

That every personal attention and respect would be paid by the King's Servants abroad to her Majesty, and every endeavor made by them to protect her Majesty against any possible inconvenience...

These observations not appearing to make any material difference in the views taken by her Majesty's Law Officers of the result of the conference, it was agreed to proceed in the arrangement of the Protocols.

Before however the Protocol was discussed, the King's Servants desired distinctly to know from her Majesty's Law Officers, whether the introduction of the Queen's name in the Liturgy, and her Majesty's introduction at Foreign Courts...

No proposition on the part of her Majesty, other than those already adressed to, was brought forward. (Signed) WELLINGTON, CASTLEREAGH, H. BROUGHTON, T. DENMAN.

Protocol of the Fourth Conference, held at St. James's-square, 18th June, 1820.

Before proceeding to finish the discussion of the protocols, it was suggested, on the part of the King's Servants, if possible to meet the Queen's wishes, and in order the better to assure to her Majesty every suitable respect and attention...

The King's Servants were particularly anxious to impress upon the Queen's Law Officers the public ground upon which this principle rested.

It would be neither for the King's dignity nor for the Queen's comfort, that she should be made the subject of such a question.

To this it was replied for the Queen, that with respect to this new proposition on the part of the King's Servants, it should be taken into immediate consideration: but her Majesty's Law Officers observed, that her Majesty was not in the situation referred to in the above reasoning...

By Mail which arrived this morning, we have received Dutch and Hamburg Papers, the former to the 17th, the latter to the 13th inst.

An Article, dated H.burgh, the 13th inst., states—His Majesty the Emperor of Russia has addressed a declaration to all the European Courts, relative to the late political changes in Spain.

The protocols of the preceding conferences were read and agreed upon.

Her Majesty's Law Officers stated, that the proposition of yesterday had been submitted to her Majesty, and that it had not produced any alteration in her Majesty's sentiments.

In order to avoid any misrepresentation of the expression used on mentioning their belief that her Majesty might overcome her reluctance to go abroad, viz. "under all the circumstances of her person," they stated that they meant thereby,

SUPPLIES. Estimated for 1820. 2,582,470 Annals... 2,000,000... 582,470...

WAYS AND MEANS. Estimated for 1820. 2,582,470 Annual Malt... 2,000,000... 582,470...

UNFUNDED DEBT—1819. Exchequer Bills, 20 Gns. 111. cap. 4... 16,000,000...

UNFUNDED DEBT—1820. Exchequer Bills... 230,000,000... Irish Treasury Bills... 1,500,000...

It will be seen from the Parliamentary proceedings, contrary to the prevalent impression, that the Royal negotiation has finally terminated without adjustment...

The peace of France seems to be very precarious; discontent universally prevails; the Government is every where suspicious; arrests constantly take place...

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. On Thursday next, at Twelve o'Clock, at the CUSTOM-HOUSE SQUARE, NINETY-EIGHT PIPES & HHDs. OF CIDER.

TO BE SOLD. THE INTEREST IN PART OF THE LANDS OF LOTTUN-HALL, County of Wick, containing 54 Acres, 1 Rood, with a good HOUSE and OULDFATHERS, commanding a beautiful Prospect of the Harbour of Waterford.

MESSRS. NEWPORTS BANK. THE COMMITTEE appointed by the Creditors of Messrs. Wm. NEWPORT and Co. beg to acquaint the Creditors, that the PETITION directed at their last General Meeting to be presented to the Lord Chancellor has not been granted...

COUNTY OF WATERFORD MEETING. AT A MEETING OF THE GENTLEMEN OF THE COUNTY OF WATERFORD, held at DUNAGANAS, on the 21st of this month, The Hon. SHERIFF in the Chair, The following Resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Resolved—That the Distress of all Classes, from the calamitous and sudden check to the circulating medium, which has occurred from the recent Bank Failures, has been most generally and sensibly felt throughout this County.

Resolved—That the Hon. SHERIFF be requested to transmit these Resolutions to his Majesty's Government.

Resolved—That it is the Opinion of this Meeting, that the issuing of a Statute of Bankruptcy against the Firm of NEWPORT and Co. would be extremely injurious to the Interests of the Creditors at Large, and ruinous to the small Note-holders.

RICHARD MUSGRAVE, High Sheriff, Chairman. It was moved, and unanimously adopted, that the Hon. SHERIFF should leave the Chair, and that JOHN KELLY, Esq. be called to it.

It was unanimously resolved—That the Thanks of the Meeting be returned to the Hon. SHERIFF for his readiness in concerning the County, and for his highly proper conduct in the Chair.

JOHN KELLY, Chairman. WATERFORD: Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PERLIN, Chronicle-Office, Quay.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. On Thursday next, at Twelve o'Clock, at the CUSTOM-HOUSE SQUARE, NINETY-EIGHT PIPES & HHDs. OF CIDER.

TO BE SOLD. A FRESHLY ESTATED, producing a Profit Rent of £150 per Annum, arising out of Lands and Houses in and near the Town of KELLS, County of Kilkenny.

TO BE SOLD. THE ESTATE OF BALLINLOVANE and CLOON. This Estate, situated midway between the Towns of Lisdowney, Carrigrohane, and Fennyngs, on the River Blackwater, and forms part of the Village of BALLINLOVANE.

LONDON ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE COMPANY. ESTABLISHED BY ROYAL CHARTER, IN THE YEAR OF HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE THE FIRST.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. On Thursday next, at Twelve o'Clock, at the CUSTOM-HOUSE SQUARE, NINETY-EIGHT PIPES & HHDs. OF CIDER.

TO BE SOLD. THE ESTATE OF BALLYLOVANE and CLOON. This Estate, situated midway between the Towns of Lisdowney, Carrigrohane, and Fennyngs, on the River Blackwater, and forms part of the Village of BALLINLOVANE.

EVERY MAN HIS OWN DOCTOR. BY THE EFFICACY OF BROWN'S INFALLIBLE RHEUMATISM PILL. (See full text in image)

By the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland A PROCLAMATION. WHEREAS the time limited by the Proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant and Council of the 14th of December last, for prohibiting the Exportation out of Ireland of Gunpowder, or Salt Petre, or any sort of Arms or Ammunition, to the places therein specified, expired on the 30th day of May last:

WHEREAS the time limited by the Proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant and Council of the 14th of December last, for prohibiting the Exportation out of Ireland of Gunpowder, or Salt Petre, or any sort of Arms or Ammunition, to the places therein specified, expired on the 30th day of May last:

THE CELEBRATED ABSTURGENT LOTION. For removing all kinds of Pimples, Tetters, Ringworms, Carbuncles, &c. from the FACE and SKIN. "Beauty is the crown of our life, and the first of our pleasures."

DUBLIN MARKET NOTE. For the Week ending Friday, June 23, 1820. From To M. Price

PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS—TUESDAY, JUNE 26. THE QUEEN. MR. WILBERFORCE said, that in consequence of the failure of the late negotiations between the King and Queen, he felt his duty to give notice, to-morrow, of a motion on the subject.

MR. BROUGHAM begged the House to remember that to-morrow was a motion day, and therefore that of which the Hon. Gentleman had just given notice would have the precedence. He submitted to the House, in the mean time, whether it would be expedient, seeing how deeply the Hon. Genl. was engaged, in common with every other member, in the result of this motion, that that should take place with respect to it, which

Lord A. HAMILTON wished merely to say, that the object of his Right Hon. Friend was to ascertain at least the principle of the proposed motion. It seemed to be certain that that motion was to have the precedence to-morrow; and he did think, after what had occurred—after the papers had been printed and put into the hands of Members—and after all the preparations they had made to come down to the adjourned debate of to-morrow—that it would not have been too much for the Hon. Gentleman to have stated the substance at least of his motion. He did not wish to mention the terms, but the object ought surely to be known.

MR. SCARLETT begged to ask the Honourable Member, whether his object was to propose the restoration of her Majesty's name to the Liturgy? If the Honourable Member did not answer the question, he should conceive this to be the object of his motion.

MR. WILBERFORCE thought that, so far as had yet appeared, Honourable Gentlemen seemed to know the object of his motion; the object of their question, therefore, could hardly be for their own information, but for some other purpose. (Cheers.) Was he to be required to define that motion, whatever it might be? Thus much he had no objection to state, that such as it was, it arose entirely out of the papers on the table; and he would ask, therefore, whether he was not authorized in bringing it forward? His only object in not complying with the request now made was, that he did not like to bind himself in any way to particular terms.

MR. CALVERT reported, from the Bridport Election Committee, that it had found that Mr. Sparrow was not duly elected, and that Sir H. St. Paul ought to have been returned. It was ordered, therefore, that the Clerk of the Crown should attend the House to-morrow to amend the return.

Colonel BAGWELL brought up the Report of the St. Ives Election Committee; it confirmed the return of the Sitting Members, R. Graham and E. Evelyn, Esqrs. It stated that the Petitioners were not frivolous or vexatious. The Report further stated, that the Committee were of opinion that George Patrick Dunn, one of the witnesses, had been guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury; they therefore recommended that the Attorney-General should forthwith prosecute the said G. P. Dunn.

Lord A. HAMILTON wished merely to say, that the object of his Right Hon. Friend was to ascertain at least the principle of the proposed motion. It seemed to be certain that that motion was to have the precedence to-morrow; and he did think, after what had occurred—after the papers had been printed and put into the hands of Members—and after all the preparations they had made to come down to the adjourned debate of to-morrow—that it would not have been too much for the Hon. Gentleman to have stated the substance at least of his motion. He did not wish to mention the terms, but the object ought surely to be known.

MR. SCARLETT begged to ask the Honourable Member, whether his object was to propose the restoration of her Majesty's name to the Liturgy? If the Honourable Member did not answer the question, he should conceive this to be the object of his motion.

MR. WILBERFORCE thought that, so far as had yet appeared, Honourable Gentlemen seemed to know the object of his motion; the object of their question, therefore, could hardly be for their own information, but for some other purpose. (Cheers.) Was he to be required to define that motion, whatever it might be? Thus much he had no objection to state, that such as it was, it arose entirely out of the papers on the table; and he would ask, therefore, whether he was not authorized in bringing it forward? His only object in not complying with the request now made was, that he did not like to bind himself in any way to particular terms.

MR. CALVERT reported, from the Bridport Election Committee, that it had found that Mr. Sparrow was not duly elected, and that Sir H. St. Paul ought to have been returned. It was ordered, therefore, that the Clerk of the Crown should attend the House to-morrow to amend the return.

Colonel BAGWELL brought up the Report of the St. Ives Election Committee; it confirmed the return of the Sitting Members, R. Graham and E. Evelyn, Esqrs. It stated that the Petitioners were not frivolous or vexatious. The Report further stated, that the Committee were of opinion that George Patrick Dunn, one of the witnesses, had been guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury; they therefore recommended that the Attorney-General should forthwith prosecute the said G. P. Dunn.

It was then ordered, on the motion of Colonel BAGWELL, that the Attorney-General should forthwith prosecute G. P. Dunn for wilful and corrupt perjury.

INSUBORDINATION IN THE THIRD REGIMENT OF FOOT GUARDS. Lord NUGENT, seeing the Secretary at War in his place, rose to repeat the question he had put yesterday, on the important subject of the late disturbance among a portion of the military, which had been produced, as it seemed, by the withholding of certain allowances. In advertising to this subject, he felt sure that he need not vindicate himself from the imputation of endeavouring to apologize for the motives which gave rise to the alarming claim to which he had alluded, thought it was one of the many fatal evils arising out of the system of military government. His question was, for what reasons, and out of what funds, any pay or allowances had been given for special services of the military at home, when no such pay or allowances were given on service abroad?

Lord PALMERSTON said, he was desirous to afford the Noble Lord every satisfaction he wished upon this subject. In the first place, the instance of irregularity alluded to arose from no cause connected with pay, nor any grievance of that kind. He believed it arose from an opinion among some of the men in the regiment, that their duty of last year was rather severe, but no question of pay entered into the cause of their discontent. With respect to the subject of allowances on extraordinary duty, he believed it had occurred during the riots which had taken place some ten years since, excited by some transactions respecting Sir Francis Burdett. Some troops of Life Guards and infantry were obliged to continue in the streets all night on duty; and, being at a distance from their barracks and regimental arrangements, they had no opportunity or means of procuring refreshments. Some allowance of bread, cheese, and beer, was therefore served to them on that occasion; but the articles were found for them, and not money given them to provide for themselves. The allowance given was very moderate—it was paid from the Commissariat Department, and a regular account furnished of the number of men and days, and the quantities of rations issued, which the Noble Lord might have laid on the table if he wished it.

Lord NUGENT expressed his pleasure at the satisfactory explanation afforded by the Noble Secretary at War; he thought that the sum disbursed, however trifling, ought to come under the cognizance of Parliament. His Lordship accordingly moved for a return of the arms thus supplied since the year 1810.

MR. TIERNEY had really no other object in asking what was the intention of the Hon. Gentleman's motion, but the information of the House. It appeared to him that the House ought to have the benefit of that information.—Knowing that he could not calculate what were the difficulties which might arise out of the subject, he had not, in so asking, confined himself to the proposition of any precise form of words; but he only required to know, generally, what the principle of such motion was.

MR. WILBERFORCE said, that his motion in a great measure explained itself; its object undoubtedly was to remove, as far as possible, all obstacles to an amicable arrangement of the differences existing between their Majesties.

MR. TIERNEY had really no other object in asking what was the intention of the Hon. Gentleman's motion, but the information of the House. It appeared to him that the House ought to have the benefit of that information.—Knowing that he could not calculate what were the difficulties which might arise out of the subject, he had not, in so asking, confined himself to the proposition of any precise form of words; but he only required to know, generally, what the principle of such motion was.

MR. WILBERFORCE said, that his motion in a great measure explained itself; its object undoubtedly was to remove, as far as possible, all obstacles to an amicable arrangement of the differences existing between their Majesties.

MR. TIERNEY had really no other object in asking what was the intention of the Hon. Gentleman's motion, but the information of the House. It appeared to him that the House ought to have the benefit of that information.—Knowing that he could not calculate what were the difficulties which might arise out of the subject, he had not, in so asking, confined himself to the proposition of any precise form of words; but he only required to know, generally, what the principle of such motion was.

MR. WILBERFORCE said, that his motion in a great measure explained itself; its object undoubtedly was to remove, as far as possible, all obstacles to an amicable arrangement of the differences existing between their Majesties.

MR. TIERNEY had really no other object in asking what was the intention of the Hon. Gentleman's motion, but the information of the House. It appeared to him that the House ought to have the benefit of that information.—Knowing that he could not calculate what were the difficulties which might arise out of the subject, he had not, in so asking, confined himself to the proposition of any precise form of words; but he only required to know, generally, what the principle of such motion was.

MR. WILBERFORCE said, that his motion in a great measure explained itself; its object undoubtedly was to remove, as far as possible, all obstacles to an amicable arrangement of the differences existing between their Majesties.

MR. TIERNEY had really no other object in asking what was the intention of the Hon. Gentleman's motion, but the information of the House. It appeared to him that the House ought to have the benefit of that information.—Knowing that he could not calculate what were the difficulties which might arise out of the subject, he had not, in so asking, confined himself to the proposition of any precise form of words; but he only required to know, generally, what the principle of such motion was.

he thought it would have been made a charge against the confidential servants of the Queen, that, after having advised the King to enter into negotiations upon this subject, in pursuance of the desires of both Houses of Parliament, they should have further recommended that the result of those negotiations should be laid before the Legislature. The Noble Earl had complained that no measure was to be founded upon this communication, and stated that such a proceeding was contrary to precedent. But it must be known to their Lordships, that it was not unusual to have papers laid before the House, on which the Ministers of the Crown did not think it necessary either to express an opinion themselves, or to ask Parliament to express an opinion. Such, for instance, were some treaties of peace, even after wars of some magnitude. The Noble Earl had also complained, that the Ministers of the Crown appeared desirous of throwing off their constitutional responsibility, and imposing an unpleasant duty upon Parliament; but it certainly ought not to be made a cause of censure to his Majesty's Ministers, if, on a point of such extreme delicacy, they should call for the advice of Parliament. He would not add one word more upon this subject. He stated what had transpired himself upon the propriety of the course proposed to be pursued, and he hoped it would prove equally satisfactory to the House.

Lord HOLLAND begged permission to draw their Lordships' attention back to the circumstances in which the present conversation had originated. His Noble Relative (the Marquis of Lansdown) had asked of the Noble Earl opposite, what the drift was of the papers laid now on the table, how they might affect the proceedings now pending, and in particular, whether they would prevent the Secret Committee from meeting? The Noble Earl, however, declined answering these questions. True it was, indeed, as now stated, that they had no precedent to guide them—but they had common sense and reason, and these appeared to have been wholly overlooked. A Message had come down from the Queen, requiring an immediate investigation; on the following evening, the Noble Earl at the head of the Government desired, that this investigation should be postponed, with an intimation that the utmost should be done to relieve Parliament from the unpleasant duty which had been thrown on it. A third Message was, however, now communicated to their Lordships, declaring that more than *forty* had been done, but that all had failed, and yet that the investigation should be still deferred till Friday, without any explanation given, or any cause assigned for so strange and anomalous a proceeding. Such, undoubtedly, was not the mode in which Ministers usually proceeded in cases where green-bags were referred to Parliament. When Ministers brought down their bags, fraught with charges against the People, and the present Ministers had but too much practice in that particular, did they say to the House,

"there are papers for you, do with them what you please; make what motions you think proper; but we have formed no opinion upon the matter?" No; they gave to the House inflated descriptions of what the bags contained—they stated the general purport of the documents presented—they hinted with tolerable accuracy at the probable result of the inquiry, and plainly announced what the ultimate measures might be which they would find it essentially necessary to suggest. The Noble Lord then strongly censured the conduct of Ministers, when, he said, had a tendency to injure the character of their Sovereign. Their principle of action was to throw as much as possible the odium of every severe measure upon the Crown, and to shield themselves from imputation, by saying "We have formed no opinion upon the matter." (Loud cheering from the Opposition.) The Noble Lord commented warmly upon the expression of the Noble Earl (Liverpool), who had stated that at first he had entertained hopes of success in the recent negotiations, but subsequently qualified his expression, by saying that he had entertained that expectation only for a few days. But that Noble Earl, when the proposition for postponing the meeting of the Committee was first made, had said that he had entertained no expectation of success whatsoever. Another Noble Earl (Harrowby) declared that it was the general wish of the House that the meeting of the Committee should be adjourned. When those who persuaded the House to form a Secret Committee expressed a wish to postpone the meeting of the Committee, it was not for others, who had already objected to the Committee, to oppose such a wish; for they who thought the Committee ought never to meet at all, might very well consent to putting it off for ten days, trusting to the chapter of accidents that the meeting might, by some fortunate combination, be rendered wholly unnecessary.—When the Noble Baron (Keppel) had, on a former evening, in a manly and proper manner, proposed the postponement of the proceeding altogether, it was opposed by the plea, that such a measure would be contrary to the dignity of the House; but now what was become of their dignity? (Hear, hear, hear.) Was the dignity of the House increased by their subsequent proceedings? Was it placed upon a pedestal, by appointing fifteen Noble Lords as Judges for an immediate inquiry, and keeping them since in suspense? The whole proceeding was unconstitutional and unparliamentary, that he could not say with his Noble Friend, that it was altogether disgraceful to the character of the House. The Earl of DARNLEY should not have risen to it not to notice an incorrectness into which

the Noble Earl had fallen with reference to the adjournment of the meeting of the Committee. The Noble Earl had said, that the postponement took place in consequence of the wishes of this House; but such, undoubtedly, was not a fair view of the case. The wishes of the House could be collected only by the votes of the House, and the vote of the House, on the first night, was in favour of an immediate inquiry; the adjournment, therefore, was not made in deference to their Lordships' feelings, but to those expressed in another place, to which it was said, on the first night, it did not become their Lordships' duty to refer. (Hear, hear.) Could any one doubt that if the vote of the House of Commons were known before the matter was referred to their Lordships' House, the Committee would have been appointed—as if the vote had been other than it was, the Committee would not have met upon the day after its nomination? (Hear, hear.) He doubted not that it was the general wish of the House that the green bag should never be opened; but he would repeat, that if the vote of the House of Commons were such as had been anticipated by the Ministers of the Crown, the Committee would have met on the following day.— (Hear, hear.)

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that every Noble Lord who took part in the proceedings on the former occasion expressed a wish that the meeting of the Committee should be postponed, and that further time should be afforded to enter upon such discussions as might lead to a satisfactory arrangement; but he had said, that the sense of the House had not been collected by vote.

The Earl of DARNLEY could refer only to the vote of the House to collect or understand the sense of the House. A suggestion had been thrown out on the first night for regulating the course of proceeding by his Noble Friend (the Marquis of Lansdown), which was supported by irrefragable arguments, founded upon the strict principles of the Constitution, but it was neglected, and their Lordships have since been governed by the discretion of the House of Commons.

Lord GREY said, he was as well aware as the Noble Earl opposite that occasions had happened when papers had been laid upon the table, and no proceedings instituted upon them; but such had never occurred when the papers had reference to a proceeding then pending, for in such cases it was always usual for the Ministers of the Crown to state to the House how such papers were likely to affect the proceedings. The Noble Earl had said that he would give this information to the House, or to state whether the papers now laid upon the table would be likely to prevent the meeting of the Committee. This was an unprecedented proceeding. The papers were thrown to the House to be used as it might be thought expedient, but if another Member were to notice them, the Ministers of the Crown would never distinguish them by their attention.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN repeated the course which he had proposed on the first night, and the arguments which he had then used against the appointment of the Secret Committee, but no Noble Lord on the Ministerial side of the House stated or admitted any objection to the measure. This was on the first evening; on the second, the Noble Earl opposite (Liverpool) proposed the postponement, so that having on the first day voted an immediate inquiry, the House, on the mere unsupported suggestion of the Noble Earl, consented on the second day to postpone it, and so from day to day until Friday next.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL, in explanation, said, that he by no means was induced by any circumstances which had recently occurred to form his former opinion, that a Secret Committee was not only a perfectly constitutional, but also the most decorous and proper mode of proceeding that could have been adopted. Had such a proceeding been adopted in the first instance, the question would now stand in a very different state. The Noble Earl opposite (Lord Holland), in saying that (Lord Liverpool) had on the first night expressed his hope that the discussions would lead to a favourable result, reported his words, he believed, incorrectly. In the heat of debate it was very possible that he might have expressed himself differently from what he had intended, or he might have explained himself imperfectly; but on that occasion he was particularly careful, and as well as he could remember, he said on the first night, that "he consented to the postponement of the meeting of the Committee, but without having heard of any occurrence which could induce him to hope that the result would prove such as had been expected;" nor was it until a subsequent evening that he avowed a hope which he then entertained, that the result of the discussions would prove favourable. How far he was warranted in entertaining such a hope then, Lordships might tell when they had seen the papers.

Lord HOLLAND rose to speak—but Lord ROLLE quickly stepped forward towards the table, and moved that the House do now adjourn.

Lord HOLLAND then spoke, and remarked, that by the proceeding now pursued the Ministers of the Crown shifted their responsibility from themselves upon Parliament.

Lord DACRE said, that the House might still be placed in great difficulties, should the House of Commons chance to form an opinion upon this subject different from that which was expected.—High as the legal opinion in the House was, that no impeachment could be instituted against the Queen, *non constat* that the House of Commons might not differ from that opinion, and institute an impeachment. He begged to ask, whether the ground for adjourning the meeting of the Com-

mittee was to be found in the papers now laid on the table? This Noble Earl did not say it was, but from the course pursued, such was to be inferred. He was also desirous to know what was the extent of those papers, and to what point they reached? Did they refer solely to the recent negotiations, or did they contain those previous negotiations which should be known to the House for the purpose of obtaining a perfect knowledge of the recent transactions? He further desired to know whether the Noble Earl would have any objection to furnish such other documents upon this subject as might be thought necessary?

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that the best way of knowing what the papers referred to, was to cause the Clerk to read the titles of the papers.

Lord ROLLE again moved, that the House should adjourn. (Cheers and Order, under the table.)

Lord HOLLAND moved, that the titles of the papers should be read, to ascertain whether they ought to be adjourned. (A laugh.)

Upon this point, and the right of giving priority to the question of adjournment, Lord SPENCER and the LORD CHANCELLOR spoke briefly, when Lord ROLLE declared that he would not press his motion, so as to prevent any Member from delivering his sentiments upon the question. He had been induced to make this motion, because no motion was before the House, and the debate was carried on very irregularly, each Member speaking as often as he pleased.

The Clerk then read the heads of the Papers laid before the House, as they elsewhere appear.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE remarked, that it was impossible for the House to understand the question, unless the whole of the proceedings was laid before them. It was not to be expected, that the House would express an opinion whether the proposal of the negotiation were proper or not, unless they were apprised of all the previous circumstances.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that he was aware of only one paper which had been officially communicated to the Cabinet, besides those now on the table.

Lord ERSKINE asked, how it was possible for the House to offer any advice to the King upon the propriety of entering upon the late negotiations, unless the whole charges exhibited against the Queen were first known? He, for one, should never express an opinion upon the subject while the evidence seemed so imperfect. Suppose in the negotiations the Queen stood upon her rights, and asserted her claim to the liberty of going abroad or staying at home, just as she pleased, how could the House express an opinion upon the propriety of rejecting such preliminaries, without fully understanding the Queen's condition? But he begged that he might not be understood as expressing any wish to open the green bag. With respect to the appointment of the Secret Committee, he still thought it a perfectly constitutional proceeding, and he, therefore, had consented to become a member of it.

The question of adjournment was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Lord CASTLEREAGH rose and said—I think it my duty to acquaint the House, on the part of his Majesty's Ministers, that, in compliance with its general wish, every endeavour has been made by them to relieve Parliament from the painful necessity of entering into the present delicate inquiry, & that his Majesty has been pleased to authorize that the communications which have taken place towards that end should be laid before the House. It is with great pain I have to state to the House, that this negotiation has not led to any satisfactory arrangement. Feeling the great importance of this question to the illustrious Personages themselves, and to the Nation at large, I do think it would be most improper to proceed further in the consideration of this subject, without laying before this House, in the most authentic manner, the efforts that have been made to relieve Parliament from the painful necessity of such an investigation, together with the grounds that have prevented their success. The papers are now in a state ready to be printed, and will be delivered by to-morrow to the Members of this House. I feel it therefore my duty to move, that the present Order be discharged, and to postpone to Wednesday next the further consideration of his Majesty's most gracious Message, in order that this House might be enabled, under all the difficulties of the case, to proceed to its discussion with the fullest information as to every thing that has occurred.

Mr. BROUGHTON—I rise to express my perfect confidence in the view which the Noble Lord has taken of the unfortunate failure of this negotiation. It cannot feel greater pain than I do at the unfortunate result of the attempt to adjust the existing differences between the illustrious Personages. To that illustrious Personage, to advise whom it is my duty, I think not a shadow of blame can attach; but, in stating this, I do not ask this House, nor do I mean, to imply that blame for such a result is to be attributed to the other illustrious Party. It is possible, that amidst all the other peculiarities that attend this extraordinary case, the House would find that blame, as arising out of the failure of this negotiation, attaches in no quarter.

Lord CASTLEREAGH stated, that the papers would be delivered to the Members to-morrow.

The Order was then discharged, and the discussion on the Royal Message fixed for Wednesday next.

COMMUNICATIONS.

ON THE PART OF THE QUEEN WITH HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT AND MINISTERS OF PARLIAMENT, JUNE, 1820.

No. I.

The Queen commands Mr. Brougham to inform Lord Liverpool, that she has received his letter, and that the Memorandum of April 15, 1820, which the proposition made through Lord Holland had appeared to supersede, has also been now submitted to her Majesty for the first time.

Her Majesty does not consider the terms there specified as all according with the condition upon which she informed Lord Liverpool yesterday that she would entertain a proposal, namely, that it should be consistent with her dignity and honour. At the same time, she is willing to acquit those who made this proposal, of intending any thing offensive to her Majesty; and Lord Liverpool's letter indicates a disposition to receive any suggestions which she may offer.

Her Majesty retains the same desire which she commanded Mr. Brougham yesterday to express, of submitting her own wishes to the authority of Parliament, now so decisively interposed. Still acting upon the same principle, she now commands Mr. Brougham to add, that she feels it necessary, before making any further proposal, to have it understood that the recognition of her rank and privileges as Queen, must be the basis of any arrangement which can be made. The moment that basis is established, her Majesty will be ready to suggest a method, by which she conceives all existing differences may be satisfactorily adjusted.

16th June, 1820.

No. II.

The Earl of Liverpool in answer to the Communication from the Queen of the 10th June, 1820.

Lord Liverpool has had the honour of receiving the Queen's communication of this day, and he begs leave to request her Majesty, that a memorandum delivered to Mr. Brougham, of the 15th April, contained the only proposition to the Queen which the King authorized to be made to her Majesty.

The views and sentiments of the King's Government as to her Majesty's actual situation are sufficiently expressed in Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th June.

Lord Liverpool will present to her Majesty the enclosed part of the King's letter at the close of this communication, viz. That she is willing to leave every thing to the decision of any person or persons of high station and character, when both parties are content in naming, and who shall have authority to prescribe the particulars as to residence, patronage, and income, subject of course to the approbation of Parliament.

16th June, 1820.

No. III.

The Earl of Liverpool in answer to the Communication from the Queen of the 10th June, 1820.

Lord Liverpool has received the communication made by the Queen's commands.

The King's Servants feel it to be unnecessary to enter into any discussion on the early parts of this communication, except to repeat that the memorandum delivered to Mr. Brougham, of the 15th April, contained the only proposition to the Queen which the King authorized to be made to her Majesty.

The views and sentiments of the King's Government as to her Majesty's actual situation are sufficiently expressed in Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th June.

Lord Liverpool will present to her Majesty the enclosed part of the King's letter at the close of this communication, viz. That she is willing to leave every thing to the decision of any person or persons of high station and character, when both parties are content in naming, and who shall have authority to prescribe the particulars as to residence, patronage, and income, subject of course to the approbation of Parliament.

The King's confidential Servants cannot think it inconsistent with their constitutional responsibility to advise the King to sign to any instrument, in a matter so deeply connected with the honour and interests of his crown, and with the most important of his subjects, but they are fully sensible of the great delicacy which may be derived from an unnecessary personal discussion, and they are desirous to avoid it, and to advise her Majesty to accept of the terms proposed by the King's Servants, who, in concert with the like number of persons to be named by the Queen, may frame an arrangement to be submitted to her Majesty, for settling upon the basis of Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th June, the necessary particulars of her Majesty's future situation.

16th June, 1820.

No. IV.

Mr. Brougham to the Earl of Liverpool, stating that he has received the Queen's communication, and that he will inform the Queen, that if the accompanying answer should not appear to quiete any rest, Lord Liverpool is prepared to name the two persons whom his Majesty will appoint for the purpose referred to in this note.

16th June, 1820.

No. V.

The Earl of Liverpool in answer to the Communication from the Queen of the 10th June, 1820.

Lord Liverpool has had the honour of receiving the Queen's communication, and cannot refrain from expressing the extreme surprise of the King's Servants, that the memorandum of April 15th, the only proposition to her Majesty which ever was authorized by his Majesty, should not have been submitted to her Majesty until yesterday.

That memorandum contains so full a communication of the intentions and views of the King's Government with respect to the Queen, as to have entitled his Majesty's Servants to an equally frank, full, and candid explanation on the part of her Majesty's Advisers.

The memorandum of the 15th April, while it proposed that her Majesty should abstain from the exercise of the rights and privileges as Queen with certain exceptions, did not call upon her Majesty to renounce any of them.

Whatever appertains to her Majesty by law, as Queen, must continue to appertain to her so long as it is not abrogated by law.

The King's Servants, in expressing their readiness to receive the suggestion for a satisfactory adjustment which her Majesty's Advisers promise to think it right, in order to save time, distinctly feel it to be consistent with their duty to recommend to his Majesty, most have for its basis her Majesty's residence abroad.

16th June, 1820.

No. VI.

Communication from the Queen to the Earl of Liverpool.

The Queen commands Mr. Brougham to acknowledge having received Lord Liverpool's note of last night, and to inform his Lordship, that her Majesty takes it for granted that the memorandum of April 15 was not submitted to her before Saturday, only because her legal advisers had no opportunity of seeing her Majesty until Lord Hutchison was on the spot prepared to treat with her.

Her Majesty commands Mr. Brougham to state, that as the basis of her proposition, as Queen is admitted by the King's Government, and as his Majesty's Servants express their readiness to receive

any suggestion for a satisfactory adjustment, her Majesty, if acting upon the same principles which have always guided her conduct, will now point out a method by which it appears to her Majesty that the object in contemplation may be attained.

Her Majesty's dignity and honour being secured, she regards all other matters as of comparatively little importance, and is willing to leave every thing to the decision of any person or persons of high station and character, when both parties are content in naming, and who shall have authority to prescribe the particulars as to residence, patronage, and income, subject of course to the approbation of Parliament.

16th June, 1820.

No. VII.

Mr. Brougham to the Earl of Liverpool, stating that he has received the Queen's communication, and that he will inform the Queen, that if the accompanying answer should not appear to quiete any rest, Lord Liverpool is prepared to name the two persons whom his Majesty will appoint for the purpose referred to in this note.

16th June, 1820.

No. VIII.

Mr. Brougham to the Earl of Liverpool, stating that he has received the Queen's communication, and that he will inform the Queen, that if the accompanying answer should not appear to quiete any rest, Lord Liverpool is prepared to name the two persons whom his Majesty will appoint for the purpose referred to in this note.

16th June, 1820.

No. IX.

Memorandum for a proposed arrangement with the Queen.

The Act of the 5th Geo. III. cap. 160, recognised the apparition of the Prince Regent from the Princess of Wales, and allotted a separate provision for the Princess.

This provision was to continue during the life of his late Majesty, and to determine at his demise.

In consequence of that event, it has altogether ceased, and no provision can be made for her until it shall please his Majesty to recommend to Parliament an arrangement to that purpose.

The King is willing to recommend to Parliament to enable his Majesty to settle an annuity of £50,000 a year upon the Queen, to be enjoyed by her during her natural life, and in lieu of any claim to the nature of jointure or other dowry, provided she will engage not to come into any part of the British dominions, and provided she engages to take some other name or title than that of Queen, and not to exercise any of the rights or privileges of Queen, other than those which appertain to the annuity shall have been settled upon her.

Upon her consent to an engagement on the above conditions, Mr. Brougham is desired to obtain a declaration to this effect, signed by her

self; and at the same time a full authority to conclude, with such person as his Majesty may appoint, a formal engagement upon those principles.

16th April, 1820.

PROTOCOLS.

No. I.

Protocol of the First Conference, held at the Foreign Office, June 15th, 1820.

In pursuance of the Notes of the 13th and 14th of June, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh, on the part of the King, having met Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman, her Majesty's Law Officers, in order to facilitate the proposed personal discussions, it was suggested by the former—

1st. That the persons named to frame an arrangement, although representing different interests, should consider themselves in discharge of this duty, not as opposed to each other, but as acting in concert, with a view to frame an arrangement in compliance with the understood wish of Parliament, which may avert the necessity of a Public Inquiry into the information laid before the two Houses.

2d. The arrangement to be made must be of such a nature, as to require from neither party any concession as to the result to which such inquiry, if proceeded on, might lead. The Queen must not be understood to submit, nor the King to retract, any thing.

3d. That in order the better to accomplish the above important object, it was proposed that whatever might pass in the first conference should be recorded without previous communication, and as far as possible, common consent; and that, in order to facilitate explanation and to encourage unreserved discussion, the substance only of what passed should be reported.

These preliminary points being agreed to, the questions to be examined (as contained in Lord Liverpool's memorandum of the 13th April, 1820, delivered to Mr. Brougham previous to his proceeding to St. Omer, and in Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th of June, and Mr. Brougham's note of the 12th of June, written by the Queen's commands) were—

1. The future residence of the Queen abroad; 2d. The title which her Majesty might think fit to assume when travelling on the Continent; 3d. The non-exercise of certain rights of patronage in England, which it might be desirable that her Majesty might desist from exercising, should she reside abroad; and,

4th. The suitable income to be assigned for life to the Queen residing abroad.

Her Majesty's Law Officers, on the part of the Queen, desired in the first instance, that the fourth point should be altogether laid aside in those conferences; her Majesty desired it might make no part of the conditions, nor be mixed with the personal discussions. They then proceeded to state, that under all the circumstances of her Majesty's position, they would not say that her Majesty had any insuperable objection to living abroad; but, in consequence of such foreign residence being deemed indispensable to the completion of an arrangement so much desired by Parliament, her Majesty might be prevailed upon to acquiesce; but then that certain steps must be taken to remove the possibility of any interference being drawn from such compliance, and from the inquiry not being proceeded in, unfavourable to her Majesty's honour and inconsistent with that recognition which is the basis of those negotiations; and her Majesty's advisers suggested with this view the restoration of her name to the Liturgy. To this it was replied, that the King's Government would no doubt have with great surprise, that a question of this important nature had now been brought forward for the first time, without having been adverted to in any of the previous discussions, and without being included amongst the heads to be treated of; that the Liturgy had been already regulated by his Majesty's formal declaration in Council, and in the exercise of his Majesty's legal authority; that the King, in yielding his own feelings and views to the wishes of Parliament, could not be understood (in the absence of inquiry) to alter any of those dispositions under which his Majesty had hitherto deliberated and advisedly acted; and that, as it was at the outset stated, that the King could not be expected to retract any thing, no hope could be held out that the King's Government would feel themselves justified in submitting such a proposition to his Majesty.

To this it was answered, that although the point of the Liturgy was certainly not included by name amongst the heads to be discussed, her Majesty's Law Officers felt themselves entitled to bring it forward in its connection with the question of her Majesty's residence abroad. It was further contended, that the alteration in the Liturgy was contrary to the plain sense and even letter of the statute, and that it was highly objectionable on constitutional grounds, being contrary to the whole policy of the law respecting the security of the succession, and liable to be repeated in cases where the succession itself might be endangered by it, and therefore it was said that a step so taken might well be retraced, without implying any unworthy concession. It was also urged, that the omission having been plainly made in contemplation of legal or parliamentary proceedings against her Majesty, it followed when those proceedings were to be abandoned, that the omission should be supplied; and it followed for the same reason, that supplying it would imply no retrocession.

It was replied, that his Majesty had decided that her Majesty's name should not be inserted in the Liturgy for several reasons not now necessary to discuss; that his Majesty had acted con-

clude, with such person as his Majesty may appoint, a formal engagement upon those principles.

16th April, 1820.

PROTOCOLS.

No. I.

Protocol of the First Conference, held at the Foreign Office, June 15th, 1820.

In pursuance of the Notes of the 13th and 14th of June, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh, on the part of the King, having met Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman, her Majesty's Law Officers, in order to facilitate the proposed personal discussions, it was suggested by the former—

1st. That the persons named to frame an arrangement, although representing different interests, should consider themselves in discharge of this duty, not as opposed to each other, but as acting in concert, with a view to frame an arrangement in compliance with the understood wish of Parliament, which may avert the necessity of a Public Inquiry into the information laid before the two Houses.

2d. The arrangement to be made must be of such a nature, as to require from neither party any concession as to the result to which such inquiry, if proceeded on, might lead. The Queen must not be understood to submit, nor the King to retract, any thing.

3d. That in order the better to accomplish the above important object, it was proposed that whatever might pass in the first conference should be recorded without previous communication, and as far as possible, common consent; and that, in order to facilitate explanation and to encourage unreserved discussion, the substance only of what passed should be reported.

These preliminary points being agreed to, the questions to be examined (as contained in Lord Liverpool's memorandum of the 13th April, 1820, delivered to Mr. Brougham previous to his proceeding to St. Omer, and in Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th of June, and Mr. Brougham's note of the 12th of June, written by the Queen's commands) were—

1. The future residence of the Queen abroad; 2d. The title which her Majesty might think fit to assume when travelling on the Continent; 3d. The non-exercise of certain rights of patronage in England, which it might be desirable that her Majesty might desist from exercising, should she reside abroad; and,

4th. The suitable income to be assigned for life to the Queen residing abroad.

Her Majesty's Law Officers, on the part of the Queen, desired in the first instance, that the fourth point should be altogether laid aside in those conferences; her Majesty desired it might make no part of the conditions, nor be mixed with the personal discussions. They then proceeded to state, that under all the circumstances of her Majesty's position, they would not say that her Majesty had any insuperable objection to living abroad; but, in consequence of such foreign residence being deemed indispensable to the completion of an arrangement so much desired by Parliament, her Majesty might be prevailed upon to acquiesce; but then that certain steps must be taken to remove the possibility of any interference being drawn from such compliance, and from the inquiry not being proceeded in, unfavourable to her Majesty's honour and inconsistent with that recognition which is the basis of those negotiations; and her Majesty's advisers suggested with this view the restoration of her name to the Liturgy. To this it was replied, that the King's Government would no doubt have with great surprise, that a question of this important nature had now been brought forward for the first time, without having been adverted to in any of the previous discussions, and without being included amongst the heads to be treated of; that the Liturgy had been already regulated by his Majesty's formal declaration in Council, and in the exercise of his Majesty's legal authority; that the King, in yielding his own feelings and views to the wishes of Parliament, could not be understood (in the absence of inquiry) to alter any of those dispositions under which his Majesty had hitherto deliberated and advisedly acted; and that, as it was at the outset stated, that the King could not be expected to retract any thing, no hope could be held out that the King's Government would feel themselves justified in submitting such a proposition to his Majesty.

To this it was answered, that although the point of the Liturgy was certainly not included by name amongst the heads to be discussed, her Majesty's Law Officers felt themselves entitled to bring it forward in its connection with the question of her Majesty's residence abroad. It was further contended, that the alteration in the Liturgy was contrary to the plain sense and even letter of the statute, and that it was highly objectionable on constitutional grounds, being contrary to the whole policy of the law respecting the security of the succession, and liable to be repeated in cases where the succession itself might be endangered by it, and therefore it was said that a step so taken might well be retraced, without implying any unworthy concession. It was also urged, that the omission having been plainly made in contemplation of legal or parliamentary proceedings against her Majesty, it followed when those proceedings were to be abandoned, that the omission should be supplied; and it followed for the same reason, that supplying it would imply no retrocession.

It was replied, that his Majesty had decided that her Majesty's name should not be inserted in the Liturgy for several reasons not now necessary to discuss; that his Majesty had acted con-

clude, with such person as his Majesty may appoint, a formal engagement upon those principles.

16th April, 1820.

PROTOCOLS.

No. I.

Protocol of the First Conference, held at the Foreign Office, June 15th, 1820.

In pursuance of the Notes of the 13th and 14th of June, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh, on the part of the King, having met Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman, her Majesty's Law Officers, in order to facilitate the proposed personal discussions, it was suggested by the former—

1st. That the persons named to frame an arrangement, although representing different interests, should consider themselves in discharge of this duty, not as opposed to each other, but as acting in concert, with a view to frame an arrangement in compliance with the understood wish of Parliament, which may avert the necessity of a Public Inquiry into the information laid before the two Houses.

2d. The arrangement to be made must be of such a nature, as to require from neither party any concession as to the result to which such inquiry, if proceeded on, might lead. The Queen must not be understood to submit, nor the King to retract, any thing.

3d. That in order the better to accomplish the above important object, it was proposed that whatever might pass in the first conference should be recorded without previous communication, and as far as possible, common consent; and that, in order to facilitate explanation and to encourage unreserved discussion, the substance only of what passed should be reported.

These preliminary points being agreed to, the questions to be examined (as contained in Lord Liverpool's memorandum of the 13th April, 1820, delivered to Mr. Brougham previous to his proceeding to St. Omer, and in Lord Liverpool's note of the 11th of June, and Mr. Brougham's note of the 12th of June, written by the Queen's commands) were—

1. The future residence of the Queen abroad; 2d. The title which her Majesty might think fit to assume when travelling on the Continent; 3d. The non-exercise of certain rights of patronage in England, which it might be desirable that her Majesty might desist from exercising, should she reside abroad; and,

4th. The suitable income to be assigned for life to the Queen residing abroad.

Her Majesty's Law Officers, on the part of the Queen, desired in the first instance, that the fourth point should be altogether laid aside in those conferences; her Majesty desired it might make no part of the conditions, nor be mixed with the personal discussions. They then proceeded to state, that under all the circumstances of her Majesty's position, they would not say that her Majesty had any insuperable objection to living abroad; but, in consequence of such foreign residence being deemed indispensable to the completion of an arrangement so much desired by Parliament, her Majesty might be prevailed upon to acquiesce; but then that certain steps must be taken to remove the possibility of any interference being drawn from such compliance, and from the inquiry not being proceeded in, unfavourable to her Majesty's honour and inconsistent with that recognition which is the basis of those negotiations; and her Majesty's advisers suggested with this view the restoration of her name to the Liturgy. To this it was replied, that the King's Government would no doubt have with great surprise, that a question of this important nature had now been brought forward for the first time, without having been adverted to in any of the previous discussions, and without being included amongst the heads to be treated of; that the Liturgy had been already regulated by his Majesty's formal declaration in Council, and in the exercise of his Majesty's legal authority; that the King, in yielding his own feelings and views to the wishes of Parliament, could not be understood (in the absence of inquiry) to alter any of those dispositions under which his Majesty had hitherto deliberated and advisedly acted; and that, as it was at the outset stated, that the King could not be expected to retract any thing, no hope could be held out that the King's Government would feel themselves justified in submitting such a proposition to his Majesty.

To this it was answered, that although the point of the Liturgy was certainly not included by name amongst the heads to be discussed, her Majesty's Law Officers felt themselves entitled to bring it forward in its connection with the question of her Majesty's residence abroad. It was further contended, that the alteration in the Liturgy was contrary to the plain sense and even letter of the statute, and that it was highly objectionable on constitutional grounds, being contrary to the whole policy of the law respecting the security of the succession, and liable to be repeated in cases where the succession itself might be endangered by it, and therefore it was said that a step so taken might well be retraced, without implying any unworthy concession. It was also urged, that the omission having been plainly made in contemplation of legal or parliamentary proceedings against her Majesty, it followed when those proceedings were to be abandoned, that the omission should be supplied; and it followed for the same reason, that supplying it would imply no retrocession.

It was replied, that his Majesty had decided that her Majesty's name should not be inserted in the Liturgy for several reasons not now necessary to discuss; that his Majesty had acted con-