I apologise for any trouble this letter may occasion you; for your own good sense will tell you, that when the head of our family aims a deadly blow at the head and heart of another, no member of either can be perfectly at ease. Not knowing your address, I have sent this to a friend in London, with directions to have it personally delivered, and to call for your answer. In the mean time, with the same affection that I conceived for you at our first meeting, and that we testified for each other at our last separation,  
I am yours, &c. sincerely,  
W. GRADY.

"To Mrs. W. Quinn, 108, Pall Mall."

ENGLISH LAW INTELLIGENCE.  
VICE-CHANCELLOR'S COURT—MARCH 21.  
Broughton and Others, v. Lord Ffrench and Others.

Mr. Bell and Mr. Horne, on the part of the Plaintiffs, showed cause against dissolving an injunction. The circumstances were shortly these: Mr. Broughton, a gentleman of respectability, resident in London, filed his Bill against Lord Ffrench and Co. who were considerable Bankers at Dublin, praying that they might be compelled to deliver up certain Bills of Exchange to be cancelled, and to be restrained from all further proceedings in their Actions at Law. It was stated, that, in the year 1811, Mr. Broughton was applied to by one Cullimore, a Provision Merchant, who, with other gentlemen, was engaged in a Contract to supply Government with Provisions, to accept Bills of Exchange upon that account. Cullimore represented to him that the Banking-house of Ffrench and Co. was jointly interested, and would, from time to time, furnish them with money. The Bills were to be negotiated through the House of Ffrench and Co. and they would take care that the (Mr. Broughton) should never be called upon to pay those Bills without being provided with funds for the purpose. In consequence of this, Mr. Broughton did, from time to time, accept various Bills of Exchange to a large amount. Some of the Bills were protested for non-payment. Cullimore having failed in providing funds, and Ffrench and Co. being Embarrassed, brought the Action in question, and against Mr. Broughton, for £1300, and another against Messrs. Broughton, Cockburn, and Roper, as Partners, for £300. It was stated that Ffrench and Co. had given no value for the Bills, and that Mr. Broughton and his Partners had received no consideration for their acceptance. It was stated, that Mr. Broughton had been induced to accept the Bills under the impression that Ffrench and Co. would provide for them; but it was admitted, that it did not appear from any part of the pleadings that he had any other ground for this belief than the representations of Cullimore. Ffrench and Co. were likewise charged with having a share in the contract with Government, and with receiving part of the profits, and prayed that they should set forth, where, and when, and from whom they received the Bills, and the consideration which they paid for them. Mr. Taaff, the Acting Partner in this Banking-house, in his answer, swore that they were Holders of these Bills for a full and valuable consideration, and that the funds for covering them were not to be provided by Ffrench and Co.; and that the representations stated to be made by Cullimore to the Plaintiffs, Broughton, were wholly untrue; and for the consideration given for the Bills, referred to a schedule annexed to his answer, in which it was set forth. Exceptions were taken in this answer, and a further answer was taken in, detailing still more fully the circumstances under which the Bills in question came into the hands of Ffrench and Co. Exceptions were also taken in answer to which Ffrench and Co. stated, that they had already given account, and that it was out of their power to give any explicit reference to the schedule annexed to their former answers. The Learned Counsel for the Plaintiffs, under these circumstances, seeing that all the other accounts connected with these transactions were kept with the greatest particularity, submitted, that if the Defendants refused to set forth the consideration in a fuller and more satisfactory manner, it was a circumstance to excite suspicion, and that therefore they were entitled for dissolving the Injunction, but that the same ought to be continued.

The Vice-Chancellor, without hearing Mr. Head and Mr. Mathew, who were to have argued the case on the part of the Defendants, said:—"Mr. Head, this is a very plain case. The Plaintiff alleges against the House of Ffrench and Co. that they were holders of these Bills without consideration; and they (Ffrench and Co.) swear positively they are holders for a full and valuable consideration. The Plaintiff asks them, as he has a right to do, to set forth the consideration they gave for these Bills, with the dates, and the parties' names, &c. and they say, we are not able to set them forth, farther than the schedule describe them. That is the whole of the case."—Injunction dissolved.

COURT OF CONSCIENCE.

[From Currier's Morning Post.]  
On Tuesday last, a very singular case came on for a hearing at this Corporation Court, which belongs exclusively to their "Honours"—where

most enlightened Sheriffs Peers and Aldermen expound the law affecting all debts under Four Shillings—where Coporation Knowledge and Corporation Justice are exhibited in full force to the wondering auditors—and where that decorum which should ever be attendant on Courts of Justice reigns with paramount sway, under the auspices of the Dublin Corporation; where, but we shall not detail the reader longer, in describing what every body knows, for who is, or ever has been in the City of Dublin, that can be ignorant of what kind of place is

THE COURT OF CONSCIENCE.

Mr. Charles, well known to the Citizens, as an ingenious person, whose Ventriolism, and Exhibitions of various Mechanical and Philosophic amusements, have often afforded them an evening's recreation, has, for some time past, performed at Larkin's Great Rooms, in Great-street, He paid to the Lord Mayor's Secretary, previous to his opening, two guineas for a license, and he promised to admit a reasonable number of customers from the High Sheriffs and the Lord Mayor's Secretary.

Now, as we wish not to be misunderstood, we shall here state, that if the Corporation was constituted as it ought to be, we should never desire to see the privileges of its Officers abridged, or even curtailed in any manner; neither are we disposed to censure those Officers for adhering to the usages established by their predecessors; but if the Corporation were really the City, and its Officers the City's choice, we should still consider ourselves as desiring our best, were we to permit an unjust or oppressive attempt to extend, or even to continue them, beyond what was strictly legal, to pass unprepared; and we think the proceeding which we are about to detail the most flagrantly improper and unwarrantable attempt of this kind we ever heard of.

Mr. Charles did admit orders to a considerable amount, as we are informed; to many, indeed, that he found this exercise of Corporate privilege little short of an absolute nuisance. At length, he deemed it advisable to refuse to admit them, letting the Corporators take their own remedy, if the practice was founded in law or justice. Accordingly, their Honours did enforce Corporation law against poor Mr. Charles. If their law, in this case, accord with the law of the land, then do we pray soon to be delivered from it.

It happened, that Mr. Charles, in pursuance of a printed advertisement, published and placarded throughout the city, that no orders could be admitted, refused to admit two orders, which were presented by two Gentlemen; the Gentlemen immediately paid for their admission a sum of six shillings and sixpence. Next morning, to the utter amazement of Mr. Charles, he received a summons to attend the Court of Conscience, on the part of those two Gentlemen, who alleged, that he owed to each of them three shillings and sixpence, being the actual admission money which they had paid to see his performance the evening before!!!

Mr. Charles attended the summons; he most solemnly declared that he owed no money to those Gentlemen. The Gentlemen who made this claim from him, were, he said, utter strangers to him, and could have no possible demand against him. The eloquence of poor Mr. Charles was ineffectual. The Court seems to have adopted the principle—*fiat Justitia, ruat cælum*; accordingly, after the delay of a few days, the Court issued its warrant against the person of Mr. Charles, in default of payment of the debt and costs!!!

Mr. Charles believing, from the delay that had occurred, that his new creditors had forgone their claims, was, on Friday last, most agreeably surprised, in Great-street, by the respectful approach of three Gentlemen—bills and he was arrested by them on the authority of a warrant, signed, by no less a personage than Alderman Warner!!!

Mr. Charles was re-founded—he knew not, for the moment, where he was; incredulous, and he stood on what is called British ground, and he said, that he was in some of those Continental Countries, where men are thrust into prison at the pleasure of any opinion of authority who may please to vent his spleen, or to satiate his resentment, against helpless and unfortunate individuals. Mr. Charles is a foreigner; he is, but imperfectly acquainted with our laws and customs, and even with our language. He said to these conceited, shoulder-tapping gent-folk, as soon as he could recover himself, "take me to prison—do with me as you please; I owe no money to the persons who have arrested me in this manner." The Officers of the Court of Conscience, with much politeness, assured him that they would not have laid a finger on him were it not in discharge of their public duty; they offered to conduct him to any convenient house; and would not wish, they said, to expose him to the gaze of the town, by parading him through the streets. Mr. Charles was not invariable to the expressions of the Marchioness of the Balliffs, keeping a sharp eye on him, and walking so as to be always within reach of him, should he attempt an escape. He accompanied, he proceeded along the way; he was passed Mr. Kerland's house, he knew himself, that that Gentleman, whom he knew, might have the kindness to give him some advice and help to extricate him from his unpleasant situation. Accordingly, with the prudence, he entered the shop, and told how he was circumstanced.

Mr. Kerland immediately proposed to go with

to the Court of Conscience, and gave bail for security to the Bailiffs that he would on the next day bring forth the body of the said Mr. Charles, to be then and there disposed of according to Law. They did accordingly attend the next day. Two Aldermen, Fleming and Warner, were sitting at the time; they applied to Alderman Fleming, who referred them to Alderman Warner, but Alderman Warner was in so great a hurry going away that he could not wait, and thus was poor Charles given up to the Bailiffs once more!!! The Bailiffs took him again into custody, and actually lodged him in prison. Mr. Kerland then paid the entire demand, which was now raised from 8s. 6d. to £1 9s. 5d.

The next of this curious affair shall be given in our next.

PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS—MONDAY, APRIL 5.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BANK.  
The Earl of HARROWBY presented a Report from the Secret Committee on the affairs of the Bank.

This Report stated, that the Committee had proceeded to execute the duty entrusted to it, and had particularly directed its attention to the circumstances in which the Directors found themselves, in the years 1816 and 1817, by a partial performance of their wish to pay in specie. A considerable call had been made on the Bank in January, 1818, the issue of specie from the Bank had been £1,500,000, and, since January, 1819, £700,000 in addition had been thrown into circulation. As this chain would retard the final redemption of cash payments, the measure was of great importance.

Mr. BROUHAM protested strongly against these proceedings. He did not see any reason why the House should assist the Bank out of difficulties into which it had fallen by its own error. In the next place, he saw no reason for hurrying the Bill through the House. He should not, however, object to its passing, if it could be certainly known, that the Restriction Act would be repealed. He requested, that Ministers had not followed the precedent of Mr. Pitt, in 1797, as he could see no distinction between the two cases.

Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that if the accommodation of the Bank were now in question, it would be highly improper that the measure should pass. He could see no analogy between this case and that of 1797.

Mr. THURNEY expressed his surprise at the conduct with which Ministers seemed to treat an important matter. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Mr. RICHARDSON expressed his surprise at the conduct of the House upon this subject. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Lord HARROWBY said, that a proper time would arrive for disputing whether the proceeding had originated in fraud or in ignorance; the Report had arisen out of the unanimous vote of the Committee. It had appeared, that the partial payments in cash retarded the ultimate object; and the proposal had not been dictated by any feeling for the situation of the Bank, which was capable of answering all demands upon it.

Lord LAUDERDALE denied, that he had concurred in the Report of the Committee. He had dissented; but, as a Member sworn to secrecy, he could not explain his reasons. He had agreed not to give it his active opposition.

Lord HOLLAND thought, that the Noble Earl had no right to suspend the Order of the House to-morrow, for the sake of bringing forward his motion. He was not prepared to say any thing on the merits of the measure, as he knew nothing of the grounds of it. The partial payment in cash was a voluntary act by the Bank; if it were wise, the House ought not to interfere; and, if it were foolish, ought Parliament to commit the Country to such imbecile hands? This was a dilemma from which there was no escape, and Ministers were bound to show the necessity of the interposition of Parliament, and not require it to act blindly.

He protested, in the most solemn and determined manner, against dispensing with the Standing Orders.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL maintained, that the proceeding had been perfectly regular; all that was suggested was the fitness of a precautionary measure. If Ministers had adopted an Order in Council in its stead, the Noble Lord would have declaimed for hours against a proceeding so unconstitutional. The Committee could have no communication with the Privy Council to instruct it upon the subject. There was no analogy between the case now and in 1797, when Mr. Fox objected to the step taken by the Privy Council. The recommendation of the Committee was founded on the expediency of the case, and not on the necessities of the Bank.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said, that it was most essential that it should be understood, that this recommendation was not founded on any distress of the Bank. Such a Report might be very injurious, as that body was prepared to fulfill all its engagements. He was satisfied, that the measure was indispensable.

Lord GREY added, that, if it were clear that the Bank had acted imprudently in partially resuming cash-payments, the Country ought no longer to rely upon it. The Public would not be imposed upon by bold assertions of its solidity; if it were firm, of what importance to it was this small drain of cash. He had been satisfied, in 1797, that specie payments could not be returned to with an ultimate difficulty. He denied, that he should have objected to proceeding by an Or-

der in Council, and he did not recollect that Mr. Fox had opposed it.

Lord LAUDERDALE thought it his duty to say, that the necessities of the Bank had never entered into the contemplation of the Committee.

It was then directed, that the Standing Orders should be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that the House should be summoned.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MR. W. QUINN.  
Mr. AGAR ELLIS withdrew his notice for an Address to move Mr. W. Quinn from his office of *Castro Rotundum*, in consequence of various opinions against the motion.

MR. W. QUINN.  
Mr. PEEL presented at the Bar a similar Report from the Secret Committee on the Bank to that laid on the table in the Lords.

Mr. PEEL then moved for the introduction of a Bill, according to the recommendation of the Report. He stated, that, from January, 1818, to January, 1819, the issue of specie from the Bank had been £1,500,000, and, since January, 1819, £700,000 in addition had been thrown into circulation. As this chain would retard the final redemption of cash payments, the measure was of great importance.

Mr. BROUHAM protested strongly against these proceedings. He did not see any reason why the House should assist the Bank out of difficulties into which it had fallen by its own error. In the next place, he saw no reason for hurrying the Bill through the House. He should not, however, object to its passing, if it could be certainly known, that the Restriction Act would be repealed. He requested, that Ministers had not followed the precedent of Mr. Pitt, in 1797, as he could see no distinction between the two cases.

Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that if the accommodation of the Bank were now in question, it would be highly improper that the measure should pass. He could see no analogy between this case and that of 1797.

Mr. THURNEY expressed his surprise at the conduct with which Ministers seemed to treat an important matter. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Mr. RICHARDSON expressed his surprise at the conduct of the House upon this subject. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Lord HARROWBY said, that a proper time would arrive for disputing whether the proceeding had originated in fraud or in ignorance; the Report had arisen out of the unanimous vote of the Committee. It had appeared, that the partial payments in cash retarded the ultimate object; and the proposal had not been dictated by any feeling for the situation of the Bank, which was capable of answering all demands upon it.

Lord LAUDERDALE denied, that he had concurred in the Report of the Committee. He had dissented; but, as a Member sworn to secrecy, he could not explain his reasons. He had agreed not to give it his active opposition.

Lord HOLLAND thought, that the Noble Earl had no right to suspend the Order of the House to-morrow, for the sake of bringing forward his motion. He was not prepared to say any thing on the merits of the measure, as he knew nothing of the grounds of it. The partial payment in cash was a voluntary act by the Bank; if it were wise, the House ought not to interfere; and, if it were foolish, ought Parliament to commit the Country to such imbecile hands? This was a dilemma from which there was no escape, and Ministers were bound to show the necessity of the interposition of Parliament, and not require it to act blindly.

He protested, in the most solemn and determined manner, against dispensing with the Standing Orders.

der in Council, and he did not recollect that Mr. Fox had opposed it.

Lord LAUDERDALE thought it his duty to say, that the necessities of the Bank had never entered into the contemplation of the Committee.

It was then directed, that the Standing Orders should be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that the House should be summoned.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MR. W. QUINN.  
Mr. AGAR ELLIS withdrew his notice for an Address to move Mr. W. Quinn from his office of *Castro Rotundum*, in consequence of various opinions against the motion.

MR. W. QUINN.  
Mr. PEEL presented at the Bar a similar Report from the Secret Committee on the Bank to that laid on the table in the Lords.

Mr. PEEL then moved for the introduction of a Bill, according to the recommendation of the Report. He stated, that, from January, 1818, to January, 1819, the issue of specie from the Bank had been £1,500,000, and, since January, 1819, £700,000 in addition had been thrown into circulation. As this chain would retard the final redemption of cash payments, the measure was of great importance.

Mr. BROUHAM protested strongly against these proceedings. He did not see any reason why the House should assist the Bank out of difficulties into which it had fallen by its own error. In the next place, he saw no reason for hurrying the Bill through the House. He should not, however, object to its passing, if it could be certainly known, that the Restriction Act would be repealed. He requested, that Ministers had not followed the precedent of Mr. Pitt, in 1797, as he could see no distinction between the two cases.

Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that if the accommodation of the Bank were now in question, it would be highly improper that the measure should pass. He could see no analogy between this case and that of 1797.

Mr. THURNEY expressed his surprise at the conduct with which Ministers seemed to treat an important matter. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Mr. RICHARDSON expressed his surprise at the conduct of the House upon this subject. He thought it was treating the Public in a most arbitrary manner, first to restrict the Bank, and then to take it away altogether.

Lord HARROWBY said, that a proper time would arrive for disputing whether the proceeding had originated in fraud or in ignorance; the Report had arisen out of the unanimous vote of the Committee. It had appeared, that the partial payments in cash retarded the ultimate object; and the proposal had not been dictated by any feeling for the situation of the Bank, which was capable of answering all demands upon it.

Lord LAUDERDALE denied, that he had concurred in the Report of the Committee. He had dissented; but, as a Member sworn to secrecy, he could not explain his reasons. He had agreed not to give it his active opposition.

Lord HOLLAND thought, that the Noble Earl had no right to suspend the Order of the House to-morrow, for the sake of bringing forward his motion. He was not prepared to say any thing on the merits of the measure, as he knew nothing of the grounds of it. The partial payment in cash was a voluntary act by the Bank; if it were wise, the House ought not to interfere; and, if it were foolish, ought Parliament to commit the Country to such imbecile hands? This was a dilemma from which there was no escape, and Ministers were bound to show the necessity of the interposition of Parliament, and not require it to act blindly.

He protested, in the most solemn and determined manner, against dispensing with the Standing Orders.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said, that it was most essential that it should be understood, that this recommendation was not founded on any distress of the Bank. Such a Report might be very injurious, as that body was prepared to fulfill all its engagements. He was satisfied, that the measure was indispensable.

LONDON.  
TUESDAY, APRIL 6.  
Special Report of the Committee of Survey.—  
Quarter's Revenue.  
We are not yet able entirely to satisfy the anxiety which our readers will naturally feel for the result of the Quarter of Revenue which closed yesterday; and we presume, indeed, that the earliest details and accounts upon that subject will be presented to Parliament. We have the satisfaction, however, to know in general, that the credit has been favourable, and that an improvement has taken place even upon the produce of the corresponding Quarter last year, which was of £239,000 less than the April Quarter of the year preceding. The British Revenue, in the April Quarter of the year 1817, amounts to have produced £9,510,000; that of the Quarter ending 5th April, 1818, £10,219,000; while the Quarter which expired yesterday has produced no less a sum than £10,432,000.

"PARTY, APRIL 5.—The assassin of M. De Kotzebue, Henry Ralph Sand, died at Marshfield, on the night of the 25th and 26th inst., of the several wounds which he had inflicted upon himself. The lacerations were pierced by the stab, were in a state of mortification, and it was therefore impossible to prolong the life of the murderer, to endeavour to obtain from him some confessions and information, which his crime rendered necessary and the interest of society demanded.

"Lord Darnley, a peer of England, died in Paris on the 1st inst."

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

THE DRAWING OF THE SUBSCRIPTION-SHEET WILL TAKE PLACE ON THURSDAY, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.

At the House of Mr. DESBURY, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, on Friday, the 20th April, at Mr. DESBURY'S, No. 250, Tottenham Court Road, where Tickets will be had of Mr. BULL, Quays, and the Newspaper Office. Particulars of the Subscription Sale to be expressed in the printed Bill.