Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No. 12,554. THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1820. PRICE FIVE PENCE.

PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—MONDAY, MAY 8.

CIVIL LIST.

The Order of the Day for the further consideration of the Resolutions of the Civil List being read,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that before he moved the second reading of the Resolutions, he should shortly explain the circumstances under which they were offered to their consideration. In comparing the last establishment, in 1816, with the former arrangements, it was necessary to remark, that at four former times had Parliament made payment of the debts of the Civil List, and four times without accounts or investigation, on the mere statement of the fact in a Message from the Crown—and thus four times had voted a permanent increase of the Civil List. In 1782, a very considerable improvement in the Civil List arrangements took place, and permanent rules were laid down for the administration of its revenues. It was thus the Civil List charges were divided into classes, to be paid in regular succession, and on this principle it was hoped that such a system of economy would be carried into practice, as would prevent the recurrence of embarrassments. If Mr. Burke, the illustrious author of that Bill, had gone a little farther, his hopes would probably have been well founded; but though he divided the ordinary expenditure into classes, a power was given to make occasional payments to any amount. Though no limits were set to the contingent expenses, there was no deficiency in the Civil List thenceforward, till the breaking out of the French war—but after that, all the contingent expenses were so increased, that in 1790 there was an arrear of £900,000. At that time extensive accounts were laid before Parliament—the debts were paid, and further provision was made for the Civil List expenditure. From that time forward, though the ordinary expenses of the Civil List exceeded the sums allowed for them, it was not found necessary to call for a direct provision for them, as the large sums at the disposal of the Crown, in the shape of Droits of Admiralty, &c. afforded a fund to supply those deficiencies. Yet in 1804 the authority of Parliament was again resorted to, and estimates were framed for the future expenditure of the Civil List. In 1811 and 12, the subject came again under investigation, and an excess of £124,000 per annum was found to have taken place. Between 1812 and 1816 a further increase of expenditure took place, and a greater excess happened than in any former years. A Committee was then appointed, which sat three months, and the arrangements in consequence of its report were brought forward in the House by the Noble Secretary of State for the Foreign Department. That Bill repealed so much of Burke's Bill as regarded the payments according to the order of classes, and directed that the demands of each class should be answered by appropriations at the beginning of each quarter. The advantage on the score of economy from this arrangement was very considerable, because the different departments of the Household, being thus enabled to deal with ready money, enjoyed an advantage thereby, which they had never had under any other system of the Civil List. It also provided in a complete manner for the comfort and convenience of the persons, many of whom were in narrow circumstances, who depended on the Civil List. The distress which some of the officers suffered who were five, six, or seven quarters in arrears, might be easily conceived. In both these particulars, the arrangement of 1816 was an improvement, but with respect to the Public the advantage was still more considerable, by its economy in comparison of former times. The expenses of the Civil List, since 1816, had been less by £150,000 than the average of the three years before. In proposing the establishment at present on a system similar to that of 1816, he was proceeding on a principle already sanctioned by Parliament, of providing a sufficient, but not an extravagant allowance, retaining such a control over the expenditure as would prevent the recurrence of future debt. The Establishment of 1816 he should therefore propose entire, with the exception of the reduction of the first class. That class contained allowances to the amount of £298,000 a year, being the allowance for the Windsor Establishment, the privy purse of his Majesty, the allowance to her late Majesty, and the privy purse of the Prince Regent, exercising the functions of royalty. Of these allowances, the King's privy purse of £60,000 a year was all that would remain; and as this class alone was the only one in which the circumstances connected with the demise of the Crown had made any alteration, it was the only one in which he should propose any change. There would be thus a saving of £238,000, with the exception of such provision as the liberality of Parliament chose to make for the servants of his late Majesty. After expressing his conviction that no new circumstances could be shewn to call for delay, he concluded by moving that the Resolutions be read a second time.

Lord J. RUSSELL rose and said, that it was with considerable pain that he undertook the ungracious task of moving, that the Second Reading of the Resolutions should be postponed, in order to afford time to appoint a Committee, closely to investigate the subject of them. It made him apprehensive of the fate of such a motion, when he recollected that neither the eloquence nor the wit of his Hon. and Learned Friend (Mr. Brougham) had been able to persuade the House the other night to concur with him in his motion: He (Lord J. R.) had, however, one advantage, that he had a question more obvious and more easy of solution to put to the House than that which his Hon. and Learned Friend had proposed. It was this—whether they, as Representatives of the People, with professions to their Constituents scarcely passed from their lips, would agree, on the mere asking of the Ministers of the Crown, on accounts of old standing, which not one-half of them had an opportunity of examining, to vote a round sum for the Civil List; or whether, after examination of the wants of the Crown, and the exigencies of the People, they should settle such an allowance as was called for by their duties to both? *(Hear, hear!)* The latter course he had no doubt would be as much the more beneficial to the King as it was beneficial to the Country. They had, in the first place, to consider the time at which the proposition was made to them, at a moment when they had complaints from all classes of men, agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing. They were all labouring under distress, much aggravated by the late decision on Bullion Payments; he said it out of no disrespect to that decision, which was, perhaps, the best which the case admitted of, and which only shewed how much more difficult it was to retrieve errors than to fall into them. Within the few last years, as had been mentioned in the course of the present evening, the value of money had been raised 25 or 30 per cent. If the diminution of taxes were calculated at fifteen millions, that sum would amount to only 22 or 23 per cent. on the sum total of our taxation, so that the People at present suffered under a weight of taxation as great as that which they had borne during the latter years of the war. In such a state of the Country, he fairly asked the House to pause. If the arrangement of 1816 were the best that wit could devise—if the economy of the Civil List were now as perfect as that of the American republic—he should still think it the duty of the House to look into it before they approved of it. As to the time which an investigation would take, he wondered to hear that made an objection by the Ministers, who had dissolved the Parliament for the professed purpose of getting a House of Commons which might devote its time to this subject. *(Hear!)* Indeed, if they were, on the pretence of want of time to inquire, to vote nearly a million a year on the mere word of Ministers, the House of Commons was perfectly useless; it would be as well to print at once, in *The Gazette*, the sum which his Majesty wanted, as to come down without explanations, and declare that such a sum was proper, and to be granted without delay. There was a fallacy evident in the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The first class of allowances in the Civil List would nominally be put an end to, there remained to be provided for, the servants of the late Queen and the Princess Charlotte of Wales. When these things were considered, the moderation of the Ministers would not be equal to their professions. It was the duty of the House, from the experience of the past, to see whether no saving could be made on the Civil List expenditure. On the Windsor establishment were some of the officers of state, and consequently without their attendance the dignity of the throne was supported by the high person who performed the functions of the monarchy. The Groom of the Stole, for instance, was one. An Honourable Friend of his suggested that the office of Groom of the Stole was abolished, but he mentioned that officer merely as an illustration of the possibility of saving without a diminution of the royal dignity, but merely with a reduction of patronage. Against cutting off those officers, which were the useless relics of feudal barbarism, it was urged that they were venerable relics of older times. But the "older times" whence they had been derived had had truer notions on these matters. A Master of the Hawks formed an Officer of the Household, because falconry had formed a principal part of the royal pleasure; and they might as well say that the King should be denied the comforts or luxuries of the present age on account of the remembrance of ancient usage, and provide him clean straw for his bed, with an allowance of litter for his chambers. But the great vice in the present condition of the Civil List was its arrangement. Since the accession of the late King, Parliament had paid of the debts of the Civil List £3,213,660; there had been paid out of the Droits of Admiralty £4,866,000; out of the Consolidated Fund £9,561,000; making £17,641,000, paid from sources other than the ordinary revenue of the Civil List; and if the other allowances paid out of the Consolidated Fund for Civil List purposes were taken into the account, it would appear by moderate calculation, that twenty millions had been paid to the Civil List which had not been contemplated by Parliament! There was thus manifestly some vice in the constitution of the Civil List. That vice was to be found in the notion, that all the expenses of the Civil Government were to be paid out of the Civil List. Those expenses had soon become so enormous, as to render it impossible to follow up that principle to its full extent; but those who had the power, instead of making a complete separation of all expenses not connected with the monarchy from the Civil List, had only carried over a few expenses as necessity urged them.—They had thus charged on the Civil List a quarter of a Speaker, and fractions of Judges; they found there what they expected not, and expected what they did not find. The Heir Presumptive was not named in it, but all sorts of officers, from the Lord High Chancellor to the rat-catcher at Carlton Palace, were saddled upon it. When his Learned Friend had urged so well his objections to this system, the only two phrases used against him (for arguments there were none) were, a "stipendiary King," and an "insolent King." As to the first phrase, it might well have been brought into play when the proposal was first made in the reign of Charles II. to abolish wards and liveries, or when the sum was first fixed for the Civil List for William III. To bring it up now was rather extraordinary. Who were they who used the phrase, but those who brought down from time to time all the expenses of the Household, all the items for bread and greens which had been read by the Right Hon. Gent. (Mr. Canning) to excite their horror; those who had brought forward all these details to justify the payment of debts, the very least of which had been contracted on account of the Royal House-hold; for they had in the accounts 18 and 30 thousands for foreign missions, and large sums for other public services, among which was the sum of £5000 for an entertainment given on the return of Ferdinand VII. to Madrid. *(Hear! and a laugh.)* As to the phrase, "insolent King," it seemed to have great force, as it had been repeated often with an apparent conviction that every one would start with horror at the idea it conveyed. It seemed to proceed from the notion that the Crown, when it stood alone, was unpopular. They who thought so were totally mistaken. Even the most violent political writers, Mr. Cobbett, for instance, who might be supposed to spare nothing, always spoke with respect of the Crown. It was the Crown, not the Ministry, that the Ministers, when they wished to raise a cry for themselves, called on the People to rally round, well knowing that they fared best when confounded with the Monarch or the Throne.—He was thus far from thinking that the Crown would suffer by being separated from the expenses of the Civil Government, and those who looked to the expenses now classed together with the maintenance of the Crown. There was the secret service money of the Home Department—that extremely popular branch of the public expenditure. *(A laugh.)* That the payments of Oliver, Castles, or Edwards, were derived from the same fund which supplied the expense of royalty, was, according to the Ministers, an aid to the splendour and dignity of the Throne.

Mr. WARRE was by no means disposed to utter, or to countenance, any denunciation against the splendour of royalty. On the contrary, indeed, no man could be more anxious to support that splendour; but he objected to any degree of expense unnecessary for that purpose—and believing that such expence was included in the Civil List, as it was at present arranged, he was desirous for a full, fair, elaborate inquiry upon the subject. He therefore seconded the motion of his Noble Friend.

Mr. HUSKISSON thought that the proposed arrangement could not be objected to upon due consideration, if it were not desired that we should have no Civil List at all. He was prepared to contend that there was no ground whatever for the proposed inquiry, or for any objection to the proposed arrangement of the Civil List; unless it were maintained that the establishment of the King should be less than that of the Regent, or that his Majesty was not entitled to spend so much in his present capacity, as he was enabled to do in that of the Regent. *(Hear, hear! on the Ministerial Benches.)* This proposition, he presumed, the Noble Lord would not attempt to assert; but even if he did, he was still called upon, in order to sustain his motion, to shew that precedents existed for an inquiry of this sort.

Mr. TIERNEY said, that in addressing the House upon a subject of this nature, at a time of such general and grievous distress—at a time that our agriculture was so materially depressed, and so likely to become worse—at a time when our commerce was in the condition so forcibly described by an Hon. Friend near him (Mr. Baring)—at a time when our manufacturers were nearly starving—at a time when the discontents arising out of such circumstances were such as to break out in various quarters into acts of unjustifiable violence—at a time when the public revenue had fallen to such a considerable extent as imperiously to call for the most rigid economy in every branch of the public expenditure—he could make no apology for occupying the attention of the House, while he submitted the observations which such a state of things naturally suggested to his mind. He called upon the House to inquire upon this subject, for the satisfaction of the Public, for the credit of the Crown, and for the vindication of its own character. If a due inquiry were instituted, the Country would be contented with the grant, although that grant might not be more than 1000 less than the sum now proposed. But the saving would, he was persuaded, be considerably more, if a thorough investigation were allowed to take place upon this subject. Of the fallacy of the estimates to which reference had so often and so confidently been made on this occasion, the House might judge from this fact, that although the estimates of 1815 amounted to £1,448,000, the Act of 1816 was founded upon an estimate introduced, making a deduction of £139,000, and the Right Hon. Gentleman had then said, that the ground of this deduction was the depreciation of the value of money. The Noble Lord, indeed, had given other reasons for this difference in the amount of the estimate for the two years, and had referred to charges for additional Ambassadors, and for keeping the gardens. But he (Mr. Tierney) knew not, nor could any man know, what real payments had been made. In every point of view, therefore, there was no sound method of arriving at a knowledge of the sum which was or ought to be granted, but by a Committee of Inquiry.—It was said that the average of the seven years ending in 1811 was the true criterion by which to form an estimate of the Civil List. This he distinctly denied. He would call to the recollection of the House the great expences of his late Majesty, arising from a large family, the expences of the Board of Works, incurred not in repairing, but in improving the stupendous structure of Windsor Castle, and in building Kensington Palace for the then Princess of Wales, the expences of his Majesty in removing his family from London to Windsor & Weymouth. None of these circumstances applied to the present day, and a scale of expenditure, suited to that period, ought not to be adopted in the present reign. The House would not discharge their duty to their Country, if they did not watch with the greatest jealousy the proceedings of his Majesty's Ministers. In that part of the Report of the Committee in 1815 which respected the charge for Ambassadors, the Noble Lord (Lord Castlereagh) had himself acknowledged an error of £25,000. Now could he (Mr. Tierney) be sure that there was not now an error of £50,000? Four most eventful years, and many changes had taken place, and it was most incumbent upon the House to pause and inquire, unless they were ready to place implicit reliance upon his Majesty's Ministers, and to assent to whatever the Crown might expect at their hands. They were called upon to vote £850,000 for the Civil List Establishment of Great Britain, and £200,000 for Ireland; but no inquiry had at any time taken place with respect to the Irish expenditure. The accounts of the Civil List had become so complicated, so many sums had been taken from one head and added to another, that it was extremely difficult to arrive at an accurate knowledge of the subject. There was another view of this question, which he considered to be most important. The Right Hon. Gentleman had stated, that the sum of £60,000 per annum appropriated "to the Privy Purse was the only sum that properly remained to the Crown, and he (Mr. Tierney) would have wished that this sum had been charged on the Consolidated Fund, instead of the Civil List. It was not placing the Crown in that proud situation in which it formerly stood. Formerly, the King was considered as the father of his People, and a gross sum was given him, which he might expend in acts of beneficence. Now, even her Majesty the Queen could not find a place in the Civil List; and in a Bill providing for the Royal Household, the Queen of England was excluded, although recognised by the Lord Chancellor, and, happily for her, represented by his Hon. Friend (Mr. Brougham). He would not press this topic further at present, because it must necessarily become the subject of future discussion. In considering the question of placing the sum of £60 000 at the disposal of his Majesty, it was material to understand how much of that sum was already in his Majesty's possession. The House were proceeding entirely in the dark. There were the Revenues of the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, the former, he believed, amounting to £10,000, and the latter to £15,000 per annum. If to these sums were added £6000 a year for the £385,000 which had been appropriated from time to time to the Privy Purse, the whole amount would be ninety-one thousand pounds a year, being an increase of fifty per cent. upon the gross sum of sixty thousand pounds per annum. The mischief of enabling his Majesty's Ministers to apply large sums out of this extraordinary resource must be obvious to every one, and the House would see how easy it would be, at the eve of a General Election, to take £20,000 out of the Privy Purse for the purposes of corruption. He made this statement with great pain to himself. He admitted that this was not a time to wound the feelings of his Majesty; but he felt that he should not discharge his duty to the Country, if he imitated the conduct of Ministers, in consenting to a few minor retrenchments, and discharging a few unhappy clerks, while they shut their eyes upon the improvident grant which they were called upon to vote to his Majesty. He had discharged his duty to the Country, and he trusted that the House would discharge theirs.

Mr. CANNING argued at considerable length in support of the motion of Mr. VANSITTART.

The House then proceeded to a Division, when there appeared—For the Amendment, 157—Against it, 256—Majority, 99.

On our re-admission to the Gallery, we found Sir J. NEWPORT on his legs, protesting against that part of the Resolutions which referred to the Civil List of Ireland, on the ground that no inquiry whatever had taken place with respect to it during the last reign. Whatever might be said for the Civil List of England, there was not even the semblance of an inquiry into that of Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that as there was no intention of making any alteration in the Civil List of Ireland, it was not considered necessary to adopt any inquiry.

The original Resolutions were then put and agreed to; and the House adjourned.

The Chevalier Domeny Di Ricozo, has quitted the persecution in France, and is now on a tour of the Highlands of Scotland.

WATERFORD:
Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PERRIN, Chronicle-Office, Quay.
Agents for England—Messrs. Newton and Co. *Warwick-square, London.*
Agent for Ireland—J. K. Jonstone and Co. No. 3, *Lower Ormond-quay, Dublin.*

PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS—FRIDAY, MAY 12.

NEW RESTRICTIVE ACTS.

The Earl of DARNLEY said, that facts had occurred which shewed that the objections of Noble Lords on his side of the House to the series of restrictive Acts passed in the late Session of Parliament, as being uncalled for and unnecessary, had been perfectly well founded. He had been informed, that not a single conviction had taken place on offences against which penalties had been provided in them, while there had been many convictions for such offences under the old laws. To ascertain this fully, and to put the House in possession of the information, he should beg leave to move, That there be laid before the House an account of all the convictions which have taken place on penal Acts of Parliament, passed since the 1st December, 1819.—Ordered.

EPISCOPAL POWERS.

The Order of the Day having been read for the consideration of a Petition from a Clergyman of the Diocess of Exeter, which Lord Holland had given notice of presenting, & for which the House had been summoned—

Lord HOLLAND rose.—Before entering on the principal subject to which he had to entreat their Lordships' attention, he felt it necessary to say a few words on two other points connected therewith. The first related to the time at which the Petition in question was brought before their Lordships; the second to the mode of redress adopted by the Petitioner. With respect to the first, their Lordships might, unless some explanation were offered, justly inquire why they were now, for the first time, called on to consider and afford relief for an injury alleged to be committed a considerable time since. It was due to the Petitioner to state that this delay was not imputable to him. So far back as last November, he had applied to a Noble Lord, as much distinguished by his eloquence as by his ardent love of liberty, and generous sympathy with all who were suffering under wrong—he meant his Noble Friend, Earl Grey—who had readily consented to lay his Petition and cause of complaint before the House. Illness, however, had prevented him from keeping his promise, and had caused the affair to be transferred to his (Lord Holland's) management; and the dissolution of Parliament, joined to personal indisposition, was the reason of the additional delay. As to the second point, the Petitioner was driven to bring his case under the consideration of the House, because he had understood, from persons well informed on the subject, that he had no remedy at law. The more natural course on the present occasion, and that which he had an undoubted right to pursue, would have been to introduce the Petition to the notice of the House; and in case it should be laid on the table, to found such motion thereon as under the circumstances of the case might seem proper. But he had thought it more fair and candid to adopt the course he was following. In doing so, he was acting entirely according to the wishes of the Petitioner, who had shewn the utmost desire to proceed in the most fair, candid, temperate and upright manner, and had so conducted himself in relation to the Reverend Prelates, whose proceedings were canvassed in the Petition. He should now proceed to the allegations of the Petition itself. In substance it stated, that the Petitioner was a Clergyman of the Church of England, regularly ordained, and that he had held a curacy in the diocess of Exeter; that, some few months before, a meeting had been publicly convened in the county of Exeter, for the purpose of presenting a Petition to the King and both Houses of Parliament against the claims of the Roman Catholics. The Petitioner stated, that having been charitably inclined towards that body of people, he had attended at the same meeting, and had delivered a speech in answer to one made by a Rev. Brother, in support of the object intended. In some time after, thro' the kindness of a friend, he was presented with two livings, one in the diocess of Peterborough, the other in that of Lincoln; that he got testimonials from three neighbouring beneficed clergymen, who stated, that he had for three preceding years led a moral, orderly, pious life, and had not, during that space of time, or before, so far as they knew, held, professed, or taught any religious opinions contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England. That he submitted these testimonials, according to the common custom in such cases, to the Bishop of the diocess in which his clerical duty was to be performed, in order to have them countersigned, but that he constantly refused so to do. He then wrote to the two reverend and very respectable Prelates who presided over the diocesses in which his livings lay, to know whether they would be willing to institute him without the counter-signature. They replied, that on such testimonials they would be unable, though their determination proceeded on somewhat different grounds. He then requested an interview with his own diocesan, to know the reasons why he had refused his counter-signature, and in the interview granted, that Rev. Prelate assumed a right to refuse, without accounting for the cause. The Petitioner affirmed, that the decision was not founded on any incompetency or incapacity to discharge the functions of his order, because the Bishop had at his request made a distinct disclaimer of that. Subsequently, however, the Learned Bishop allowed that the refusal was founded on the fact of his having made use of certain words in a speech delivered in the hearing of the Public. What the words were alleged to be, the Noble Lord said, would presently be seen—whether they were ever spoken—and what the effect of them would be, if they had been spoken. The Petitioner affirmed he had never spoken them. He was answered, that persons who had heard him said otherwise. His Lordship, after commenting on the severity of proceeding on evidence which there was no possible opportunity to rebut, said that the Petitioner went on to state that his only hope of remedy was grounded on their Lordships' consideration of the Petition, as he was instructed that the law afforded none. The Petitioner, the Noble Lord continued, not only had various documents to produce in corroboration of the facts on the face of the Petition, but thought it necessary to state all the facts which had come to his knowledge, that might serve to explain or account for the proceedings of the Rev. Bishop. He, therefore, set forth, that his Diocesan had most candidly, at his request, informed the two other Prelates, that he had no objection to him whatever on the score of moral character. He had even gone a step further than he desired, and described to those learned and reverend individuals the reasons of his withholding his counter-signature. The Petitioner lastly alleged, that the consequences of this step had fallen most heavily on him, and had destroyed his prospects in his profession. He still, however, held his curacy, which was a matter of surprise, because if he had committed any canonical offence which rendered the counter-signature improper, that should also be a reason for his being deprived of the curacy. Having said so much on the allegations of the Petition, he should observe that it was, he supposed, no great objection to a man in this country that he was a warm politician. *(A laugh.)* The inquiries he had made into the life and conversation of this individual proved most creditable to him. He had learned that shortly after being ordained (we believe in the year 1814) he had been appointed to a curacy in the county of Devon, the duties of which he had most exemplarily performed—that he never was absent from it above a week or ten days; and in consequence received a letter from the wife of the Rector, who was disabled by illness from writing himself, stating her husband's satisfaction at having procured a Curate so diligent and conscientious in the performance of the duties devolved on him. And some time after, when the Rector died, the parishioners united in a memorial to the Bishop of the diocess, praying that the Petitioner might be appointed to the vacant benefice; and though the object of their application had not been obtained, yet there was reason to think that that testimony to his meritorious conduct had not been without its effects on his mind. The power claimed and exercised on this occasion would have, if allowed, the preposterous effect of enabling a Bishop to prevent preferment in another diocess in a way he could not in his own. In such a case, a Bishop should be compelled by process of law to state his reasons of refusal before another tribunal; and if he did not give his reasons, there should be another power to compel the institution. But he was told that there was no superintending jurisdiction in case of a refusal of counter-signature; and even supposing that it was conscientiously and justly executed, yet this was an enormous and arbitrary discretionary power. If it was to continue, it should be considered what injury, without means of prevention or redress, might in that way be done, not only to a great number of respectable individuals, but to the rights of their Lordships' own property in livings, as patrons; for though Mr. Jones honourably surrendered the presentation to the patrons, yet the law did not oblige him—and if he had perseveringly insisted on the rights with which he had been invested, the patrons having had no opportunity to present anew, the livings would have lapsed to the Bishops eventually. But he could not refrain from expressing other observations to which the petition gave rise. The discretion had been harshly and injudiciously executed; the reason alleged for its exertion was the delivery of the words to this effect by the Petitioner, in a speech at a County Meeting:—"Nine-tenths of the Clergymen of the Church of England, in signing the eighth article of that Church, which contains an approbation of the Athanasian Creed, and its damnable clauses, signed what they did not believe." The Petitioner affirmed he had not used this language; and, indeed, judging from the context and the tenor of the whole address, the words must have been incorrectly reported; and instead of *damnable*, the word *damnatory* should be inserted in the passage. The Petitioner offered proof of his assertion, and referred to these three important points: He said, look at the newspapers in which the speech was reported at the time, and you will find no such thing—look to the evidence of persons who were present, and they will say that they did not hear the words—look also to the whole tenor of the argument, and you will find that this would not arise out of it.—The Noble Lord then referred to the statements of three gentlemen as bearing out the denial of the Petitioner, one of whom had sat next him at the Meeting; the second was Mr. Serjeant Pell, who had attended it; and the third was a clergyman (as we understood), and a relative of Sir Vicary Gibbs. He stated his impressions of Mr. Jones's conduct in a letter, and appeared to be rather against the Catholics than for them. He did mention one fact which was not in favour of Mr. Jones, but which was very far from justifying a proceeding which completely stopped a man in his career to the distinction and emoluments which his profession afforded. The Noble Lord then read an extract from the letter, which, he said, had been submitted to the Bishop of Exeter, without producing any effect. He then described the general nature of the speech which had called forth Mr. Jones's, the main argument of which was, that continuing the disabilities of the Roman Catholics was justified by the intolerant doctrines which their clergy signed, and by the exclusive creed of their Church. Mr. Jones replied, that he could not deny their subscribing such doctrines, but that was no proof of their real opinions or practical intolerance. Here the Noble Lord begged leave to remind the House of the maxim of the Church of Scotland, *nulla extra ecclesiam salus*. The same argument, Mr. Jones proceeded, might be used against the Church of England. All the members of that Church subscribed the eighth article, which contained an affirmance of the doctrines of St. Athanasius's Creed. But it would be an erroneous inference, that the whole of them believed it, for nine-tenths of those who signed it did not believe in it. Some of the brightest ornaments of the Church of England, the Noble Lord observed, had formally and deliberately delivered the same opinion, among whom he quoted the names of Bishop Wilkins, Archbishop Tennyson, and Archbishop Tillotson. Burnet had said distinctly, in *The History of his Own Time*, a large portion, sixty out of a hundred, signed the articles without reading, without understanding, without caring for them, and others sign them because they must do so. Archdeacon Paley said the same thing over and over. Mr. Jones did not say that he disbelieved the Athanasian Creed, but that nine-tenths of the clergymen who subscribed to it did not believe in it, or at least believed it in a sense different from that commonly received. But how, he asked, would the Reverend Prelate himself like to be judged by a report? Lord Holland here read an extract from a report of an address delivered, we believe, to the clergy of his diocess, at a visitation by the Bishop of Exeter, referring to the Coronation Oath, and that taken by the Prince Regent, in their different effects on the Catholic question—which, with another succeeding passage, as reported, he affirmed to be a gross and deliberate breach of the privileges of that House. Bishop Horsley had once said in the House, on an appeal from the Court of Chancery, where the question turned on the conversion of a minor from the Catholic faith—"I do not mean to say that he entered into the questions of the invocation of saints, and transubstantiation, and *such conundrums*."—*(A laugh.)*—But would it not be ridiculous of any one who had heard those words to go and tell the King, that Bishop Horsley was a man not to be preferred, for that he looked upon all the questions which had so much agitated the religious world as so many *conundrums*? He thought that the counter-signature was generally looked on merely as a testimony to the body and testimony of the testimonial itself—as a confirmation of the substance of the testimony. With respect to the absence of another remedy, perhaps he should be told, that the poor curate might have brought his *quare impedit* against the Bishops who refused institution; and if they put in a special plea, he was entitled to a demurrer; and that if that was determined in his favour, he could have a *mandamus* from the King's Bench, to compel institution. Whether that could or could not be done, he would not take it on himself to say; but he said that, admitting such a remedy was open, it was so much beyond the means of a poor curate, that it was next to none. After a variety of other observations, the Noble Lord said, that after the Petition should have been read, and laid on the table (if it should be), he meant to move, that a Select Committee be appointed to take into consideration the Petition of the Rev. —— Jones, and the rule which empowers a Bishop, before instituting a clerk to a benefice in his diocess, to demand the counter-signature to his testimonials of the Bishop in whose see he has resided, and to report their observations thereon to the House.

The petition was then brought up and read.—On the question, that it lie on the table, being put—

The Bishop of EXETER rose. In his observations he should confine himself to the matter and allegations of the Petition. It was true that the Petitioner had been regularly ordained—true that a county meeting had been held at which he had made a speech; but he was surprised that it should be said or insinuated, that the motives of his conduct had been grounded on the favourable opinion expressed of the Roman Catholics. On the Petitioner's being appointed to two livings (which, by the bye, he could not have held longer than seven years), and applying to him to countersign his testimonials, he had declined to do so. But he had expressly told him, that his determination in that respect was not grounded on the sentiments of his speech, or his opinions of the claims of the Roman Catholics, with which opinions, he added, he had no right to interfere. To the assertion, that he refused to countersign the testimonial because of the speech, he had given, and he now again gave, a distinct disclaimer. If he had erred it was an error of his head, not of his heart. He had investigated the matter of the case with the greatest care, and weighed with scrupulous nicety every thing offered on behalf of the Petitioner, either by letter or word of mouth. He begged leave to say, that when the three clergymen signed the testimonial, they were then ignorant of what had occurred, but afterwards, on being informed of it, they had withdrawn their signatures. His view of the case might be erroneous—but he considered that the testimonial did not give credit to the general character of the person in whose favour it was signed—but that the persons whose signature it bore only gave it as to their belief, or what had come under their personal knowledge. When he was called on to countersign it, he was obliged to make use of his belief, and on that belief he formed his opinion, and thought he was conscientiously right in refusing to sign it. When he allowed the Petitioner to keep his minor situation, he had done it out of a humane feeling towards him; at the same time, he did not allow a moment to elapse before he made the necessary inquiries, and the result of them confirmed him he was right in refusing to countersign the testimonial. The Petitioner had stated, that no inquiry was made; so far from it, it was made, and it occupied him three weeks. He did not think that there was any thing else for him to observe on, and he begged pardon for having so long intruded on the patience of their Lordships.

Lord ERSKINE said, he had seen many testimonials, and never saw one differ from another. What had fallen from the Rev. Prelate was correct, that the testimonial was not to the effect of giving the person in whose favour it was signed general credit, but it went to that credit which ought to entitle him to that presentation he sought. One of his sons was placed in a difficult situation, being presented to a living by a noble and learned Friend of his, and not knowing any beneficed clergymen in the diocess. The Archbishop of Canterbury came down to that House, and signed a testimonial that he was worthy of credit; he knew nothing of him, but depended on the report of his good character. If there was a general report against the character of the Petitioner, the Rev. Prelate would not be bound to countersign his testimonial. So it was in a Court of Law—if a man was put into a witness-box, to speak to the bad character of a person, he was not asked what part of his character he disapproved of, but whether from his general character he was not worthy of belief? But the Rev. Prelate had stated, that he did not make an inquiry into the general character of the Petitioner, but that he only inquired as to one single fact. He must therefore say he was not borne out in refusing to countersign the testimonial. It certainly was a hard case, that a man should be deprived of the benefit of a presentation, because while speaking in a public assembly he made use of a loose expression. How did the Rev. Prelate know that his informants had reported to him the whole of the speech of the Petitioner? It was well known that to take the speech of any man, however versed in public speaking, it was possible in only hearing a part of it that it would appear very different from the meaning of the person who delivered it. In his opinion, it was the duty of the Right Rev. Prelate to have countersigned the testimonial. The Bishops of this country had always conducted themselves in such a way as to give general satisfaction, and they most properly had a great share of popularity attached to them; but on this occasion he could not think the Rev. Prelate had done his duty in refusing to countersign the testimonial, as that refusal was not grounded on general conduct, but a single lapse.

(For remainder see last Page.)

and Learned Gentleman then stated the nature of the six Bills which he meant to bring in. The 1st was to repeal so much of the 12th of Queen Anne, c. 7, as made privately stealing in a dwelling-house to the value of 40s. a capital offence. The 2d was to repeal that part of the 10th and 11th of William the Third, which made stealing in a shop to the value of 5s. a capital offence. The 3d was to repeal such parts of the 24th Geo. II. c. 25, as rendered it a capital offence to steal to the value of 40s. on a navigable river, or in a port of entry and discharge. He could not here but observe upon the caprice which marked this system of legislation. In the year 1751, the Legislature enacted this capital felony for stealing on a navigable river; but a few years afterwards the Duke of Bridgewater commenced that stupendous work (the Bridgewater canal) which had in its result added so largely to the wealth of the great interests of this Country; and yet, though obviously stealing on the canal was an offence more likely to be visited with severity by the Legislature, from the facility of its commission, no one had attempted to extend to the canal the penalty imposed upon an offence on the navigable river. There were parts of a variety of other Acts which he would propose to repeal, still leaving the offence, where it was a heinous one, liable to the penalty incurred by it before the passing of the Act. He would also propose the repeal of penalties for some very severe offences, such, for instance, as the following:—He would propose to repeal the first and second of Philip & Mary, which made it capital for Egyptians (gipsies) to remain here for one month—*(a laugh)*—also to repeal the 18th Charles II. for capitally punishing what were called "notorious thieves" in Northumberland and Norfolk; the 9th George I. c. 29, which made that singular felony capital, of being disguised within the mint; also the 12th of George II. which made it a capital felony to injure Westminster-bridge. He admitted that to injure such a structure was an aggravated offence; but he would leave it to the Legislature to consider whether, at this time of day, it ought to be rendered a capital one. He meant also to propose the repeal of the capital part of several other Statutes; such, for instance, as the 31st of Elizabeth, for the offence of taking away a man's widow or wife for the sake of obtaining her fortune. This penalty, to be fair or equitable, ought not surely to be confined to the abduction of an heiress; the poor, who are equal in the eye of the law, ought, without doubt, to have an equal protection, if the penalty, was to remain on the statute book; but he really thought the penalty remained a dead letter, for the offence at which it was levelled was one so foreign to the manners and habits of the People of this Country, so impracticable also in the present condition of society and operation of its institutions, that it was quite unnecessary to be provided against among a People so sober and phlegmatic as the English. He knew indeed that in another part of the Empire there occasionally sprung up those bursts of less tractable gallantry that may require the strong interposition of legal authority—*(a laugh)*—but they were very few in number, and very rare in their occurrence. He also proposed to alter that part of the Act of Geo. I., which made privately receiving stolen goods, under peculiar circumstances, a capital felony. The only conviction under that Act was the noted one of Jonathan Wild. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman then briefly recapitulated the heads of the parts of various Acts imposing capital punishments for offences specified therein, which he proposed to have repealed. Among them was the Act for capitally punishing, without reserve, the killing and maiming of cattle; and he also proposed an alteration in the Statute respecting bankrupts. He meant to mitigate, he said, the severity of some of the provisions of the Marriage Act, which, among other excellent effects, created no less than five capital offences. *(Hear, hear!)* For many of these, and others of a similar character, he would propose to substitute transportation instead of death; and in one specific Bill he meant to consolidate, as it were, the general penalties which he would substitute for those contained in parts of other Statutes. He had no intention of withdrawing the capital punishment from the actual forgery of Bank-notes, though he would propose its being revoked in all cases of private forgery. In uttering or holding forged Bank-notes, he would apply the punishment of transportation, still of course leaving to the prosecutor to select his own mode of proceeding. He had observation enough to see that the greatest opposition he should have to encounter would be in repealing the severity of the law in cases of privately stealing in a dwelling-house, and in private forgeries; and yet these appeared to him the cases in which the principle of the repeal more clearly applied, for they were exactly those in which, according to the most conclusive testimony of the evidence before the Committee, prosecutors were deterred from proceeding against offenders by the unmitigated severity of the punishment upon conviction. He, therefore, in these cases, less appealed to the humanity than the good sense of the House, to adopt the propositions he submitted to them. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman then concluded, by proposing that a Select Committee be appointed to consider so much of the criminal law as related to the infliction of capital punishment for felony, and that they do report thereon.

Mr. CANNING rose, not to oppose the motion in this stage of the proceeding, but merely not to be understood as assenting to the whole of the propositions commented upon by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman. He could, however, truly assure him, that in the future stages no objection should be taken to any of his propositions for mere objection sake, but only upon what should appear to arise on safe and solid grounds. *(Hear, hear!)*

The Committee was then appointed.

On Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH next moving for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the 12th of Queen Anne, which made it a capital felony to steal the value of 40s. in a dwelling-house—

Mr. BENNETT rose to express, in common he trusted with every Gentleman who heard him, his thanks to his Hon. and Learned Friend for the effective manner in which he had called the attention of Parliament to this most important subject. He next complimented him upon treading in the steps of that great man, Sir Samuel Romilly, in enforcing the repeal of those parts of the criminal law which were inapplicable to the present state of society in this country. Sir Samuel Romilly had succeeded in abolishing a part of that revolting sentence for high treason which was so calculated to disgust minds of ordinary feeling; and he (Mr. B.) trusted his Learned Friend would now have the good fortune to abolish that still remaining part of the sentence which left the quarters and head of the criminal to be disposed of as the Crown shall think fit. There never was a more thrilling or repulsive sensation manifested than at the late execution of a set of criminals. Any thing which in this manner could weaken the moral taste or keen sensibility of the People, must have an injurious tendency. *(Hear, hear, hear!)* Many attended executions for a variety of reasons; some through curiosity, others from a more laudable motive. On the late occasion it was found necessary to disguise one of the executioners in a mask, the first, he believed, worn on a scaffold in England since the time of the dreadful scene of Charles the First's execution. His objection to these cruel exhibitions was, that they did nothing in the way of prevention, and were only calculated to wound the feelings of the helpless families who survived criminals. He made this allusion without the slightest political feeling towards any recent circumstance—his allusion was meant generally to the impolicy and injurious effect of such exhibitions. *(Hear!)*

Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH said, he entirely disapproved of all acts of unnecessary severity.—He had manifested this feeling by his vote on Sir Samuel Romilly's motion for abolishing the whole of that mutilation of the body of the criminal executed for high treason, which had now been only in part altered. Undoubtedly on a future occasion it might be his wish to endeavour to do away with those vain severities at an execution, which shewed the rancour of the survivor, and had no effect upon the feelings of the criminal. They were the barbarous relics of past times, which ought to be made yield to a different condition of society. *(Hear!)* Still, however, when he touched upon such circumstances, he should like to introduce the topic clear of all temporary allusions, and when the discussion could be had upon it on a better footing. He then complimented his Hon. Friend for his known humanity and philanthropy, and expressed the gratitude he, as well as the Public, always felt for his important assistance on all occasions connected with benevolence and humanity. *(Hear!)*

Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH then brought up a Bill for the repeal of the 24th Geo. II. making it capital to steal to the value of 40s. on a navigable river or a port of entry and discharge; and another Bill to repeal the 12th Queen Anne, which makes it a capital felony to steal to the value of 40s. privately in a dwelling-house. Both Bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time—the first on the 24th May, the second on the 30th May.

Sir J. MACKINTOSH brought up another Bill for the repeal of the 5th and 11th William III. which makes it capital felony to steal 5s. in a shop. Read a first time, and ordered to be read a second, but no time specified.

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF GRAMPOUND.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL, in making the motion of which he had given notice, felt it necessary to offer some opinions to the House upon the subject of it, as well as on the general propriety of removing the charters of convicted close boroughs to rich, large, and populous towns not represented. When moving for leave to introduce a similar Bill in the last Parliament, the general principle upon which he moved it was admitted. Whether this was a proper punishment for such a case as that of Grampound, or if there were any propriety in removing the franchise to another place, might yet be argued at further length, and at a more advantageous opportunity, on a future stage of the Bill; at present he would confine himself to the consideration of the best means of giving those electors of Grampound an opportunity to exercise their vote in some other place who had not shared in the guilt of the corruption. With this view, he proposed in the Bill the removal of the franchise to Leeds, a town surrounded by several villages, each making part of the borough, and containing altogether about 70,000 persons.—These would give, suppose the qualification to be the paying of £5 a-year rent, 8000 electors; if the qualification were paying £10 a-year rent, there would be about 5500 electors. His chief aim was to shew that it would in future be a principle of the proceedings of the House to transfer, as often as convictions furnished the opportunity, the charters of close & corrupt boroughs to populous towns. If the principle should be established, it was little matter whether Leeds or any other place should be selected for the first transfer, or any populous town in the West Riding of York. All he wished was to see the principle established; or if not that, any other which should tend to the same effect would be equally satisfactory to himself. He then moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the object before stated.

Mr. CANNING undertook, in observance of the agreement between the Noble Lord and the House, that the previous stages of his Bill, as far as they had been carried through in the last Parliament, should not be prejudiced; Ministers would offer no objection to the Bill in this stage of it. He would not be pledged by this, however, to refrain from objecting, if he saw fit, in the other stages; at the same time, he assured the Noble Lord, that Ministers were far from wishing to object to his motion. He and the Noble Lord felt in common as to the necessity of punishing this instance of detected corruption; so far as the disfranchisement of Grampound went, the Noble Lord was likely to receive support. The admission which had been made, however, did not extend to the nomination of Leeds as the best place to which the franchise should be transferred. On this he would reserve himself, and when the Bill came before the House he would be prepared to meet the different points contained in it which he might think objectionable. He was particularly anxious that the admission which had been made by Ministers with respect to the Bill should not be applied to any thing beyond the bare disfranchisement of Grampound. The Noble Lord seemed to think little of the success of his Bill, or the specific case to which it referred, provided he could establish the general principle. He (Mr. Canning) did not hesitate to say, that he would do every thing in his power to prevent the adoption of any principle by the House that could lead to a supposition of a general disposition in the Government to alter the state of borough representation. He would pay the utmost attention to the specific case of the Noble Lord; he would do all he could to prevent any general principle from being deduced from the specific case. He wished to know if it was the intention of the Noble Lord that Grampound should be heard by Counsel against the disfranchisement?

Lord J. RUSSELL said that he had no such intention. The case had been carefully examined in all its particulars by a Committee of the House.

Lord A. HAMILTON said, that if there should be any objection to Leeds as the place of transfer, there were many places in his part of the Country very well fitted to receive the franchise. *(A laugh.)*

Lord J. RUSSELL, in reply to the Right Hon. Gentleman, meant to draw nothing from the admission of Ministers like a pledge of assent to the present Bill, or any principle for future proceedings. There had been some objection to removing the franchise out of the hundred to so remote a distance; but all he asked from Ministers was, to give the subject earnest consideration. The knowledge of the concurrence of Government with the Bill had given great satisfaction throughout the Country, and if it should be seriously supported, might tend more than could be conceived to restore the confidence of the People to the Government.

Mr. D. GILBERT said a few words, the purport of which we could not understand.

Lord J. RUSSELL then brought in the Bill, which was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on Friday se'nnight.

PROVISION FOR THE QUEEN.

Lord A. HAMILTON wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any provision was to be made for the Queen in the Civil List? The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied in the affirmative. Adjourned.

LONDON.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10.

Letters have been received from Barcelona of the 26th April, by a vessel which had arrived direct from thence, and these state that some disturbances had broken out in that City, during which a considerable quantity of foreign goods had been destroyed by the populace, the importation of which seems to have created much ferment in that part of Spain.

The *Gazette* of last night contains a Proclamation, announcing the Coronation of his Majesty to take place on the 1st of August, and appointing a numerous list of Nobility and Gentry, including the Royal Dukes, the Ministers, Privy Counsellors, and Judges, as Commissioners to receive and determine the claims of individuals usual upon such occasions; any five of them to be a quorum; and to hold their first sitting in the Painted Chamber, adjoining the House of Lords, on the 18th instant.

THURSDAY, MAY 11.

We have received this morning New York Papers to the 14th ult., and Philadelphia and Charleston to the 10th and 5th.

The proceedings in Congress are brought down to the sitting of the 8th of April, but, with one or two exceptions, they are entirely of local interest. On the above day, the Senate entered into the consideration of a Bill, supplementary to the "Act concerning Navigation," passed in April, 1818, the Clauses of which are directly intended to affect the commercial intercourse between the Colonies of this Country and the United States. The first Clause will explain its operation.

"Be it enacted, &c., That from and after the day all and every of the provisions and regulations of the Act of Congress passed on the 18th April, 1818, entitled 'An Act concerning Navigation,' be, and the same are hereby extended and made applicable to the islands of Cape Breton, St. John's, Newfoundland, and their dependencies, to the Bermuda Islands, the Bahama Islands, the Islands called Caicos, and to all other colonies, plantations, islands, and possessions, belonging to or under the dominion of Great Britain, in the West Indies, on the Continent of America, south of the 20th degree of north latitude; and all and each of the enactments and provisions of said Act shall be construed as extending to, and as applying to, all and every of the possessions, colonies, places, and islands above mentioned."

The second clause enacts, that no goods, wares, or merchandize shall be imported into the United States of America, from any of the above places, unless they are "truly and wholly of the growth, produce, or manufacture" of the said places.—Any contravention of this law, to incur the forfeiture of the vessel and cargo. The Bill having been read, and supported by Mr. King, of New York, Mr. Macon, Mr. Barbour, and others, the further discussion of it was postponed till the following day, on the motion of Mr. Parrott, who thought it "did not go far enough."

WASHINGTON, APRIL 7.—A meeting of members of Congress is to be held to-morrow evening, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States. There appears to be a unanimous voice in favour of Mr. Monroe as President. Much diversity of opinion prevails as to the candidate for Vice-President. Messrs. Tompkins, Rush, Roberts, Clay, Mercer, and Morrow, are all spoken of. It is very doubtful whether a nomination will be made. Many will go to the meeting for the purpose of voting to adjourn; or, in other words, to defeat the object of it. Some think it wholly inexpedient to go into a nomination at this time. Others will attend; and if the motion to adjourn should not prevail, they will leave the room. I am induced to believe that if a nomination and recommendation should be made, Monroe and Tompkins will be placed on the ticket. A considerable number wish to know the result of the New York election before they will agree to nominate a candidate for Vice President. You shall hear soon after the meeting is over.

(From the National Intelligencer, April 10.)

"General Vives, the Envoy Extraordinary from Spain, yesterday arrived at the Franklin Hotel, in this City.

"We have not received from authority any account of what took place at the Meeting of Members of Congress on Saturday evening last, convened by public notice, for the purpose of considering the expediency of making a nomination of suitable persons as candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. We learn generally that the Meeting was thin, about 50 Members only being present.

"The morning, indeed, was one of the most unfavourable for the meeting that could be imagined, pouring rain the whole time. Mr. Nelson, of Virginia, was called to the chair, and it was determined in effect, but in what form we know not, that it was inexpedient for the Members then assembled to proceed to make a nomination."

The Paris Journals of Monday last have arrived this morning. The following are extracts:—

"PARIS, MAY 8.—Another atrocious attempt against the Royal Family has been defeated. The following are the authentic details of this important event:—

'Count Angles, Prefect of the Police, having received secret information that a scheme was arranged to be put in execution on the night of the 7th instant, for producing a second explosion under the windows of the Duchess de Berri's apartment, his Excellency, at half-past ten, repaired to the Thuilleries, and concerted precautionary measures with Marshal Macdonald, Major-General on service, for surprising the perpetrator in the act. The sentinels were removed, and disguised gendarmes and police-officers were stationed in ambush to insure his detection. At midnight a man was perceived to approach, with cautious step, the private door which opens into the Rue de l'Echelle, where he deposited a petard. At the moment that he was about to set fire to the fusee, by means of a lighted segar, the police agents and military rushed upon him. He was escorted to the guard-house, where he fainted. On recovering, he gave his name, Graviers, and he was soon recognised, having been a Captain in the 5th Regiment of Lancers of the Ex-Imperial Guard. On his person was found a copy of some odious invectives against the Royal Family, in verse. On examining the petard, it was discovered that it contained about two pounds of powder. The Attorney-General quickly arrived, before whom Graviers underwent an examination, which lasted from one o'clock until six. In the course of yesterday two of his accomplices were taken, one of whom, named Bouton, was formerly a courier. It is supposed they are two individuals, who were observed to post themselves, at the time of Graviers' approach to the Palace, one near the Rue de Rivoli, the other in the Place Carrousel, both of whom fled precipitately on his arrest.'

The report relative to Louvel will certainly be made to the Chamber of Peers on Saturday, the 13th inst. On Monday the criminal will be brought up to hear the indictment read. He will then be required to chuse Counsel; on his refusal, one will be appointed by the Court of Peers. His trial will be proceeded in during Whitsun week.

FRIDAY, MAY 12.

Stocks this day at One.

Bank Stock 227	India Stock
3 per ct. Red. 69	India Bonds 22 23 pm.
3 per ct. Cons. 69¾	Ex. Bills 5 4 pm.
3½ per Cents. 77¾	Long Ann. 18 1-16
4 per Cents. 87	Omnium ——
5 per Cents. 106¼	Cons. for Ac. 70

Advices have been received from the Isle of France, of the 12th of Feb. Their contents are satisfactory, inasmuch as they state that the fever which had committed such dreadful ravages in that colony had entirely disappeared, not only on the coast, but also in the interior. The accounts vary as to the number of persons who have been carried off by the malady, but it seems certain that between 5 and 6000 persons have suffered, a considerable portion of whom consisted of Europeans. The fever had been introduced into the colony by a merchantman, from the island of Ceylon, and was of so virulent a character, that the individual died two days after being attacked by it.

But while the intelligence from one situation in the East is favourable, yet it is of a distressing character from another; for we find by the letters received from the Island of Bourbon, that a fever prevailed there, which is described to be of quite as malignant a character as that which raged in the Isle of France; it is understood, that, notwithstanding the exertions of the Authorities, several hundred persons had fallen victims to the disease.

A letter was received at New-York, on the 13th April, from a Member of Congress, stating, that the Florida Treaty had been ratified by the new Spanish Ambassador.

The following is an extract of a private letter:—

"NEW-YORK, APRIL 14.—The Senate have passed, by an unanimous vote, the Bill to prohibit *all intercourse* with all British ports in Canada, Nova Scotia, and the West Indies; the Bill must pass the House of Representatives to become a law. As the House rises in a few days, it is by no means certain it will become a law."

The Paris Journals of Tuesday last have arrived this morning. The following are extracts:—

"PARIS, MAY 9.—The Queen of England, who has been detained at Macon (the chief town of the Department of the Saone and Loire), in consequence of all the post-horses having been engaged for the tour of the Duke d'Angoulême, resumed her route on Thursday, the 4th instant; she travels by easy stages, and it is probable that she will arrive in Paris this evening or to-morrow.—*Constitutionel.*

The Waterford Chronicle.

TUESDAY, MAY 16.

On the 9th, in the House of Commons, Alderman WOOD brought forward his motion for a Secret Committee, to receive evidence with respect to the conduct of *Edwards*, the Spy. The proposition was negatived without a division, and the discussion presented nothing of real interest, beyond what is already substantially known to our readers. The following circumstance occurred at the close of the proceedings, which is hardly worth notice, were it not that such altercations often create a curiosity far exceeding their merit:—

"Sir ROBERT WILSON observed, that as in the warmth of debate some irritating language had passed between two Hon. Members, he thought it his duty to draw the attention of the Chair to it, for the purpose of that irritation not being carried out of doors.

"The SPEAKER observed, that no Hon. Member could attribute any thing to the Hon. Alderman who had brought the question before the House, but the most honourable and pure motives; and if any thing personal sprung up in the discussion of that question between any Honourable Members, he had no doubt but they would come to that explanation which was so necessary to preserve the dignity of the House.

"No Member having risen—

"The SPEAKER again rose and said, that the Hon. and gallant Member who had brought his attention to this subject had put in his hand the names of two Hon. Members, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT and Mr. CANNING; he would therefore call on Sir FRANCIS BURDETT.

"The Hon. Baronet said he was not aware that he had given offence. The Right Hon. Gentleman had said that the Hon. Alderman was urged with the stimulus of popularity, and he quoted him as having said that he was drunken with popularity; the terms were nearly synonimous, but he did not misquote him intentionally. *(Hear!)*

"Mr. CANNING said he had not taken any thing amiss which had fallen from the Hon. Bart. He only replied to him as the advocate of the Hon. Alderman's motion. There certainly were no two persons greater enemies on the subject of politics than the Hon. Baronet and himself; but there was no Member he more wished to discuss a question with, for he always discussed it fairly. *(Hear!)*

"The SPEAKER observed, he was happy to find there was no ground for the supposed irritation of the feelings of the Hon. Members."

Previously to the introduction of Alderman WOOD's motion, the state of the Criminal Law, a subject of infinitely greater importance, was brought forward by Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH, and every friend to humanity will exult in the prospect which the benevolent exertions of this eminent Senator afford of meliorating the Criminal Code. In this liberal undertaking, he is the natural successor of the illustrious Sir S. ROMILLY; but he seems far to excel that amiable man in the extent of his information, and in the depth of his philosophical researches. His speech is one of the ablest, and one of the most candid and judicious expositions that ever came before a British Public.

In the House of Commons, on Thursday, when some conversation took place as to Exchequer Bills, and when it was observed, that a permanent system of revenue was desirable, that is, a Property Tax, the Right Hon. Sir J. NEWPORT made the following observations:—

"He could never consent to the strengthening of the Funds at the expense of the community.—If the Funds were improved by fresh burdens on the Country, that would be improving them at the expense of other public interests. The Stockholder already received increased value, for he had become a Stockholder during a depreciated currency. No sacrifices ought to be made of the great interests of the Country for the benefit of the Stockholder. The Commercial and Agricultural interests were already in great difficulty, & their difficulties seemed not to be diminishing. He, therefore, must protest against the improvement of the Funds at the expense of the landholder." These, however brief, are the sentiments of an able and profound Statesman, and every man who looks with solid views into the interests of the Empire will concur in them.

The Coronation is fixed for the 1st of August. Some of the London Papers complain of this precipitancy, as, according to their statement, there will not be time for the preparations. Even the Courts of Justice must be interrupted, for there will be scarcely time to fit up Westminster for the occasion—not to speak of the absolute want of velvet, ermine, and other ornamental parts of dress, to be worn. The grandeur of the ceremony, by attracting numbers to the Metropolis, would have been favourable to trade, and would have compensated the manufacturers, and others, in some degree for the losses they have sustained by repeated mournings.

Mr. GRANT has a new Police Act in contemplation for Ireland. We are ignorant of the Provisions which the Right Hon. Gentleman has in view; but, if we are to judge from his character, we would indulge the anticipation, that they will be at once beneficial, and not oppressive.

A considerable time ago, we alluded, in pretty strong terms, to a *postscript* in the "*L'Abeja*" of Sir HARCOURT LEES, in which he asserted, that his present MAJESTY had declared to Doctor FISHER, Bishop of Salisbury, his determined resolution never to consent to the Emancipation of the Catholics, and that he had given authority to that venerable Prelate to make the Royal Will, on this subject, as generally known as possible. Of what the disposition of his MAJESTY then was, or may at present be, on this important matter, we pretend to no knowledge whatever; but we could not conceive it possible, that the Sovereign of these Realms should previously, and without learning the opinion of Parliament, give his negative to what was no more, at best, than a prospective measure. We regarded this as inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution, and we totally discredited the assertion. Personally, we have nothing to do with Sir H. LEES, and we advert to him merely as a political writer. On this subject, we copy the following paragraph from the *Weekly Freeman's Journal* of Saturday:—"Now, we have authority to state, that all this is the opposite of the TRUTH. No such conversation (as that spoken of by Sir H. LEES) ever took place at all—and Bishop FISHER is extremely anxious, that such a strange assertion shall not remain uncontradicted. The venerable BISHOP of DURHAM has taken up this business also." We leave the matter as it stands. If the truth be spoken of the Prelates named, they are bound to avow, in their places in Parliament, the validity, or the falsehood, of the declaration attributed to them.—No mail due.

From the Dublin Weekly Register.

Saturday, Six o'Clock, P. M.

The Catholic Deputation have been with Mr. Grattan, who read to them the following Address. It is a document deserving of the immediate and serious attention of the Catholics of Ireland:—

Stephen's-Green, May 13, 1820.

GENTLEMEN—I avail myself of your Deputation to give you a very decisive opinion touching the interests of the Roman Catholic Body.

I am convinced that it is their policy, as well as their duty, to maintain a perpetual connection with the British Empire.

To keep clear of the associations for universal suffrage and annual Parliaments; to continue to cultivate those gracious dispositions in the Royal breast, which were early manifested in their favour; and to accept of Emancipation upon the terms that are substantial and honourable. Pursuing such a principle, and with the temper and conduct which they are manifesting, and which I am proud to contemplate, they must succeed.

They deserve a privilege to worship their God according to the best of their judgment, and they have a right to do so with impunity, and without the interference of the State.

I shall go to England for your Question, and should the attempt prove less fortunate to my health, I shall be more than repaid by the reflection, that I make my last effort for the liberty of my Country.—I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your very obedient and attached humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

To the Gentlemen composing the Deputation appointed by the Meeting of Roman Catholics.

SOUTH AMERICAN SCHEME.

(From Carrick's Morning Post.)

The young Gentlemen who have returned from Margaritta, having escaped the fate of their companions, who perished in such numbers in that wretched Island, have a new species of warfare to encounter at home—a *legal* campaign has been opened against them, in the Court of King's Bench, by the Proprietor of *The Dublin Evening Post.* On Saturday last, Mr. Burrowes, Counsel for Mr. James Magee, moved the Court for a conditional rule to shew cause why a Criminal Information should not be filed against the following persons, who have affixed their names to a Pamphlet, lately published, in reply to certain Publications of Kenny and Hall, two of Devereux's Officers, viz:

Mr. J. H. Macloghlin, Robert James Young, John Egan, Valentine Gibbons, Cornelius Hickey, Patrick Blake, Robert Macnally, Henry Fitzsimon, Richard Evans, Thomas Murray, John Finch, Richard Bourns, Snow Richardson, Thos. Smyth, John Troy, James Skerret, Jas. Plunket, Joseph Duff, Samuel Cox, John Neligan, and Christopher Shannon; and also against John Carrick, the Printer of the aforesaid Pamphlet.

Mr. Burrowes read several passages in the Affidavit of Mr. Magee, and some parts of the Pamphlet, from which it appeared, that "ONE OF THE PRINCIPALS" of *The Dublin Evening Post* Newspaper was charged with having received considerable sums of money *raised* in this Country, from the sale of Commissions by Devereux and his Agents. In one passage of the Pamphlet this is termed "BLOOD-MONEY."

This charge is denied in the Affidavit of Mr. James Magee, at least as far as respects that Gentleman himself, who is the sole Proprietor of *The Dublin Evening Post.* Order granted.

The following important article is taken from Mr. SMITH'S Waterford Report:—

VALUE

Of the EXPORT of PROVISIONS from the PORT of WATERFORD, for the Year ending 30th of April, 1820.

				£	s.	d.
531	Tierces Beef,	at	110s.	2,937	0	0
416	Barrels Ditto,	—	75s.	1,560	0	0
359	Tierces Pork,	—	135s.	2,423	5	0
8,901	Barrels Ditto,	—	88s.	39,164	8	0
246,295	Flitches Bacon	—	37s.	455,645	15	0
112,384	Cwts. Butter,	—	86s.	483,251	4	0
11,670	Cwts. Lard,	—	75s.	43,762	10	0
88,148	Barls. Wheat,	—	38s.	167,481	4	0
195,188	Ditto Oats,	—	14s.	137,051	12	0
21,884	Ditto Barley,	—	15s.	16,413	0	0
79,866	Cwts. Flour,	—	21s.	83,859	6	0
3,091	Do. Oatmeal,	—	15s.	2,318	5	0
3,463	Do. Bread,	—	18s.	3,116	14	0
10,166	Live Pigs,	—	50s.	25,415	0	0
818	Black Cattle,	—	100s.	4,900	0	0

		£	s.	d.
Total		1,468,489	3	0
Ditto	1819	1,581,377	14	0
Ditto	1818	1,564,991	1	0
Ditto	1817	1,512,093	3	0
Ditto	1816	1,181,289	2	0
Ditto	1815	1,616,845	15	0
Ditto	1814	2,096,005	13	0
Ditto	1813	2,200,454	16	0
Ditto	1812	2,021,143	15	0
Ditto	1811	1,733,804	0	0

THE MARKETS.

LONDON CORN-EXCHANGE, MAY 10.—A considerable quantity of Wheat remained over from Monday's supply, and having a further arrival this morning from Suffolk, with but little demand for it, the sales were exceedingly heavy, and only a few select samples of white from Essex found buyers at Monday's prices. All other sorts were nearly unsaleable. Fine malting Barley supports Monday's prices, having but little at market.—The arrivals of Oats were large; the trade was not so brisk as on Monday, but prices remain the same. In Beans and Peas there is no alteration.

LONDON CORN-EXCHANGE, MAY 12.—There have been but few arrivals of any Grain since Wednesday; still the Wheat trade continues exceedingly heavy, but what sales were made were at Monday's prices; some quantity of that day's supply, from Essex and Suffolk, was left on hand at the close of this day's market. Barley is 1s. per quarter cheaper, the malting season being nearly over, so that the demand is now very trifling. Oats fully support Wednesday's prices, and fine Corn met ready sale. In Beans and Peas there is no alteration.

DUBLIN CORN-EXCHANGE, MAY 12.—The supply of Grain at Market this day being as small as that on Wednesday, the prices of that day were fully supported. Oats, in particular, are in demand; Inferior, 16s. to 16s. 6d.; Feeding, 16s. 6d. to 17s. 6d. being an advance this week of fully 1s. 6d. per barrel. Wheat and Barley support our last quotations, with a small advance.—Malt continues stationary at 36s. to 38s. Very little Raposeed at Market; prime would bring 38s. to 40s. Oatmeal and Flour are in fair demand, but without advance.

CORK MARKETS, MAY 13.—Wheat, 34s. a 36s. per bag, 20 stone; Oats, 26s. a 31s. per barrel, 33 ditto; Barley, 33s. a 36s. per barrel, 36 ditto. Butter, to the Merchants, 96s. 92s. 80s. 70s. 62s. To the Country, 84s. 80s. 68s. 58s. 50s.

LIMERICK MARKETS, MAY 13.—Wheat, 1s. 8d. to 1s. 10d. per stone; Oats, 10d.; Barley, 10d.; Flour, 44s. to 45s. per bag; Oatmeal, 15s. per cwt.; Pork, 30s. to 31s.; Butter, 80s. highest for old; no price yet for new.

CLONMEL MARKETS, MAY 12.—Butter, 95s.—Oatmeal, 16s. Second Flour, 44s.; Thirds, 37s.; 4ths, 26s. to 27s. per bag. Bere, 11s. to 11s. 6d. per barrel; Barley, 13s. to 15s. per do. Wheat, 1s. 9¼d. per stone; Oats, 11½d. to 11¾d.; Potatoes, 3d. to 3½d.

WATERFORD MARKETS.

Butter, at Saturday's market, opened at 98s for first quality, but speedily got up to 100s. which was the most current rate for the day, and only a few firkins went to 101s.; yesterday, the general currency was nearly the same as on Saturday, 100s. having been the prevailing rate, tho' a higher price was given in a single instance. A few lots of *Bacon Pigs* continue still to be brought in, some of the best of which have been sold at 41s. There has been no decided alteration in *Wheat*, which cannot be said to exceed 37s. generally, tho' 9d. over was paid yesterday for a few fine Millers' samples. The demand for *Oats* continues brisk; good Potato Oats readily bring 14s. 3d. from Merchants, and some have sold at 14s. 6d.; Common Oats, which are rather more in request, bring 13s. to 13s. 9d. and even 14s. has been given for good parcels of this description. *Barley*, of which scarcely any now appears at market, has been more inquired for within the last few days, and 15s. has been obtained in a few instances. No change has taken place in *Flour*. An advance of 6d. per cwt. on *Oatmeal* has been demanded by a few holders, but it is still found difficult to effect sales at the former price, 15s. Large quantities of Newport and Swansea *Coals* are offered 2d. per barrel lower. No change in other articles.

Some private communications have reached us from Correspondents, to which we shall attend as soon as practicable, but our columns are at present overwhelmed with matters of public and unavoidable interest.

BIRTH.

In Graig, the Lady of Timothy Doyle, Esq. of a son and heir.

DEATHS.

In London, on Saturday week, after a short illness, Edward Flin, Esq. Post Captain Royal Navy, son of Edward Flin, Esq. of Limerick, a young Gentleman whose distinguished merit in the service of his Country, in various parts of the Globe, raised him to the honourable distinction of a Companion of the Bath. The freedom of that his native City was also presented to him by the Corporation, in an oak box, accompanied by a suitable inscription. His disinterested friendship, and warm-hearted attachment, could not be excelled, and his premature death is a source of deep affliction to an amiable widow, affectionate parent, and numerous friends.

At Belfast, on the 9th instant, of a lingering and painful illness, Ellen, wife of Joseph Follingsby, Esq. Comptroller of Customs for that Port, sister to the present, and eldest daughter of the late Sir Broderick Chinnery, of Anne's Grove, County Cork, Bart.

On the 11th of April, near Dublin, Olivia, Countess Dowager of Rosse, widow of Sir Richard Parsons, Earl of Rosse, who died in the year 1764. Her Ladyship was in her 90th year.

On the 8th instant, in the 68th year of his age, at his house, Harold's-cross, Andrew Fraly, Esq. sincerely regretted by a numerous circle of friends and acquaintances.

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE, MAY 14.

ARRIVED,

12th—None.

13th—Netune, Musquita, St. Ubes, salt, for Dublin.

14th—Expedition, Steacy, Bristol, m. goods; Ann, Harding, Swansea, culm; Friendship, Fowler, Glasgow, coals; Diligence, Morgan, ditto, ditto; Cygnet, Sloop of War, Capt. Bennett, from a cruise.

15th—Fortitude, Griffiths, Cardiffe, coals.

SAILED,

12th—Rosa, Jeffery—and Concord, Limbery, Bristol, pigs; New Blessing, Tedball, Milford, horses.

13th—None.

14th—Mary Ann, M'Fie, from Liverpool, Limerick, m. goods.

15th—Wind W. S. W. at 7 morning.

THE CREDITORS of FRANCIS SULLEVAN, Esq. are requested to meet at the Office of Mr. M. DEVEREUX, Attorney, in Rose Lane, at One o'Clock in the Afternoon on SUNDAY, the 21st Day of May inst.

Waterford, May 15, 1820.

EDUCATION.

ENNISKILLEN SCHOOL.

THE Rev. Dr. O'BIERNE, appointed Successor to Dr BURROWES, promoted, is ready to receive Pupils on the following long-established Terms:—

Board and Washing, Thirty-two Guineas per Annum.
Tuition, in Classics and English, Four Guineas per Annum.
Writing and Arithmetic, 16s. per Quarter.
Stationary, 5s. 5d. per Quarter.
Entrance, Six Guineas.
French, One Guinea per Quarter.
Mathematics, One Guinea per Quarter.
Drawing, Dancing, and Music, on terms of the most approved Masters.
No extra charges whatsoever.

☞ For further particulars, application to be made at Portora-House, Enniskillen.

WATERFORD MARKET PRICES—MAY 15.

	s.	d.	s.	d.	
Butter, first quality (new)	98	0	100	0	per Cwt.
—— second,	00	0	00	0	
—— third,	00	0	00	0	
Tallow, rendered, (Waterford)	78	0	80	0	
—— (Russia, Y. C.)	70	0	72	0	
Lard, casks, rendered,	54	0	55	0	
Beef,	00	0	00	0	
Pigs, singed,	40	0	41	0	
—— scalded,	00	0	00	0	
Pork Offal,	18	0	20	0	
Pigs' Heads,	24	0	25	0	
Oatmeal,	15	0	15	6	
Flour, first quality,	00	0	00	0	per Bag.
—— second,	42	0	44	0	
—— third,	32	0	33	0	
—— fourth,	24	0	28	0	
Wheat,	36	0	37	0	per Barrel.
Barley, malting,	00	0	00	0	
—— grinding,	12	6	15	0	
Oats, potato,	14	3	14	6	
—— common,	13	0	13	9	
Scotch Herrings, gutted,	33	0	34	0	
——, ungutted,	00	0	00	0	
Coals, Whitehaven,	0	0	0	0	
—— Newport,	3	2	3	6	
—— Swansea,	3	2	3	6	
Tallow, rough,	7	6	8	0	per St.
Potatoes, by weight,	0	3½	0	4½	
—— by measure,	0	7	0	9	
Beef,	0	5	0	7½	per lb.
Mutton,	0	6½	0	8	
Veal,	0	4½	0	6½	
Pork,	0	3½	0	4	
Fresh Butter,	1	0	1	9	
Cork Whiskey, per Gallon,	10	2	10	4	
Marlfield Ditto,	9	3	9	6	