

EXTRACTS FROM A POEM, JUST PUBLISHED, ENTITLED, A QUEEN'S APPEAL.

It could not be that I should cease to feel Both what I am, and what a proffered hand Would make me seem. Nor could I wholly steel My heart with pride...

THE QUEEN.

The following is the letter written by her Majesty, on her seeing from the newspapers that her name was omitted in the Liturgy.

DESPERATE AFFRAY.

GLASGOW, JUNE 30.—Wednesday night, an alarming affray took place in this city between a party of about twenty of the 13th foot on the one hand, and the police and inhabitants on the other...

and through every opening where they could find access. The crowd soon considerably augmented, and stones were thrown at the military from all quarters...

ATROCIOUS PIRACY.

We have received from Liverpool the following extract from the log-book of the ship Jane, James Drummond, master, arrived at Savannah from Liverpool. We have rarely read a narrative of more wanton and savage plunder.

EDUCATION OF THE POOR.

Among the many efforts to educate the lower orders, we think that the plan adopted by George Krough, Esq. of Kilkenny, in this County, one of the best—religious instruction is left entirely to the Clergy, according to the different principles in which the children are intended to be brought up.

much as they could carry about them: the residue of the boxes were taken on board accordingly. They also took from us every garment of clothing, all our bedding, hats, shoes, and boots...

COUNTY OF KILKENNY AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR JUNE.

For years back there has not been experienced to intense a glow of heat, as characterized the last week or ten days of June, and which, rapidly succeeding a state of weather nearly in the opposite extreme, produced a sensible alteration in the affections and powers of the animal world.

EVERY MAN HIS OWN DOCTOR.

By the Effluvia of BOBBERY'S INFALLIBLE RED PILL. (18. 6d. British per box) assisted by the invaluable Caplin's Directions therewith enclosed.

who attend at the times and places appointed. The school is neat and commodious. The sexes are separated by the Schoolmaster's apartments. There is no gratuitous instruction, for all are obliged to pay something.

ANTI-IMPETIGINES.

The celebrated ANTI-IMPETIGINES, OR SOLDIERS' DROPS, without Mercury, or any deleterious preparation, stand in the highest estimation for the cure of the Scabies, Scordula, Leprosy, and all disorders originating in an impure state of the Blood.

WATERFORD.

Printed and Published by R. J. JAMES PLENNY, Council-Office, Quay.

No. 12,576.

AUCTION OF KELP. SAMUEL CROSFHWAIT INTENDS SELLING BY AUCTION, AT THE STORE OF W. M. ARDAGH, QUAY, ON WEDNESDAY next, the 13th Inst. at 11 O'CLOCK, EIGHTY TONS OF GALWAY KELP, OF VERY SUPERIOR QUALITY.

THE GOVERNORS OF THE FEETTER HOSPITAL, do hereby inform, that a SPECIAL MEETING will be held on TUESDAY, the 14th instant, at 8 O'CLOCK, to consider the propriety of lessening the number of Visiting Physicians; and that a GENERAL MEETING will be held on FRIDAY, the 17th instant, at the same hour, to elect Physicians for the ensuing Year, and transact such other Business as may come before them.

R. WATERFORD.

NEW ROSS HOTEL. TO BE LET. FROM 29th OF SEPTEMBER, THE INN AND STABLES, &c. Now occupied by the Widow SAMPSON.

TO BE LET, OR THE INTEREST ONLY, FOR AN UNLIMITED TERM OF YEARS, AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN.

THE HOUSE AND GARDEN in Jervis-street, in the Parish of the Passmore of ANNERLY BROSSE, is now in the best repair, and is well situated for business.

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

THIS Corporation, established now almost a Century, insures all kinds of Manufactures, Railways, and Ships, from Loss or Damage by Fire.

THE ISSUVE OF BREAD, BY ORDER OF THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL JAMES HACKETT, ESQ. MAYOR OF SAID CITY.

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Average) was last week 10s. 6d. per bushel, subject to an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Refined, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

LIENSTER CIRCUIT. County of Wicklow, at Wicklow, Monday, July 10. County of Wexford, at Wexford, Thursday, 13. County of Waterford, at Waterford, Monday, 17. City of Waterford, at Waterford, same day.

WATERFORD. Printed and Published by R. J. JAMES PLENNY, Council-Office, Quay.

BOAT BY AUCTION.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION, THE 12th INSTANT, AT 12 O'CLOCK, THE CLONMEL BOAT REBECCA.

THE PASSAGE REVENUE BARGE, WITH ALL HER FURNITURE, MATERIALS, &c. AND A FOUR-OAR BOAT, TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION, AT THE OLD CUSTOM-HOUSE QUAY.

TO BE LET, For such Term of Years or Lives as may be agreed upon.

THE HOUSE and DEMESNE of BALLINACOURTY, as heretofore advertised.

TO BE SOLD, A FEE SIMPLE ESTATE, IN THE PARISH OF WATERFORD.

TO BE LET, FROM THE 29th OF SEPTEMBER NEXT, For such Term as may be agreed upon.

THE ISSUVE OF BREAD, BY ORDER OF THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL JAMES HACKETT, ESQ. MAYOR OF SAID CITY.

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Average) was last week 10s. 6d. per bushel, subject to an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Refined, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

LIENSTER CIRCUIT. County of Wicklow, at Wicklow, Monday, July 10. County of Wexford, at Wexford, Thursday, 13. County of Waterford, at Waterford, Monday, 17. City of Waterford, at Waterford, same day.

WATERFORD. Printed and Published by R. J. JAMES PLENNY, Council-Office, Quay.

TO BE LET.

THE PROVISION & BACON CELLARS, CHANDLING HOUSE, &c. ON THE BALLAST-QUAY OF NEW ROSS.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH, LONDON, JUNE 30. CRIM. CON.

Viscount Glenavon v. Henry John Burn, Esq. This was an action to recover a compensation in damages against the Defendant, for criminal conversation with the Plaintiff's wife.

TO BE LET, For such Term of Years or Lives as may be agreed upon.

THE HOUSE and DEMESNE of BALLINACOURTY, as heretofore advertised.

TO BE SOLD, A FEE SIMPLE ESTATE, IN THE PARISH OF WATERFORD.

TO BE LET, FROM THE 29th OF SEPTEMBER NEXT, For such Term as may be agreed upon.

THE ISSUVE OF BREAD, BY ORDER OF THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL JAMES HACKETT, ESQ. MAYOR OF SAID CITY.

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Average) was last week 10s. 6d. per bushel, subject to an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Refined, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

LIENSTER CIRCUIT. County of Wicklow, at Wicklow, Monday, July 10. County of Wexford, at Wexford, Thursday, 13. County of Waterford, at Waterford, Monday, 17. City of Waterford, at Waterford, same day.

WATERFORD. Printed and Published by R. J. JAMES PLENNY, Council-Office, Quay.

TO BE LET.

THE PROVISION & BACON CELLARS, CHANDLING HOUSE, &c. ON THE BALLAST-QUAY OF NEW ROSS.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH, LONDON, JUNE 30. CRIM. CON.

Viscount Glenavon v. Henry John Burn, Esq. This was an action to recover a compensation in damages against the Defendant, for criminal conversation with the Plaintiff's wife.

TO BE LET, For such Term of Years or Lives as may be agreed upon.

THE HOUSE and DEMESNE of BALLINACOURTY, as heretofore advertised.

TO BE SOLD, A FEE SIMPLE ESTATE, IN THE PARISH OF WATERFORD.

TO BE LET, FROM THE 29th OF SEPTEMBER NEXT, For such Term as may be agreed upon.

THE ISSUVE OF BREAD, BY ORDER OF THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL JAMES HACKETT, ESQ. MAYOR OF SAID CITY.

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Average) was last week 10s. 6d. per bushel, subject to an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Refined, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

LIENSTER CIRCUIT. County of Wicklow, at Wicklow, Monday, July 10. County of Wexford, at Wexford, Thursday, 13. County of Waterford, at Waterford, Monday, 17. City of Waterford, at Waterford, same day.

WATERFORD. Printed and Published by R. J. JAMES PLENNY, Council-Office, Quay.

ment compatible, but because he considered it would be a great hardship that pending an election the House of Commons should, without previous notice, take a step the operation of which might be the exclusion of the successful Candidate, without his having had any opportunity before hand of imagining even the possibility of such an intimation. (Hear, hear!) Besides the hardship to the individual, he also looked, as he was bound to do, to the great inconvenience which might possibly arise to the citizens of Dublin from the party spirit and expense of a renewed contest at their election. The present election, he understood, was conducted with very strong feelings at both sides. The repetition of these in the event of a new election, still further exasperated, as they doubtless would be under such circumstances, he would deplore as a great misfortune for the citizens of Dublin. Under any circumstances, he would deprecate an *ex post facto* measure. (Hear.)

Mr. ABERCROMBY begged to call the attention of the House to the subject upon which they were about to legislate. It had nothing to do with the Dublin Election, but was in plain terms whether or not Parliament would continue to afford sutors in the Irish Court of Chancery that protection to which the law had entitled them. (Hear!) Nobody had ventured to state that the office of a Master in Chancery and a Member of Parliament were compatible. The very Gentleman whose case was supposed to be involved in the present consideration had himself given conclusive testimony upon that point. He declared that the business of his office required his full attendance for ten months in the year. (Hear!) Could any man, after such a declaration, and with a consciousness of the importance of the duties of such an office, require an exception to be made in favour of a Gentleman who had himself shown the impossibility of making it with any sense of justice? (Hear!) The Hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw) asked the House, on behalf of the citizens of Dublin, not to accede to this clause. If he asked that on behalf of the citizens of Dublin, he (Mr. Abercromby) would ask for the clause on behalf of the whole People of Ireland, who, if it did not pass, would be deprived of the performance of those duties which they had a right to require from a public officer. Were they (the People) to be deprived of the benefit of having indispensable duties performed, merely because Mr. Ellis wished to gratify his ambition? To pass the clause would entail no individual hardship, for no Master in Chancery had been a Member of Parliament since the Union. As to the *ex post facto* operation complained of, he must say, that he thought the complaint a little out of place, for this Bill was not now for the first time brought forward; it was a measure long in contemplation for the regulation of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, and this was the first time when his Right Hon. Friend could have introduced the clause, which was now completed as if it had been prematurely framed to meet a particular occasion. It would be a dereliction of their duty if they did not agree to this clause. (Hear.)

Sir M. W. RIDLEY said, the Member for Dublin stated that the introduction of the present clause would operate as an injustice and an inconvenience. He would in two words convince him that no inconvenience and no injustice would be occasioned by the clause. He would first suppose that the Hon. Gentleman would feel no hesitation in voting for the motion. The Election would be concluded either in favour of Mr. Ellis or Mr. Grattan. If Mr. Ellis were returned, he would have an opportunity of vacating his office, and would give the population of Ireland and the sutors of the Court of Chancery that protection to which they were allowed on all hands to be entitled. If, on the other hand, Mr. Ellis should wish to retain his office, he might vacate his seat, and thus afford to the citizens of Dublin an opportunity of electing another man of his party and his principles. If the Election should terminate in favour of Mr. Grattan, then no harm would be done to Mr. Ellis by the introduction of the clause now proposed. In either case the ends of justice would be answered, and the fair exercise of the elective franchise would be protected.

Mr. T. F. BUXTON.—"I beg to ask a question, on the answer to which will materially depend the vote I shall give on this motion." The Noble Lord opposite (Lord Castlereagh) having declared the offices of Member of Parliament and Master in Chancery to be totally incompatible with each other, will he, in the event of Mr. Ellis being elected as a Member of Parliament, and retaining his seat as such, recommend his dismissal from his office as a Master in Chancery, the duties of which it will be impossible for him to perform, while attending the business of his constituents?"

Mr. CANNING said, that he believed his Noble Friend had no objection to the principle of the motion, provided it did not receive a retrospective application. Supposing, for instance, Mr. Ellis was returned by the electors of Dublin, he might resign his office as a Master in Chancery, and then it would be improper to interfere with his representative situation. (Hear!) They ought to do nothing which could interfere with the pending election, but then let the Gentleman, if returned, consider which he would retain—his seat or his office.

Sir J. NEWPORT had no objection whatever that such should be the effect of his clause in the present instance. But soon and after the passing of the said Act, he thought the office of Mas-

ter in Chancery should expressly disqualify the holder from being a candidate to serve in Parliament.

Mr. CANNING.—"Then let us understand each other. Supposing the election to take place while this Bill is pending, or at the time it is passed, the being a Master in Chancery at that time it took place is not to be considered a disqualification in this particular case." (Hear.)

Sir J. NEWPORT.—"No, but then he cannot sit in this House while he holds the office of Master." (Hear.)

Mr. CANNING.—"Still the election, he being a Master in Chancery at the time, shall be valid."

Sir GEORGE HILL warmly complained that the object of the proposed clause would be to disqualify, without notice, a gentleman from filling a situation to which he was previously clearly eligible. If, as he understood, this clause was intended to disqualify Mr. Ellis (should he be returned) from holding his seat, unless he relinquished his office in Chancery, then he should say, that it was the first time any Member of Parliament had, during an election of great expectation, ever proposed that House a measure which would, if passed, have the effect of concluding that election. (Hear.) Indeed, he meant to ask if the Right Hon. Baronet would not proceed a step further, and substitute Mr. Grattan's name for Mr. Ellis's, in the event of the latter's being ultimately at the head of the poll? ("No, no!" from Sir J. Newport.) Well, if that were not the case, still the effect must be to disqualify a Gentleman, who up to the present moment was qualified. (Hear, hear!)—He did not mean to contend against the inconvenience, which might arise from the duties of the two offices; all he desired was, to protest against the principle of disqualifying any person from being a Member of Parliament during his election, who at the time he became a candidate was qualified, and had not altered his position in that respect. None but an Irish gentleman, locally acquainted with the state of parties now in Dublin, could be aware of the extraordinary intricacy attached to the present election for that city. Under such circumstances, it could not surely be thought fit to disqualify a gentleman without notice, who may be on the eve of being the sitting Member, or who perhaps actually was so at the present moment. He thought such a principle would be an outrage on consistency, an outrage on fairness, and an outrage on candour.

Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH observed, that he would not stop to inquire whether the principle of this clause was an outrage on consistency, an outrage on fairness, or on candour;—but he would ask, whether it was not an outrage on common sense, to imagine that any man was to retain the privilege of filling two situations of active business, the duties of which were totally incompatible with each other? (Hear, hear!)—It was said that his Hon. Friend (Sir J. Newport) had given this Gentleman no notice of his intention. That certainly might be the fact; but the Gentleman had himself given that House notice, in the evidence which had been read, of his utter incapability to sit in that House, and at the same time perform the laborious duties of his office. (Hear, hear!) This was said to be a novel proceeding. It certainly was so, and the first novelty in it was the conduct of the friends of Mr. Ellis, and of those who were the friends of his seat. The former seemed anxious to attack his evidence, that he should be able to keep his seat; while the latter supported his evidence, to save the duties of his office. (Hear, hear!) If his evidence were true, if it was true that the duties of his office most necessarily detain him in Dublin ten months out of the year, would the House endure the idea of permitting a person to sit amongst them holding a judicial office, the duties of which, if they believed his oath, required ten months of his attendance in Ireland in each year. (Hear!) The Right Hon. Baronet (Sir G. Hill) had used very hard words. He (Sir James) had another tale—he would rather use hard arguments and soft words. (Laughter.) The Right Hon. Baronet had talked a great deal about the Constitution; it was an extraordinary appeal, considering the line of argument he had taken. (Hear!) He talked of the election as interesting to the Public—what did he (Sir James) know of the interest of the violence, or the frauds, of any party in Dublin—what did he care about them. (Hear!) Was any of them prepared, in order to satisfy any party in that Country, to establish by his vote so shameful, or rather so shameless a principle? Would any one call upon Parliament to permit a gentleman to sit in that House, whilst the most pressing, and he would say, the most sacred duties of society disqualified him? It would be impossible, even if all the passion and the spirit of an Irish election found its way into that House, that any party or any faction could so thwart its proceedings or darken its views. He did not wish to speak harshly, but this he would say, that so absurd, so monstrous, and so unconstitutional an exemption, could not possibly be tolerated in that assembly.

Lord CASTLEREAGH repeated, that he wished the clause so framed as not to affect the pending election, since the Right Hon. Baronet avowed it was not intended to have such an operation. If the candidate be returned, the seat is open to him; should he divest himself of his office as a Master in Chancery. (Hear!)

Sir JOHN NEWPORT agreed to frame his clause in this view, which he did at the suggestion of Lord Castlereagh and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. CALCRAFT hoped it would be understood that in future no Master in Chancery should be eligible to become a candidate for a seat in Parliament.

Mr. WYNN added, that in such a case the votes ought to be considered as thrown away.

Sir GEORGE HILL again complained of the retrospective effect this clause would have upon the interest of the particular individual.

The question was then put upon Sir John Newport's instruction to the Committee; there were some Noes, but the Speaker declared the *Ayes* had it.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee on the Irish Chancery Bill, when, after some immaterial clauses were agreed to respecting fees—

Sir JOHN NEWPORT, in form, proposed his clause to the Committee, respecting the incompatibility of the office of Master in Chancery with a seat in Parliament.

Colonel BARRY said, that though he perfectly agreed with the principle of the clause, he could not help objecting to it as an *ex post facto* law affecting Mr. Ellis, who probably was at this time a Member of the House.

Sir J. NEWPORT begged to observe, that he had not introduced a Bill on this subject. A Bill was before the House for the Regulation of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, and this clause, suggested by Mr. Ellis's evidence, was naturally proposed as a part of it.

Mr. DAILY observed, the Bill which had passed this House last year, and was thrown out in the Lords, was without any such clause as that now proposed. This circumstance proved that it was an *ex post facto* law to affect Mr. Ellis, and he said this without any personal feeling in his favour, for (Mr. D.) would, with all his heart, go over to Dublin to vote for Mr. Grattan.

Dr. PHILLIMORE observed, that this clause was not intended to deprive Mr. Ellis of his seat, but to give him the option which of two offices he would hold, the performance of the duties of both being according to his own account, impossible.

Dr. LUSHINGTON said, that Mr. Ellis, being a Master in Chancery, had taken an oath faithfully to perform the duties of his office, to do which, according to his own evidence, it was necessary that he should be in Dublin during ten months in the year. They should not, by allowing Mr. Ellis to retain the two situations, put him under the temptation of neglecting the duty of the one or the other, which no honourable man would wish to be subjected to. Besides, were they to forget the Public in this case? A Master in Chancery had important duties to perform, the management of bankrupts' affairs, &c. which required attendance from day to day—so that every hour he was absent in England was injurious, and might be ruinous to the suitors. He would not take the narrow ground on which his Right Hon. Friend (Sir J. Newport) stood. If no such Bill was before the House, he thought one should have been introduced to protect the Chancery suitors of Ireland. (Hear.)

Mr. NOLAN considered the clause an *ex post facto* law, and an act of injustice of the deepest dye. Though Mr. Ellis had heavy duties to perform, his friends might consent to do them for him during his absence; besides, the two months during which he was unoccupied might be the time that Parliament was sitting. It would hardly be tolerated, if this Gentleman was in Parliament, that a Bill should be brought in to exclude him; yet he probably was by this time a Member, so that the only difference was (and Honourable Gentlemen might make the most of it), that he was absent.

Mr. R. MARTIN said, that Mr. Ellis was not disqualified by the Bill, he had disqualified himself. (Hear!) It was allowed that he could not perform the duties of the two offices, and the House gave him the option which he would continue to hold. As to the assertion, that the other Masters in Chancery might supply his place, they should recollect that if the principle were sanctioned, they might probably have all the four Masters in Chancery in Parliament, so that the duties of the office would be altogether neglected. (Hear!)

Mr. W. WILLIAMS was sorry that the question had been made a personal one, but when it was said that Mr. Ellis was absent, it should be remembered that he was here by his evidence.

Colonel BARRY explained, that Mr. Ellis had bought his office, at a time when it was legally saleable, for £10,000. Two years ago, a Bill was passed which presented him from selling his office; he had now presented himself as a Candidate for a seat in Parliament, not knowing that it was incompatible with his office, and when he was (probably) elected, he was met by a Bill to oblige him to relinquish his seat or his office.—This he (Col. B.) thought an act of gross injustice to Mr. Ellis, though he had not any personal acquaintance with that Gentleman.

Sir J. NEWPORT said, Mr. Ellis had bought the office under an express notification from Lord Chancellor Ponsonby, that he would not be allowed to sell it. He had no objection to except Mr. Ellis from the operation of the clause, if any provision could be made to protect the suitors of the Court from injury.

Mr. NOLAN said, all the great Acts of disqualification had not taken effect till the Session following that in which they passed.

Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH said, a manifest distinction existed between the present clause and those general measures of disqualification which had been passed from an apprehension of some future possible inconvenience. In those cases there could be no necessity to affect the actual

holders of seats. But here the case was the reverse; it was not future inconvenience that was guarded against, but Parliament had presented a case in which the holder of an office had declared that it was impossible that he could perform the duties of that office if he were a Member of Parliament. As to the allegation, that the other Masters might do the duty for Mr. Ellis, the argument of the Hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Martin) could not be replied to; and if there was one Master in Chancery more than was necessary, the House should immediately set about the work of reduction.

Mr. WROTTESELEY said, a seat in Parliament was a trust, not an office. It was, therefore, a question between Mr. Ellis and his constituents, because the Lord Chancellor of Ireland would see that the business of Mr. Ellis's office was attended to. If the House took upon it to legislate in the case of every person returned to the House who might not be able to attend, they would be obliged in consistency to exclude many of their Members who were Generals in the Army, and had commands abroad, for instance at the Cape and in India, so that they could not attend at all.

Mr. BARRING said, there was a distinction that commanded in the Army and Navy were occasional, while the place of a Master in Chancery was a constant office.

Sir J. YORKE said a few words in reply to Mr. Wrottesley.

Lord PALMERSTON said, that the argument of his Honourable Friend (Mr. Wrottesley) had not been answered. There was no effectual distinction between a command in the army or navy and the office of Mr. Ellis, as far as attendance in Parliament was concerned. Hitherto the House had proceeded on one principle of exclusion only, viz. that which was directed against the influence of the Crown. It was not on that principle that the admission of Mr. Ellis was opposed. They had to consider whether they would admit another principle of exclusion, viz. that a man should not be elected to Parliament when he had other occupations which might keep him absent. This principle might lead to an inconvenient extent, which might exclude any man for any sort of public or private business.

Mr. M. FITZGERALD maintained, that the clause proposed by his Right Hon. Friend was not liable to any of the objections which applied to a retrospective or *ex post facto* law with respect to Mr. Ellis, as this clause proposed only to enact a general principle, from which it was in the power of that Gentleman to relieve himself if he should think proper. By the evidence of Mr. Ellis himself, it appeared that a Master in Chancery was necessarily occupied in performance of his official duty for ten months in the year, and even liable to be called upon at times within the remaining period. How then was it possible, he would ask, for such an officer to perform his official duties and to attend to the business of that House?

Lord CASTLEREAGH said that he was an advocate for the principle of the clause, upon the ground that attendance in Parliament was incompatible with the duties of an office which required perpetual attention in Ireland. He was, indeed, an advocate for the clause upon the same ground that the Judges were excluded from that House, which was not because they were supposed dependent upon the Crown, but because, from the pressure of their judicial engagements, the two situations were incompatible. Still he thought that this clause should not be retrospective with regard to any Masters in Chancery who might be elected previous to the passing of the Act. But should the Gentleman alluded to be returned, it would, of course, be competent to any Member of that House to move an Address to the Throne for his removal from the office which he held in the Court of Chancery, and upon that Address being presented it would be difficult, he thought, for any Minister, with that Gentleman's own evidence before him, to hesitate about advising his Majesty to comply with such an Address.

Mr. ABERCROMBY supported the clause. The observations made on the other side, with regard to officers of the Army and Navy holding seats in that House, had, in his view, no analogy to the present case; for a seat in Parliament was to such an officer but a secondary consideration, while a Master in Chancery, in becoming a Member of that House, was but too likely, he feared, to make that his primary object, through which, of course, his official business would be neglected.

Sir J. NEWPORT assured the Committee, that he had no personal motive whatever on this occasion, as he had the greatest personal respect for Mr. Ellis, and as he had mentioned to a friend of his, then in the House, before the death of his lamented Right Hon. Friend, that it was his intention to move the insertion of a clause of this nature in the Bill under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER objected to the proposed attempt to defeat the wishes and to interfere with the franchises of the People of Dublin. He called upon the Committee to recollect the precedent in the case of Horse Troop, where the Act excluding persons in Holy Orders from that House specially provided for the exception of that Gentleman during the existing Parliament, on the ground that it should not be retrospective in its operation, although that Act was actually brought forward in consequence of Mr. Tooke's election.

Mr. MACDONALD observed, that Mr. Tooke had no option, as he could not divest himself of his orders, and that he had no duty to perform elsewhere, by the neglect of which the Public would suffer, while Mr. Ellis was in quite different circumstances, as he had an option

to leave Mr. Ellis to give up his office.

Mr. R. SALTH said, that Mr. Ellis had, by his own admission, such official business to discharge as rendered it impossible for him to attend his duty as a Member of that House. Therefore, should that Gentleman be returned, an Address to the Crown should be voted for his removal from office; and if no other person would make the motion, he should himself feel it his duty to do so. (Hear, hear, hear!)

Colonel BARRY moved an amendment to exempt from its operation any Master in Chancery who might be elected previous to the passing of the Act.

After a few words from Mr. V. FITZGERALD in support of it, and Sir J. MACKINTOSH against it, the proposition was put, and the SPEAKER declaring that the Noes had it, a division was called for; but although the gallery was cleared, no division took place, and the amendment was negatived.

The clause was agreed to, the House resumed, and the Report was ordered to be brought up on Monday.

LISEN COUNTY ACT.

Mr. MABERLY brought up the Report of the Committee on these Acts, and moved that the Report might be agreed to. He was of opinion that the duty paid on yarn imported by the manufacturers of linen was a sufficient equivalent for the bounty they received.

Mr. ROBINSON said he could not agree to the two last Resolutions of the Committee, and if they were passed in, he would not bind himself to support the first. He thought, when looking at the late period the Session had arrived at, that a Bill on the subject was not immediately necessary, or, at least, it would be premature, as the Bounties Act did not expire until March, 1821.

Sir GEORGE HILL thought this was a question of great importance; it was certainly one to the North of Ireland, as the linen trade was its great support, and there would much danger arise if they could be brought for a moment to suppose that the Legislature did not intend to continue the bounties.

Mr. HUME said he would recommend it to his Hon. Friend to withdraw the two last Resolutions, to enable him to carry the first. He complained that England and Scotland were not put on an equal footing with Ireland, as to the drawback on ashes used in bleaching linen cloth.

Mr. FOSTER said, he could assure the Hon. Gentleman that the People of Ireland wished that those of England and Scotland should be included in every thing in the way of advantage they deserved; but it would be ingratitude to take away the bounties on linen from Ireland. If he was exclusively an Irishman, he would say, triple the duties on yarn coming into Ireland, for the Country grew more than it could manufacture.—As to the drawback on ashes, he did not think it was sufficient, for formerly it was imported into Ireland free of duty.

Mr. BUSKISSON said, that every principle of justice required that the other parts of the Empire should be put on the same footing, as to bounties, with Ireland; but when it was said that bounties were to be permanent, it was not implied that they were to be perpetual.

Mr. RICARDON considered bounties given to Ireland in this way, as in the nature of a tax on the People of this Country, and therefore he was generally opposed to such measures.

Mr. FOSTER explained.

The Resolution was then read a second time and agreed to.

After a few observations from Mr. MABERLY, the two other Resolutions were negatived, and a Bill was ordered to be brought in founded on the first Resolution.

SUPPLY.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of Supply—

Lord PALMERSTON moved, that it be the opinion of this Committee that a sum not exceeding £209,839 be granted to his Majesty for defraying the charges of disembodied militia of Ireland.—Agreed to.

The following Resolutions were then carried:—

£120,000 for clothing the same force; £50,000 for clothing the Yeomanry of Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in the absence of Mr. Ward, moved a re-vote of the sum of £250,000 granted in the last Session of the last Parliament for the Ordnance services of the year 1820.—Agreed to.

Mr. GOULBURN moved, that a sum not exceeding £60,000 be granted to his Majesty, for completing the Inland Navigation in Scotland, between Liverpool and Fort William.

Sir J. YORKE said, he supposed that as now the morning was come (it being past twelve o'clock), the most important part of the business was to be got through. (Laughter.) He had been surprised at the economy on the opposite side of the House consenting to double this vote. The work for which the vote was required was commonly called the *Calcutta Canal*, but perhaps it might more properly be designated a *Scotch job*. (A Laugh.) He well recollected when a Noble Lord came down and proposed the commencement of this Canal. It was to be the pride of the age, to unite the eastern and western seas, and two frigates were to navigate it. He estimated that it was but about two hundred or eighty thousand pounds in all; but now it cost the Country upwards of £400,000.—There were four Commissioners' names to be seen the work but one. Mr. Temple (we

believe) was a great genius, and might, for aught he knew, bottle up the eastern sea, and set fire to the western—(laughter)—but after all the canal was a very bad one. The locks were very close, which every one knew was a material objection.

Lord BUNNING acknowledged he had never seen the canal. But it was not a Scotch job; it was confessedly a most magnificent and, when completed, would be a most beneficial work.

Lord ALTHORP entirely agreed in the remarks of the Honourable and Gallant Officer opposite.

£60,000 for the Calcutta Canal was agreed to, after a short consideration, in which Sir Joseph Yorke, Sir H. Parnell, Lord Binning, and Mr. Home took a part.

Mr. C. GRANT then proposed the following sum for Ireland, and withheld others which he supposed likely to excite discussion:—

£29,224 for the Protestant Charter Schools in Ireland.

Mr. HUME observed, that there were other funds belonging to these schools. He thought the funds ought to be made more generally useful, and differently employed, so as to embrace Catholics as well as others. (Hear!)

Mr. VESEY FITZGERALD said, this principle was now acted upon, except so far as related to the distribution of particular bounties. He fully agreed in the necessity of collating extensive education in Ireland.

Sir H. PARNELL wished this Resolution withdrawn for the present.

Mr. C. GRANT suggested that any debate upon it should take place on receiving the Report.

This arrangement was agreed to.

Sir G. HILL lamented that an inquiry into the state of the Education of the Poor in Ireland had not taken place.

£12,500 for the Board of Works was agreed to.

Mr. PARNELL complained of an omission in the items for an Eye Hospital.

Mr. HUME would not recommend grants of this kind in the general manner suggested. He rather wished them to depend on private benevolence.

Mr. C. GRANT concurred in the opinion of the Hon. Member who spoke last. Ireland was by no means deficient in private benevolence.

Mr. V. FITZGERALD did not believe there was a Capital in Europe where private charity was more generally distributed than in Dublin.

£538 for the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland, was agreed to.

Mr. HUME suggested a reduction in the grant of £20,000 to the Linn Board. He also thought the charge on stationary too high.

Mr. C. GRANT knew there were doubts respecting the sum to be given to the Linn Board, and would withhold his observations in the absence of his Hon. Friend (Mr. Foster). There was an inquiry into the expenditure of stationary.

The Resolutions were then agreed to, and the Report ordered to be received on Monday, to which day the House adjourned.

LONDON.

FRIDAY, JUNE 30.

The Committee of the House of Lords met again yesterday on the contents of the *Green Bag*. The Committee being a Secret one, it would be absurd to credit any reports that may be circulated of their proceedings. Respecting the sealed letter sent into the Committee by Messrs. Brougham and De-man, the Queen's Counsel, on their first assembling, a report says that it contained evidence of a most material and important character on the part of her Majesty. "This evidence," says a contemporary, "the Committee refused to receive" and add—

"This, then, is the mode and spirit in which Ministers, in their packed and Inquisitorial Committee, commence the Inquiry, which they themselves have pronounced to be derogatory to the dignity of the Crown, and injurious to the interests of the Country; such, we intend out to the readers to remark, is the first exemplification of that perfect fairness and impartiality which the Lord Chancellor, in a solemn appeal to Heaven, swore he would preserve. "He would make a covenant with God, that neither affection nor any other undue motive should prevail upon his judgment."

To this remark, as thus stated, we can attach no credit; and we consider the proceedings as too grave to have any thing attached to them in the way of colouring, by the manner in which a fact, true in itself, may be set forth. The Committee may have refused to receive this letter; but then the question should be:—Could the Committee, as constituted, and for a certain purpose appointed, receive the letter? We are rather inclined to think that it could not. It had no powers of any kind committed to it, but, to report on the contents of the *Green Bag*; nor, as a Committee, could any communication reach it but through the House of Peers. To us it appears evident, that the letter referred to, whatever were its contents, should have been sent to the House of Peers, with a request that it might be referred to the Committee on the *Green Bag*. This affair, then, has no connection whatever with the spirit and manner in which Ministers have instituted or are carrying on the Inquiry, but resolves itself simply into a matter of form and order. If the usual course of offering documents to a Committee has been departed from in this instance, it cannot follow that therefore the Committee should also have departed from the usual mode of procedure.—*Star*.

We mentioned yesterday, that neither the Marquis of Lansdown nor Lord Eskine attended the first sitting of the Committee. We have learnt that, after the Debate in the Peers, on Tuesday night, and during the exclusion of strangers, these

Noble Lords signified their wish to decline serving on the Committee; and their resignation having been accepted by the House, the Earl of Harwick and Lord Ellenborough were appointed to serve in their stead. Both of these Noble Lords attended the Committee yesterday.

It is expected that the Report of the Committee of the House of Lords will be presented early next week, and, at all events, before Thursday.—*Ibid.*

The Library of London assembled this day in Common Hall, to take into consideration the propriety of presenting an Address to her Majesty on her return to this Country. The Attendance was extremely numerous. The Resolution for the Address was carried by a large majority.

The inhabitants of the Borough of Southwark also met this day, pursuant to requisition, in the Town Hall, when a similar Address to her Majesty was unanimously agreed upon.

An Address from the inhabitants of Nottingham, signed by upwards of seven thousand persons, has been presented to her Majesty.

The City of York Address was yesterday presented to her Majesty by Mr. Wyrill, M. P. Mr. Sykes, M. P. and Mr. Cooke.

Her Majesty went out yesterday evening in her carriage; the populace, in spite of every effort to prevent it, took the horses out and drew her home.

At a late hour last night we received the following bulletin of the state of the amiable Duchesse of York:—

"The Duchesse of York feels herself extremely weak, but the inflammation and difficulty of breathing have very much subsided.

(Signed) "H. HALFORD."  
"M. BAILLIE."

Paris Papers of Tuesday arrived this forenoon. The proceedings of the Chambers, as reported, continue to be without interest. In the Peers, there has been another day's discussing on the Election Project; in the Deputies, another day's talking on the Budget of Expenditure. M. Desaze was set out on his Embassy to London on Wednesday morning.

Accounts from R-nnes state, that on the evenings of the 29th and 30th inst. some commotions paraded the streets, exclaiming—"The Charter for ever, the whole Charter, and nothing but the Charter!" It was found necessary to disperse them by a military force. Seven were taken into custody, amongst whom were several Law Students.—"Eight days ago," it is added, "some factious characters repaired to the powder magazine, with a view to set it on fire. It was 11 o'clock at night, when the sentinel, hearing a noise, cried, 'who goes there,' on which the wretches made off; one of them had a lighted torch. There have been some troubles at Brest, Nantes, and Lausanne; the rest of Brittany is tranquil."

Letters from Madrid, Cadix, Bilbao, and Santander, positively announce that the plague has broken out in the Island of Majorca, and that in consequence very rigorous orders have been dispatched by the Government, to enforce precautions in all the ports throughout Spain, especially those in the Mediterranean.

Dutch and Flemish Mails have arrived with Papers from Brussels to the 27th instant. Accounts of the 12th May, received at the Hague from Caracas, state, that in consequence of the political changes in Spain, the patriots in Venezuela were disposed to return to their allegiance to their old government. To these alleged accounts we attach no credit.

SATURDAY, JULY 1.

Stocks this day at One.

Bank Stock	India Stock
5 per Cent. Red. 64 1/2	India Bonds 28 pm.
3 per Cent. Cons. 87 1/2	Ex. Bill 5 pm.
4 per Cent. Cons. 87 1/2	Long Ann. 17 1/2-18
5 per Cent. Cons. 87 1/2	Cons. for Act. 104
Omnium 2 pm.	Scrp 14 pm.

GENTLEMEN,  
I fully solicit the honour of your Suffrages on the occasion; and should I be so fortunate as to become one of the Objects of your choice, I can only promise my utmost Exertions to discharge the Duties of the Office faithfully and attentively, as I hope I have hitherto done, since the formation of the Establishment, in 1799.

With respect, I have the honour to be,  
Gentlemen,  
Your very obedient and humble Servant,  
MATTHEW POOLE, M. D.  
King-street, Waterford, 5th July, 1820.

AUCTION OF KELP.  
SAMUEL CROSTHWAIT  
INTENDS SELLING BY AUCTION  
AT THE STORE OF W. M. ARDAGH, QUAY.  
ON WEDNESDAY next, the 13th Inst. at 1 o'clock,  
EIGHTY TONS OF GALWAY KELP,  
OF VERY SUPERIOR QUALITY.  
Waterford, July 5, 1820.

SHERIFFS' SALE.  
County of the City of Waterford.  
To be sold by Auction, by the Sheriff of the City of Waterford, the remainder of the FURNITURE of the late Wm. Newport, Esq. viz.—  
This Day (Thursday), at Eleven o'clock precisely, the extensive and valuable Collection of BOOKS—To-morrow, the HOUSE-LINEN, of which there is a large Quantity, perfectly new; BLANKETS, COUNTERPANES, QUILTS, and BED FURNITURE—On SATURDAY, the KITCHEN and DAIRY UTENSILS.  
HENRY ALCOCK,  
HENRY H. HUNT, Sheriffs.  
July 6, 1820.

BOAT BY AUCTION.  
TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION,  
THE 12th INSTANT, at 12 o'clock,  
THE CLONMEL HOAT REBECCA.  
As she now lies at the Ship Yard, opposite this City, where she can be seen any day previous to Sale,  
Waterford, 6th July, 1820.