



PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS—THURSDAY, MAY 6.

REFORM OF SCOTS BURGHS. Lord A. HAMILTON said, that after the number of Petitions which had been presented, praying for a Reform of the Burghs of Scotland, he trusted he need not offer any apology to the House for occupying their attention for a short time, on a motion which was intended as a remedy to the oppressive grievances complained of. He fully concurred in opinion with the Petitioners on this subject, and he trusted he should lay such a case before the House as would induce them to grant a Committee to inquire into the abuses of the Burgh system, and if any Honourable Member was of a contrary opinion, the Petitioners on the Table were sufficient to convince him to the contrary. The grievances complained of were not new, nor were they of a partial nature. Twenty-five years ago, similar complaints had been made by the Burghs of Scotland; and he had on the Table the Report of a Committee appointed by the House to inquire into those complaints. He regretted, that this Report had not been put into the hands of Members before this discussion came on, as it would show what were the opinions entertained at that period of the Burgh Government of Scotland. But before he entered upon his motion, he wished to state to the House how far a Reform of the Scots Burghs was connected, either directly or indirectly, with Parliamentary Reform. A principal subject of complaint on the part of the Burghs was, that the Magistrates were self-elected, and that they (the Burghs) had no control, either over the election or the acts of those Magistrates. (Here the Lord Advocate and Lord Castleragh were observed in close conversation on the Treasury Bench.) He begged the attention of the Noble Lord and the Learned Lord for a few moments; though he was not so much anxious for their attention as he was for their conversion; but he hoped he would be allowed the common courtesy on such occasions. He should repeat, that the charge against the Petitioners, of endeavouring to bring about a Reform in Parliament, was unfounded. The only connexion between a Reform of the Burgh system and a Reform in Parliament was this:—at present, the Magistrates returned the Members to Parliament without the interference of the Burghs; but if the Burghs were empowered to elect the Magistrates, they would possibly prefer those who would return elect Members chosen by them—and what was this more than saying, that the Member so returned was chosen by the great body of the district he represented? In this way, and in this way only, was a Reform of the Burghs connected with Parliamentary Reform. He hoped he had now disposed of this part of the question; and with leave of the House he would proceed with the subject more immediately before them. The existing Burgh system of Scotland was so oppressive, so abhorrent, and so very different from the government of any other part of the United Empire, that he found it difficult to conceive how the House could refuse a Committee to inquire into the grievances complained of. He would by and by read to the House some extracts from the Report of the Committee appointed on this subject twenty-five years ago; and it would be seen, that though the grievance was allowed to exist, no step towards a remedy had been attempted. When Petitions were first presented against the Burgh system, the Learned Lord objected, that they were not numerous, and therefore could not be considered of any weight; when they poured in from all parts of Scotland, it was allowed they were numerous, that they were general; but then it was objected, that they were not respectably signed. But here again the Learned Lord was obliged to shift his ground, for when taxed with having made the latter objection, he gave a different interpretation to his words.—(Hear!) It was strange, however, that the evils complained of had not been denied; that the existing system had not been defended. Several objections had been stated by the Learned Lord; but he (Lord H.) was not aware that any Gentleman had ever attempted to defend the present system. He appealed to those who heard him, if the Petition from Aberdeen did not bring under the view of the House a scene of oppression and fraud, which called loudly for investigation?—What was the existing system? The Magistrates had the unbounded control of the funds of the different Burghs; they were empowered to contract debts to any amount they pleased; and the Burghs had no power to inquire into the accounts, or check the expenditure of the public money, they were accountable to the full extent for the debts so contracted. This had been fully shown in the case of Aberdeen; there the Burghs had no means of detecting the frauds committed by the Magistrates; and even if they had such power, they were unable, by the present practice, to obtain any remedy. Was not this an insufficient ground for granting a Committee? The case of Aberdeen was notorious; the Petitioners said, the system was the same in the other

Burghs. If this statement was false, the Committee could easily detect the falsehood; if it was true, then the Committee would so report it, and the House would have an opportunity of applying the proper remedy. In either case, a Committee was necessary. One great truth was established, that the Petitioners had no other means of redress than an application to that House. Whatever might be their opinions, whatever might be their knowledge of the improper conduct of the Magistrates, still there was no remedy, if the Town Council were unanimous in support of that conduct.—This had been decided over and over again by the Law Courts. [The Lord Advocate was understood to be glad to hear the Learned Lord prove the contrary; but he would repeat, that it had so been decided over and over again, and an Act of Geo. II. supported the decision. In Perth, for instance, one of the Council had been illegally elected; application was made by the Burghs to Council on the subject, but they said there was no legal redress, as there was no legal application, the Council being unanimous in support of the person so elected. (Hear!) If the Learned Lord still entertained any doubts of this decision having been made, he had better grant the Committee, and the question could be easily ascertained. The Noble Lord, after having entered into a detail of the practice carried on in some other Burghs, begged to call the attention of the House to another abuse which called for revision. The Acts of Parliament in favour of the Burghs were allowed to fall into desuetude, while those which favoured the Magistrates were continued in force. There were Acts obliging the Magistrates to be residents in the Burghs, and others for preventing the sale of Seats in the Town Council. But those laws were evaded; in one instance eight out of fourteen Magistrates were not residents of the Burgh. It was not uncommon for persons to sell their seats in the Council; and it had been proved, that one individual had received £100 and another £50 for a seat; there were also many instances of individuals vacating their seats, binding their successors to a particular line of conduct, under a penalty of giving up their places when called upon to do so. The Magistrates of Perth having expended the whole of the Funds of the Burgh, had been obliged to apply to Parliament for a bill to pave, light, and cleanse that town, thus laying an additional weight on the Burghs. Was a system like this to be tolerated? Was it to be endured, that the Magistrates should, after having expended the funds of the Burgh without accounting for the manner of expenditure, be permitted thus to make up the deficiency from the pockets of those whose money they had expended? He begged to ask the Learned Lord, if the Burghs were obliged to pay all debts contracted by the Magistrates; if they were deprived of all redress by law, what civil or political rights remained to them, unless, indeed, that of suffering patiently this accumulation of grievances? The Noble Lord then read a passage from the Report of the Committee of 1793, in which the various hardships under which the Burghs laboured were enumerated. Among other things, an illegal exaction of the cess was complained of. It also stated that the 66 Royal Burghs paid one-twelfth of the land tax; that the Magistrates had the power of the common lands, against which the Burghs had no remedy. With the body of evidence before them, borne out by the Report of a former Committee, he could not conceive how the House could remain insensible to the situation of the Petitioners; or, if they were sensible of that situation, how they could refuse to remedy the grievances complained of.—What he had already stated was grossly oppressive, but it was only an outline of the general abuse which existed, and which was more fully detailed in the several Petitions on the Table. It had been urged, that any interference on the part of the House was contrary to the Act of Union; but if this argument were to be held good, then the inhabitants of Scotland were shut out from all redress, however severe & multiplied the grievances under which they laboured. They must continue under all the evils of the present Burgh system, from which they can derive no relief from the law of Scotland, and the Act of Union must be considered as a bar to the justice of their claims. But he conceived the Act of Union had not, that it could not have, such an effect. The great question for them to consider was, whether the Petitioners, from their own statements, laboured under severe grievances—and if so, in what way ought the House to interfere? He would not presume to point out the remedy; all he asked for was a Committee to inquire into the subject. As to the Learned Lord, the only remedy to be expected from him was the Bill which he had introduced, and which was in fact no remedy at all. But whatever might be the effect of that Bill, he (the Lord Advocate) seemed to think the Act of Union an insuperable bar to all interference on the part of the House. Hence more potent it to the House, whether they could in justice, or in policy, refuse to lend an ear to the prayers of the Petitioners; or whether the Act of Union was to be held as a bar to all interference by Parliament? He should want to hear what the Noble Lord or his friends on the opposite side of the House would say, having before them the facts of the case and the confession of the guilty persons, for such he must consider the Magistrates to be. If the Noble Lord refused the motion for a Committee, he hoped they should hear from him, whether it was his wish, that this odious system should continue till there could not be found any persons so lost to feelings for the

respect of their fellow-citizens as to accept the office of Magistrates. In the full persuasion that the claim, which so large and respectable a body of His Majesty's subjects as the Petitioners had on the consideration of the House, could not justly be resisted, he moved, that the several Petitions from the Royal Burghs of Scotland be referred to a Select Committee, to examine the matter thereof, and to report their observations thereupon to the House. Mr. W. DUNDAS said that the Noble Lord was rather unfortunate in his assertion, that the present motion was not connected with Parliamentary Reform, when all his observations were directed to prove the propriety of a change in the present system on which the Members from Scotland were returned, to a free and popular Election. The object of this motion for inquiry was nothing less than to strike down the constitution of Scotland as it had existed for three hundred and fifty years—a system under which it had flourished so fairly, under which late it had advanced with almost unexampled rapidity in wealth and power. This system had received the sanction of time and the seal of ages. It was not at all particular abuse, but at the whole of the chartered rights of Scotland, that the motion was aimed. Some of the Petitioners complained indeed, that they were liable for debts which the Magistrate might contract. This was a specific grievance; but to this it was replied, that a Bill was in progress to apply a check to the Burgh expenditure, by giving the Burghs a power of auditing the accounts. But the Petitioners said they would not take this, unless they had more, and showed, that the remedy of their financial difficulties was the pretext, and not the object. Now as to the proposed change in the Constitution of Scotland. Had England yet given up her rotten boroughs? (Hear! and a laugh.) Had she not always resisted the attempts made to alter her system, confident that, if there were anomalies in the case of Old Sarum and other Burghs which it was needless to mention, the result of the whole was admirable? The Petitioners wished to have restored to them the ancient Constitution of the Burghs, and the golden age before 1469. What the ancient Constitution of the Burghs was, none of them knew—what the golden age was, they all knew. It was a time of anarchy, tumult, confusion, and disorder; the nobility and the people at large, the monarch sometimes trampled under foot, sometimes supreme, and by decision more embroiled than the fray. He had no ambition to restore such times, or to give to Edinburgh or Glasgow the benefits of a Westminster Election. He felt he was little qualified to bear part on such a scene. (Hear, hear! and a laugh.) Neither were such scenes fitted for the people of Scotland; they were a sad state, religious people, not easily moved, but if once roused, let the House beware of them. (Hear, hear!) The Noble Lord, when he had raised the storm, would in vain attempt to command it by his voice. When the waves were rolling on the shore, he might in vain draw a line, and say, thus far shall you come and no further. The Hon. F. W. PRIMROSE said, he was anxious to state why he should support the motion, both because the question affected that peculiar part of the community with which, as a Representative, he was most closely connected, and because he wished to guard himself against being supposed to pledge himself to maintain in the Committee any compulsory measure affecting all the Burghs. As it was said the present motion was connected with the great question of Parliamentary Reform, he felt himself bound to say, that he was not one of those who were so confident in the superior wisdom which they and their perceptions possessed, as to hope to re-model with new feelings the whole system of the Constitution. But the more earnestly did he feel himself bound to apply himself to the remedy of particular grievances: (hear, hear!) and it was to the disposition in the authorities of the State, and especially in that House, to remove particular abuses when they were pointed out, while radical or systematic change was avoided, that the Constitution had been preserved and worth preserving. This motion being resisted on the ground that it was a step, not openly, but in fact, towards Parliamentary Reform, it was proper to inquire what its effect would be.—It would not give the elective franchise to different persons from those who exercised it, nor would it change the persons from whom the Councils would be to be chosen. In this, it differed from those proposals for Parliamentary Reform which had been brought forward in England. The main difference would be the change it would effect in the representation of the Burghs in the Councils. At the present time, the persons who were represented in the Burgh Councils were the inferior classes. In Edinburgh, for instance, which the Right Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Dundas) represented, the trade burgesses were inferior in rank (though respectable men) to the merchant burgesses. Yet the merchant burgesses were not represented at all in the Council—The Councilors who nominally sat for them being returned on the principle of self-election, while eight councillors were returned at poll elections by the trades. So also at one of the Burghs he represented, Dumfries, which contained 6 or 7000 persons, 10 councillors were annually elected by the trades, while 12 others were self-elected, tho' they professedly sat for the merchants; and thus the higher orders of the Burgh were really shut out from the elections. This was nearly the state of things in all the Burghs of Scotland, with the exception of one

which he had the honour to represent, Stirling, in which eleven, a majority of the council, were annually elected by a poll of the merchants and trades. This Constitution was granted to that Burgh in 1780, under the advice of the Lord Advocate of that day, who was not suspected of hostility to the Constitution of Scotland. In that Burgh, the finances were in a flourishing condition, and the inhabitants, whatever were their speculative opinions as to matters of government, were well satisfied as to the manner in which their ordinary concerns were administered. There was another instance in which the Crown had acted in a similar manner, viz. in the case of Montrose, to which a similar Constitution (with some exceptions) was granted in 1817. When it was contended, that a Reform of the Constitution of the Scots Burghs was proclaimed by the Act of Union, most it not be at the same time asserted, that the Crown had acted in defiance of that Act in the case of Stirling and Montrose? (Hear, hear!) Now, as to the particular abuses complained of, was it denied in any Petition, that the funds of many Burghs had been squandered away in feasts and foreign purposes? In the Burghs which he represented, large landed property had been alienated, and the last 12 acres had been sold three years ago. Was not this a state of things different from that in English boroughs? Could there be found in England Corporations who could alienate their lands and make a title for their purchasers? Yet such had been decided to be the state of the law in Scotland. (Hear!) Some check was manifestly required; and what check was so good as to give those for whose benefit the funds were raised a control over those by whom they were expended? If, in doing this, he gave the Burghs an influence on the conduct of the Councilors in the choice of Representatives, he should rejoice at it. That influence would be the silent influence of public opinion—and it would be natural, that the Councilors should endeavour to gain the confidence of their constituents in the election of Parliamentary Representatives, as well as in other parts of their trust. Yet this influence could not be too powerful or sudden, for the Council did not choose the Member, but elected Delegates, and the Delegates elected the Representative. As to the Bill of the Noble Lord, which had been spoken of as the means of checking abuse, it was, in his opinion, nugatory; as it only allowed to Burghs, on hearing (which they could not but by accident) of any measure in progress through the Council, to apply to the Court of Exchequer. He concluded by giving his hearty support to the motion. Mr. BOSWELL said, that Ireland had been said by a Right Honourable Gentleman to be married to England. He was afraid Scotland would prove an equally querulous though not so interesting a spouse. The motion for the Committee had been supported by strange arguments. One Honourable Gentleman had supported it because it would not lead to general Reform; another, because it would be useful to inquire into demands which he knew could not be granted. He contended that the phrase *probi homines*, used in the old laws of the Burghs, meant not "honest men," (as it had been translated,) which in Scotland was no term of distinction, and not applied to persons pre-eminent for their wisdom. The meaning of the expression was, in his opinion, "substantial Burgesses." The question with regard to the Burghs of Scotland, as it was now brought forward, was not merely a question of internal regulation; it embraced that of Parliamentary Reform. He concluded with some arguments, denying that the Crown had the power to make so great a change in the Constitution of these Burghs as was now proposed, and referred to the articles of Union, by which their rights and privileges were protected. Mr. J. P. GRANT agreed as to the great importance of the question. In Scotland, almost every principal town was a Royal Burgh, so that the evil of their mal-administration was most extensive in its influence. When grievances were stated to exist in the local administration, and Parliament was applied to in consequence of such grievances to place them on a different footing, they were told it could not be done, because in the attempt they might happen to touch upon some small part of the existing representation.—The simple proposition before them was to do what they had done in 1793, when they appointed a Committee of Inquiry. But what, he would ask, was the degree of popular infusion so much desired by those who resisted the reform of the Burghs? To take Edinburgh as an example—there were only 1300 Burgesses in that place, and those consisting of respectable persons, yet the admission of such a number and such a description of persons to the right of voting for their own Magistrates was described as the introduction of a sort of Westminster Election. The Honourable Gentleman next proceeded to ridicule the opinion, that a reform of the Burghs was contrary to the articles of Union, observing, that it was scarcely possible to conceive, that two great countries agreeing to unite should, in the very act of their union, preclude themselves by mutual engagements from the possibility of improving their condition. The proofs of mal-administration were abundant. The town of Aberdeen was reduced to such a state as to be under the necessity of making over their property to trustees for the benefit of the creditors, not reserving to themselves even the goal for their own purposes, and a change was thrown upon the system, and the higher orders of the Burgh were really shut out from the elections. This was nearly the state of things in all the Burghs of Scotland, with the exception of one

was answerable for the debts of the Burgh.—The principle, he said, was maintained by several of the most eminent Lawyers, and was insisted on by that House, without attributing to them any opposition upon Parliamentary Reform.—For all those reasons, he thought that a case was made out sufficient to induce the House to appoint a Committee. Mr. C. WYNN combated the opinion that the reform contemplated by the Petitioners was contrary to the Act of Union. If that was a violation of the Act of Union, so was the determination of Parliament in some recent instances.—He alluded to the cases of Perth, Ayr, Shrewsbury, and Shoreham. The Constitution of this Country was in itself a progressive Reform. As for what was called Parliamentary Reform, he had always objected to it, because it began by pulling down, without having any thing to substitute, and because Parliament had the power to remedy any abuses that could be proved to exist. The great evil complained of was the misapplication of the revenues of Burghs, and what the Burghs required was a power to check the misapplication, and in many instances gross profusion, that prevailed. He did not hear any contradiction to the statements of the Petitioners, and he believed he might say with confidence, that at no time had such statements ever been made without securing Parliamentary Interference. It was equally necessary, that inquiry should take place whether the evils complained of originated in ignorance or fraud. Mr. CANNING set out with declaring his indisposition long to press upon the attention of the House, weary, as it appeared to be, of this discussion; but, as he felt that it would not be respectful to the Scottish Nation, if, upon a question so immediately concerning the interests of that country, but one English Gentleman was found to take any part in the debate—therefore he was urged to assign his reasons for opposing the motion of the Noble Lord. His Hon. Friend (Mr. C. Wynn), who was the only English Representative who had yet interposed, had maintained, that the Articles of the Union did not preclude the House from interfering with the Scots Burghs; and that it was as competent to legislate for the alteration of any arrangement to those Burghs as it was in the case of Perth, or any other English Burgh. The article of the Scots Union was, however, so clear and distinct, that its meaning could not be misunderstood; it provided, that Parliament should not interfere with the rights and privileges of the Royal Burghs. This condition was made for the weaker party in that contract, while there was no corresponding condition on the part of the stronger, England being left free from any such restriction. But there was a similar condition on the part of Ireland in the Union with that Country, respecting the rights and privileges of certain Burghs. Hence he conceived, that Parliament was not entitled to take the same course with respect to the Royal Burghs of Scotland, or certain Burghs in Ireland, as he had been lately pursued in the case of Perth. He did not, however, mean to say, that it was not open to Parliament to deal with any Burgh in the United Kingdom as it was proceeding to do towards Perth, if a case of similar misconduct in such Burgh were regularly brought under its cognizance. But if the fancy should seize the House, which God forbid! to establish any general principle of Reform in the Representation, he was not prepared to maintain, that its power was so limited that it could not act towards Ireland and Scotland as it might resolve to do with respect to England. It did not, however, follow, that the long-established rights and privileges of the Burghs under consideration should be interfered with by Parliament, merely because those Burghs did not happen to send such Representatives to that House as were exactly agreeable to the taste of particular persons. Such a conclusion was not indeed to be admitted, unless the House determined to enter into a consideration of the whole system of our representation. There was, he admitted, an imputed maladministration on the part of the Scots Burghs with respect to the management of their funds, and that was an evil which ought undoubtedly to be corrected. But there were two modes proposed for this correction, the one designed to meet the specific evil complained of, the other to touch the principle of election. The former mode, which was the object of the Lord Advocate's Bill, of the merits of which Bill, however, he was not yet competent to form a conclusive judgment, he decidedly preferred; for he could not accede to the latter, which served the purpose of the Noble Lord's motion, because he was adverse to any attempt to meddle with the Scots system of representation, entertaining, as he did, the utmost apprehension of the consequences of any measure tending to what was denominated Parliamentary Reform. To that Reform, indeed, he was a decided opponent, whatever disguise it assumed, or in whatever form it was presented; whether in the gross and disgusting shape in which it appeared in other places, or in the more plausible or less offensive character in which it was occasionally laid before that House. (Hear, hear!) To the establishment of the Reform of the Burghs, he was, in his view, a direct tendency, and therefore he was irresistibly impelled to resist its adoption. That such was, indeed, the ultimate object of the motion, was he feebly disguised, if not altogether avowed; and therefore being determined on every occasion to touch the question of Reform with that spirit, which must serve to exhibit all its native malignity, he felt it his duty to deprecate such

a motion. For while the wisdom and firmness of Parliament withstood the attempts to establish Reform in England, he could not consent to have an experiment made in Scotland that was but too likely to lead to the most dangerous consequences. Lord A. HAMILTON, in his reply, animadverted upon the attempt of the last speaker to misinterpret the language of the Petitioners, and to ascribe to them an object which they distinctly disavowed; for those Petitioners did not seek Parliamentary Reform, as the Right Hon. Gentleman assumed, but merely solicited the establishment of some security against the prodigal expenditure of their funds. Upon a division, the numbers were— For the motion, 149 Against it, 114 Majority, 35 When this result was announced, the cheering was louder and more general than we have ever heard in the House since the division that decided the fate of the Property Tax. The Waterford Chronicle. THURSDAY, MAY 13. In the House of Commons, on Thursday last, Lord ANGLIMORE HAMILTONS brought on the question of the Reform of the Scots Burghs, a measure which is so loudly called for in that part of the United Kingdom, and which the mal-administration of a self-elected Magistracy has rendered absolutely necessary. The motion for a Committee was ably supported, and opposed by nothing like solid argument. Mr. W. DUNDAS behaved with pathetic and, on such a subject, almost ludicrous eloquence, the perils to which the rottenness of the Burghs was exposed. Even Mr. CANNING failed in the want display of his talents, and the motion was carried against all the weight of ministerial power. We refer to the details of the proceedings, which, although more immediately connected with Scotland, are in reality of national interest, and afford information on a topic which is but imperfectly understood in Ireland. Mr. TEMPLEY has given notice of a motion on the state of the Nation for the 18th of this month. This investigation is of the highest importance, and will bring the whole situation of the Country, in point of foreign and domestic politics, of finance, commerce, and manufactures, under review. The motion promises to excite an animated struggle between the two great parties in the State. On Friday, in the House of Lords, Sir G. Grey expressed his dissent from the Noble Lord (DUNDAS) who had given notice of bringing forward, on that day, the question respecting the Roman Catholics, who so extremely ill, that he was unable to attend the House. The Noble Earl regretted much the disappointment, not only on account of the importance of the question, but also from the great public interest it had excited. To prevent, as far as possible, another disappointment, he proposed to name Monday next (next Monday) for the discussion. The Globe of Friday contained the following paragraph:—"Our account of the circumstances which took place in the House of Commons on Monday night, immediately previous to the division on the Catholic Question, was so far incorrect, that it was before, and not after, the decision by the SPEAKER, in favour of the Noes, that the right of addressing the Chair was determined against Mr. PLESKETT. On the gallery being cleared, Mr. PELL rose, but sat down again without any apparent reason. The question was put, and the usual cries of "Aye" from the one side, and "Nay" from the other, followed. At that moment, before the SPEAKER had pronounced his opinion on the numbers, Mr. PLESKETT presented himself to the notice of the House, but was informed from the Chair, that the regular time of speaking on the question had elapsed. Mr. PLESKETT conceived the right remained till the question should have been put a second time, and stated and urged the argument to that effect with the greatest force and earnestness. The point of order was then discussed, and determined against him. We have the best reason to know, that the last Right Hon. Gentleman delayed joining in the debate, till so late an hour, to have an opportunity of replying to extracts of a very different description from those few words, which he thought it prudent to put themselves forward—and that he greatly lamented having fallen into so natural an error."

We understand, that, on the day on which the Claims of the Roman Catholics were discussed, there were 572 Members of the House of Commons in London; and that, even if there had not been a single absentee on the division, the majority against Mr. GRATTAN'S motion would have only amounted to ten—so much for the Courier's majority of 49 or 50. The defeat has, in truth, been nothing more than formal, and next Session of Parliament must bring victory with it, if the affairs of the Catholics shall, during the interval, be conducted with prudence & wisdom. Let there be no Boards, and no Associations of any kind. These will assuredly retard the grand object in contemplation, and if ever they were necessary at all, they may now be completely dispensed with. The march of the human mind is every where decidedly in favour of Emancipation, and it is to be particularly observed, that, even in Scotland, the opposition was confined to a district which has at all times been eminently distinguished for the illiberality of its principles, and that a greater number of Members from that Country voted for Mr. GRATTAN'S motion than generally make their appearance in the House, except when their own interests are concerned, and then they muster in formidable and united force, like the phalanx that entered the field, and frightened Ministers, on the subject of illicit distillation. The Frankfort Journal has announced that the Russian Court is about to withdraw from St. Helena the Commission placed there by it, to assist in the safe custody of NAPOLEON. The trial at Brussels of the persons accused of a conspiracy against the Emperor ALEXANDER, during last autumn, have all been found guilty, and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment:—PROEN and DUBREUX, one year; POULLOT (alias LAOCHOU) and BERTIN, three years; and BUCQUOT two years in the pillory, and to be branded. All the prisoners were to pay the costs. The military movements in France, and the strengthening of the Northern Frontier, have excited the apprehensions of some of the neighbours. An article from Berlin says:—"The France which affairs appear to take in the interior of her Cabinet attracts more and more the attention of our Country. It is said, that, as a measure of safety, all our strong places on the Rhine will, in future, be provisioned for a year. Orders have been also given to finish, as soon as possible, the works of our fortifications."

CATHOLIC AFFAIRS. (From The Dublin Evening Post.) It is manifest that the Ascendancy is vexed and mortified. If our wish were to perpetuate the avail ourselves of the present opportunity; but we can do so with a desire—we shall not even condescend to notice the melancholy ravings put forth by the Organs of the Party. It would be almost cowardly to triumph in their defeat. We leave them, therefore, to such consolation as their wounded spirit is capable of receiving, and return to the more cheering prospect before us. We find, by the London Papers, that they confess themselves unable to supply a catalogue of the Ayes and Nays on Monday night. We shall, in some respect, supply the deficiency, by publishing Lists, at least of the Irish Members, and how they voted, and which of them declined attending his duty. We can state, then, from unquestionable authority, that, on Monday night past, there was a greater attendance of Irish Members than has ever taken place since the Union—more than NINETY-FIVE Irish Representatives being present in the House of Commons during the Debate. The following, we have reason to conclude, is a correct List of the Minority and Majority of Members, representing Irish Counties and Boroughs, who voted on that occasion:—

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| Ayes—       | 57  |
| Paired off— | 1   |
| Shut out—   | 57  |
| Absent—     | 6   |
| Total—      | 100 |

This statement is, alone, a tolerable proof, that the Protestant mind of the People of Ireland is favourable to Catholic Emancipation. Though it will not silence the eternal ravings of the Faction, it must be conclusive with every man who views the Question with impartiality.

List of Irish Members who voted on Mr. Grattan's Motion on the Catholic Question.

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| AYES.                     |   |
| Barnwell, Right Hon. W.   | Harvey, C.                                    |
| Bernard, Thomas           | Hill, Lord                                    |
| Berridge, John            | Hutchinson, Hon. C. H.                        |
| Bocher, W. W.             | Kelly, John                                   |
| Boyle, Earl of            | Kingborough, Visct.                           |
| Blake, Van                | Lansdowne, John                               |
| Browne, Don               | Lansdowne, Robert                             |
| Blount, James             | Martin, Richard                               |
| Butler, Hon. C.           | Martin, Hon. A.                               |
| Carroll, R. S.            | Newport, Sir John                             |
| Carroll, John             | O'Brien, Sir Edward                           |
| Carroll, John             | Ogle, H. M.                                   |
| Clifford, Visct.          | Parnell, Sir H.                               |
| Collopy, Visct.           | Parsons, W.                                   |
| Collopy, Cesar            | Pinkett, Right Hon. W. C.                     |
| Collings, Sir N.          | Pole, Right Hon. W. C.                        |
| Conroy, James             | Ponsonby, Hon. F. C.                          |
| Conroy, Gerald            | Power, Hon. F. A.                             |
| Daly, James               | Power, Richard                                |
| Dunlop, Edward            | Preble, Hon. G. L.                            |
| Fitzgerald, Right Hon. V. | Quin, Hon. W. W.                              |
| Fitzgerald, Right Hon. M. | Richardson, Wm.                               |
| Fitzgerald, Lord W.       | Shaw, Robert                                  |
| Forbes, Hon. R.           | Sumerville, Sir M.                            |
| Forbes, Lord              | Stewart, Alex.                                |
| Glanville, Lord           | Talbot, R. W.                                 |
| Grattan, Right Hon. H.    | Walpole, Hon. G.                              |
| Hamilton, Hans            | White, Luke                                   |
| NOES.                     |   |
| Bromley, C.               | Jocelyn, Visct.                               |
| Bury, Right Hon. J. M.    | Leah, C. P.                                   |
| Burford, Lord G.          | Montagu, Earl of                              |
| Burgh, Sir John           | Richardson, Richard                           |
| Bent, John                | O'Neill, Hon. J. B.                           |
| Bent, Burgh, Visct.       | Percival, Spencer                             |
| Copple, Ed. S.            | Pakenham, Hon. R. H.                          |
| Collet, Ed. L.            | Richardson, Wm.                               |
| Cole, Sir L.              | Rochford, Gustav                              |
| Croft, George             | Seymour, Hugh                                 |
| Dawson, George            | Seymour, Honore                               |
| Evans, H.                 | Smyth, Nathaniel                              |
| Foster, Right Hon. J.     | Stewart, William                              |
| Forbes, Hon. R.           | Vereker, Hon. C. S.                           |
| Gordon, John              | Wentworth, Hon. H. R.                         |
| Hare, Hon. Rich.          | Hon. T. Knox paired off against the Question. |
| Hill, Sir G.              |   |

Mr. Ulysses Burgh; Sir T. Featherstone; C. O'Hara; Earl of Belfast; Hon. F. J. Neeldham; and John Parsons.

Sir John Stewart and General Archdall, who had intended to oppose Mr. Grattan's Motion, were shut out.

The following Lists are interesting. Their accuracy, we believe, may be relied upon, the

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Number of Members in Grand, May 3. . . . .    | 570 |
| Voted for Mr. Grattan's Motion, including     |     |
| Ayes . . . . .                                | 543 |
| Paired off . . . . .                          | 20  |
| Absent, who were sure Votes . . . . .         | 14  |
| Total . . . . . 577                           |     |
| Voted against Mr. Grattan's Motion. . . . .   |     |
| Noes . . . . .                                | 945 |
| Paired off . . . . .                          | 9   |
| Absent, who were sure Votes against . . . . . | 20  |
| Total . . . . . 974                           |     |
| The Speaker . . . . . 1                       |     |
| Total . . . . . 975                           |     |
| For . . . . . 577                             |     |
| Half the Doubtfuls . . . . . 19               |     |
| Total . . . . . 596                           |     |
| Against . . . . . 274                         |     |
| Half the Doubtfuls . . . . . 19               |     |
| Total . . . . . 293                           |     |
| Majority for the Catholics . . . . . 299      |     |

Such a division, when 277 votes appeared, without any doubt, in favour of the Question, in opposition to the Court influence and all private considerations, is a virtual carrying of the Question.

THE WONDERFUL DOGS. Signor M. GRAMONDI has obtained permission from the Corporation to exhibit the feats of these surprising animals in the large room on the Mall, which was some time ago occupied as a temporary Theatre. It will take a few days for Mr. GRAMONDI to put up his scenery, and to make other necessary arrangements, but due notice of the opening of the Exhibition will be given to the Public. Many of the Inhabitants of this City and Vicinity have elsewhere witnessed these performances, but they, from the high gratification they formerly received, will appear among the first visitors on the present occasion. The Exhibition is perfectly singular, and none will lose an opportunity of pleasure which may never again be offered to them.

PORT NEWS.—PANAGO, MAY 12. ARRIVED. 11th—Lady Penning, Dalzell, Beaumaris, slates, for Row; New Mary, Harris, Baltimore, potatoes, a market; Mansfield Packet.

SAILED. 10th—Providence, Robinson, Newport; cattle and sheep; Surprise, Nelson, Bristol, bacon, &c.; Freeing Packet. 11th—Sarah, Mould, Milford, cattle; Camden Packet; Lovely Peggy, York, Liverpool, wheat and flour; Liverpool, wheat, flour, &c.; Ann, Evans, Bristol, oats; Triumph, Nicholas, Swansea, sheep; Penryn, Hull, from Baltimore, Swansea, copper, iron; Galls, Anderson, Milford, Galatz.

Wind W. S. W. past 7 morning.

CITY OF WATERFORD. THE COMMITTEE of the CORPORATION, having it in contemplation to repair the STREETS of this City with LIME-STONES, and being anxious at the same time, as far as in them lies, to afford Employment to the industrious POOR, have directed, that Measures for these Purposes shall be immediately adopted. Written Proposals for the Execution of the Work to be addressed to ROBERT COOKE, Esq. who will lay them before the Committee. Waterford, May 13, 1810.

EQUITY, EXCHEQUER. PURSUANT to an Order of His Majesty's Court of Exchequer, bearing date the 10th day of May, 1810, and several other Orders, I will, on THURSDAY, the 27th day of May instant, at one o'clock in the Afternoon, at my Office on the Inn-Yards, Dublin, set up and let by Public Auction, to the highest and best Bidder, for Three Years from the first day of May instant, pending this Cause—all that and those the DWALING HOUSES, OFFICES, DEMESNES and LANDS of CULLENAGH, in the County of Waterford, containing about Seventy-eight Acres, situated near or thereabouts, in the Pleadings in this Cause mentioned. Dated this 11th of May, 1810. WELLESLEY, His Attorney at Law, Dublin.

AUCTION OF NEW AND ELEGANT FURNITURE. TO BE SOLD, on MONDAY, the 17th of May, 1810, at HERMITAGE, near DUNGARVAN, (the residence of PIERCE EUSTACE BARRON, Esq.) the entire HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE—consisting of Drawing-Room, Bed-Room, and Parlour Chairs; Pier, Chimney, Breakfast, Sofa, Card, and Dressing Tables; Pier, Chimney, and Dressing Tables; Drawing-Room and Parlour stools; a Chain Lounge; Bedsteads and Hangings; Beds, Mattresses, and Pillows; Chamberlains, Globes; Bronze Figures, and Transparencies; Hall Chairs; Italian Marble Tables; an excellent Eight-Day Clock; Parlor, Drawing-Room, Bed-Room, and Chair Carpeting; China, Delft, Glass, &c. &c.—with a Variety of other Articles too numerous to mention—Kitchen and Dairy Furniture included. The above Sale will be found well worth attention; as the Furniture is of the newest kind, in the highest state of preservation, and will be sold without reserve. May 12, 1810.

APERTENT SODAIC POWDERS. THIS much esteemed and elegant Preparation, which besides forming an agreeable Draught, acts as a mild Aperient, relieving Heartburns, Bile, Nausea, Acidity in the Stomach, &c. is recommended to those who are afflicted with weaknes, or other causes, reject of the system, and is particularly useful in the treatment of Children as well as Adults. If taken after too free indulgence of the Table, the common disagreeable effects are altogether avoided. In Warm climates, these Powders are found peculiarly beneficial, as they operate on the Biliary System, without debilitating the Stomach. Sold in Botts, at 3s. 6d. each, at the Medical Hall, 31, Lower Sackville-street, Dublin; and by R. BURKE & SONS, 4, Cheap-side, London; and by J. R. HARRIS & CO., 1, Broad-street, Waterford; TAYLOR, WEAVER, & HACKETT, 1, Cornhill, London; and by the several Booksellers, Stationers, &c. &c. in every part of the Kingdom. May 12, 1810.