be had at first imagined, for he was now to presume that this particular Bill was irrevocably adopted; that this particular Bill, with all its clauses and parts, was to be received as embracing their Lordships' full and settled determination, God knows for how long a time! so that he was not only prohibited from speaking a word, not only against the mode of proceeding by a legislative measure, but even against the particular measure which had been submitted to their approval. As this was the result of their Lordships' deliberate wisdom, he was almost inclined to believe that this permission contained matter of greater indulgence than he could immediately discover. If he were limited to addressing their Lordships upon the mode of proceeding on the particular Bill now pending before them, he must confess that he knew not what to suggest.—When a Bill has been read a first time, he had not been instructed, nor was he minded himself, to suggest any other course of proceeding than that the Bill should proceed to the next stage, the second reading, and so onwards to a Committee. He knew of no fanciful new mode of legislation which he could feel it to be his duty to propose—he could suggest no Secret Committee to be interposed between the first reading and second; he should therefore decline taking any advantage of their Lordships' indulgence upon this point, and address himself to the second point of their Instructions, namely, the question of time. With regard to time, therefore, he was commanded by his Illustrious Client to apprise the House of Lords, that it was her Majesty's most earnest wish that no delay whatever should be interposed between the charge that has been urged against her honour, and the hour of final determination. It was her wish that the further proceedings might be undertaken *this evening*, or at the furthest *to-morrow*; for it was impossible to suppose that her Majesty could rest for one instant under so grave a charge, without desiring, instantly, if possible, to repel the accusations. A rumour had reached her Majesty's ears, for rumours would go abroad, and under the present painful circumstances of her Majesty's condition it was natural that her ears should be readily open to every sound that bore any relation to her case—he, too, had read a similar statement—that her Majesty should receive the same measure of justice, neither more or less, than if she had been the meanest and lowest subject in the land. Would to God her Majesty, so far as the present proceedings were concerned, instead of being the highest, had indeed been the lowest and humblest of the liege subjects of her consort the King! Would to God she had been the lowest of his subjects, for then she had never appeared in the present most extraordinary manner at their Lordships' bar! She had never been made the subject of this most strange and most anomalous proceeding. A Bill of Divorce against the meanest subject in the land! A Bill of Pains and Penalties against the meanest and lowest subject of the land!! Had she, indeed, been such, she had been fenced around by the triple barrier which the laws of England raise to shield the honour and character, still dearer than the life and property, of the meanest and lowest subject. Her case had, in the first instance, been submitted to a Jury of her countrymen, not composed of the hired servants of the assailing party, and holding their service during pleasure—not consisting of persons bound to that party by gratitude for past favours, and influenced by the hopes of others. She would have been tried by twelve honest, conscientious, and impartial Englishmen, superior to the influence of fear or favour, at whose doors such influence may await for ever without the possibility of the slightest portion of it insinuating itself to affect their judgments. She would have been tried by men who felt some sympathy for her condition and her fate—by men who, feeling that her case to-day may be that of their own wives and daughters to-morrow, would be cautious how they lent themselves to gratify the passions or the prejudices of any one. He entreated their Lordships to look to the situation in which this Illustrious Lady was placed. He was bound to take it for granted, that their Lordships, before they had resolved to proceed by way of Bill, had fully ascertained that there was no probability or even possibility of any impeachment being preferred against her Majesty. He was bound to presume that they would never have placed themselves in a situation in which, as Legislators, they should be enabled to learn the evidence upon which they might be subsequently required, as Judges, to determine. He was bound to presume that they had fully investigated and examined all these points, and that they were clearly persuaded that no charge, either of high treason or of any other criminal act, could be preferred against the Queen, which might be made the subject of judicial inquiry. But admitting that there was no act of high treason, on the ground that the actions alleged to have been committed by her Majesty were perpetrated out of the King's dominions, did it therefore follow that there was no ground for impeachment? But was not Malta part of his Majesty's dominions? was not Gibraltar part of his Majesty's dominions? and might it not have happened that the Queen, in sailing for two years about the Mediterranean, had touched at either of these places? Her Majesty had, in fact, been at both. He was bound, however, to presume that these points had been well weighed by their Lordships, and also that they had considered that nice point of national law, how far the commission of a criminal act on board a King's ship at sea brought the guilty individual within the operation of the laws of England. He was also bound to presume that their Lordships having, from their Constitution, ready access to the opinions of the twelve Judges, had resolved, upon that high authority, that an impeachment did not lie, on the ground that in the same case no indictment could be instituted; overruling the ordinary principle of law, that an impeachment should be instituted in cases for which the law had not provided, and that they were so instituted for this very purpose, that the subject should not be deprived of justice, nor a criminal escape punishment. He was bound to presume——

"The LORD CHANCELLOR.—"You are bound to presume nothing. It cannot be permitted to a Counsel to proceed in this manner. If the House think proper, they may, of course, suffer such a line of argument to proceed, but if they do I shall not sit upon the Woolsack." (*Hear!*)

Mr. Brougham resumed. He said, that he experienced so great a difficulty in fully understanding the nature and import of their Lordships' instructions, that he possibly might sometimes, even from his anxiety to preserve himself within the line prescribed, and in striving to obtain a purchase to that effect, deviate unconsciously.—He had, however, endeavoured to do his duty to his unhappy though Illustrious Client, and from this not even the power of the House of Lords should prevent him. To their Lordships' authority he of course should, with all humility, submit himself—as to their power he must of necessity yield—but from at least endeavouring to do his utmost service to his Royal Client no power under Heaven should prohibit him. This he had now endeavoured to effect, but he might be permitted to remark to their Lordships, what possibly they had overlooked, that there was a close connexion between his argument and the point of time to which he had, in pursuance of their Lordships' instructions, addressed himself. It was his duty, partly by argument, and partly by expressing to them her Majesty's wishes, to induce their Lordships to proceed at once to the second reading of the Bill, for the purpose of throwing it out. His object was to deprecate delay, and he had been pointing out one of the views in which he had regarded the inconveniences which must arise from postponing for an instant the further proceedings in this case. He would, however, bend in every instance to their Lordships' opinions, for the House of Lords was used to be just——

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—"The House is used to be just, and they gave you their instructions that they might preserve that character."

Mr. Brougham then proceeded to argue, that no inconvenience could possibly arise to any of the parties concerned from speeding the case, with the exception, perhaps, of her Majesty, who, indeed, properly speaking, could alone be regarded as a party. For it would ill become him to regard their Lordships as a party, although he must confess that an order to the Attorney-General to attend did savour something of party.—As he (Mr. Brougham) attended for the Queen, so was the Attorney-General to attend for some one; and as the Attorney-General was the Law Officer of the Crown, he was induced to suspect that the Ministers of the Crown were the parties on the opposite side. He then commented warmly and generally upon the impropriety of the Ministers of the Crown, who were to be regarded as accusers, sitting among their Lordships in the quality of Judges.

The Bishop of EXETER here rose, and at his desire Counsel were ordered to withdraw. The Reverend Bishop then said, "I desire, my Lords, to know whether the line of argument now pursued by the Learned Counsel at the bar is consistent with the instructions given by your Lordships."

Lord HOLLAND.—"This is the most extraordinary proceeding I ever witnessed. The Learned Counsel in the commencement of his pleading stated, that he was not fully possessed of what the import was of your Lordships' instructions, and now the Reverend Prelate rises, and solemnly asks your Lordships for your opinion. As the point seems to be really of some difficulty, I trust that the interruption will be attended with one advantage, and that the Learned Prelate will give an exposition of the nature of the instructions, and minutely examine the Learned Counsel's argument, for the purpose of shewing us in what the deviation consisted." (*A laugh.*)

The Counsel being again called in,

Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman advanced to the bar, when Mr. Brougham again adverted to the point he had already urged. He observed, that with respect to her Majesty's accusers, whoever they were, they could not complain of being taken by surprise. He would take either of two conclusions—one, which he believed to be the false one, that the Ministers of the Crown were fully prepared to substantiate their charges; and the other, which he believed to be the true one, that every one of his Majesty's Ministers knew the whole charge against her Majesty to be a false and foul fabrication. He felt that he should ask pardon of the House for using expressions so strong regarding any charges contained in a Bill which had so far received their Lordships' sanction as to be read a first time, but his duty towards his Client compelled him to say that the charges preferred against her were false, foul, and malignant. Upon either, however, of these conclusions, the accusers ought to be prepared to substantiate their charge. He should perhaps be told that the only prosecutor on the other side was Public Justice; under this allegorical shape, he should say of her accuser, that Public Justice, having brought a Bill into the House of Lords, ought to be prepared with his evidence, having jumped over trial without the hearing of witnesses, and having without verdict proceeded to judgment. Public Justice having been apprised of all the circumstances of this case early in the year 1819, could not, when he brought a Bill into Parliament in July 1820, complain of being surprised by a demand on the part of the accused for an early trial. The Learned Gentleman commented severely upon the conduct of Ministers, for having, while such charges were pending, offered £50,000 a year to the Queen, that she might be enabled, by the expenditure of a royal income in foreign countries, to inflict a greater stain upon the morals of whatever country she might choose for her residence; and concluded by making a powerful appeal in her Majesty's behalf to the justice and generosity of their Lordships, to admit her claim to an early trial, and to extend to her the advantages of that principle of English law, falsely called *merciful*, but it was only *just*, which held that, until conviction of guilt, the accused should be reputed and treated as innocent.

Mr. Denman then addressed the House. He said, that having been commanded by his Illustrious Client that morning to enforce her demand at their Lordships' bar for an immediate prosecution of the proceedings that had been instituted against her, he could not be said to be wholly unprepared on their Lordships' instructions, that her Majesty's Counsel should confine themselves to certain points. He then urged the absolute necessity under which her Majesty was placed to relieve her character at the earliest moment from the severe imputations that had been alleged against her. Her Majesty required nothing at their Lordships' hands but justice. It was his duty to separate the question of time from that of charge; it was a Bill of Divorce and Degradation, without a verdict of a Jury, and without sentence pronounced in the Ecclesiastical Court, & at the same time they were told that the charge had been known for six years. He was aware, in a case where the Sovereign was a party, that the proceedings he had alluded to were not necessary; but if that was not the case, her Majesty would have had an opportunity of defending herself in both Courts, and it would be then a question whether a wife, abandoned by her husband, would not be a mitigation, where a divorce was asked for. He begged not to be understood confessing guilt on the part of the Illustrious Lady accused, but as her Counsel he used the argument. She called for no delay; she was only anxious to see at their Lordships' bar the witnesses that dared to accuse her. He, as one of her Majesty's advisers, wished to have a list of the witnesses that were to support the accusation, and he could not conceive how it could be denied. The charge was thought by some to amount to high treason; if it was such, a bill must be found by a Grand Jury, who were obliged to be sworn in open Court, and on that oath to inquire whether there was ground for finding a bill; and if the bill was found, a list of witnesses was handed to the accused party, for the purpose of inquiring into their characters; but in the present proceeding that advantage was denied, and he did not know but it might be considered by his Learned Friend and himself for it to be their duty to abandon her Majesty's defence for that reason, and leave it in the hands of those who had brought forward the accusation. From the reign of Henry VIII. there was no precedent for such a proceeding; as from that time every individual had been dealt with alike, and made amenable to the law of the land in the same way. He had heard of Bills of Attainder; but the only excuse he had ever heard for them was dire necessity, which did not arise in this case. When he considered the Commission which had been sitting in a foreign country, and what passed in it regularly reported to the Ministers of the Crown, there could be no excuse for delay. There was another circumstance—it had come to her Majesty's knowledge who the witnesses were, and if there were 100 times as many, all she wished for was, that she and the Public should be informed of the contents of the green bag, as she had no fear of what it contained, for she knew the infamous source it sprung from. She not only wished for a list of the witnesses, but she considered the contents of the green bag to be her's and the Public's property. He had no guide to go by in arguing this case but that of the common law, and he considered the Secret Committee to be a Grand Jury, and their Lordships the higher tribunal. He did not come prepared to argue the case in the limited manner prescribed by their Lordships, he would therefore only ask for a speedy hearing, that her Majesty might be able to know who were the persons who had given evidence against her to form the accusation. The Royal Parties, however high their stations in life were, must stand or fall as man and wife. If any thing had fallen from him or his Learned Friend in the course of their arguments, which, in their Lordships' opinion, reflected improperly on any person, he had to beg that they would bear in their consideration that they were Counsel for the weaker sex. It had been said that it was not a Bill of Pains and Penalties. He would ask, if it was not, what other title ought to be given to it? Was it not pains and penalties to be degraded from the head of the highest society in the Country to the class most infamous in society; and after having suffered that degradation her Majesty might be liable to impeachment; for it was only doubtful, if the accusation was proved, whether it would not amount to the highest crime against the state.—He concluded by requesting that their Lordships would not allow delay.

The Learned Counsel then withdrew.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that instead of postponing the proceeding for twenty-four hours, he would have no objection to its coming on to-morrow morning; but in his opinion some delay was better than precipitancy, and according to some arrangements which were known to them all, delay might be necessary. Besides, time might be necessary to collect the witnesses, and the attendance of the Judges would be necessary for their Lordships to have the benefit of their opinions, and they would be soon obliged to attend their judicial duties in the different parts of the country. He would, however, give notice, that he should, on Monday next, propose a day for the second reading of the Bill; whether that should be in a fortnight, or a later period, he would not now undertake to say; but if delay was necessary, he would state on Monday why it was so. He therefore moved that their Lordships should be summoned for that day.

After some observations from Lord Holland, the Earl of Liverpool, the Marquis of Lansdown, and the Earl of Carnarvon,

Earl GREY moved, as an amendment, "that their Lordships be summoned for to-morrow."

On the question being put, there appeared for the original motion, 56—for the Amendment, 19—Majority, 37. Adjourned.

The Waterford Chronicle.

TUESDAY, JULY 11.

The paramount importance of the Parliamentary Proceedings contained in the London Papers to Friday, inclusive, more especially of those relating to the Queen, has induced us to postpone, for the present, the insertion of several articles of less immediate interest, in order to be able to present our Readers with a regular and continuous narrative of the leading steps which have been taken in this momentous business. The proceedings on this subject in the House of Lords, which are peculiarly deserving of attention, are very fully detailed—those in the Commons were also extremely interesting, but could not be comprised in our present number. General Fergusson brought forward on Thursday evening his motion for information respecting the Milan Commission, which was negatived without a division. The order for resuming the adjourned Debate on the King's Message, respecting the Papers in the Green Bag, was discharged, in order to await the result of the proceedings in the House of Peers.

The *Globe* of Thursday, in it's remarks on the charge of adultery with Bergami, has the following curious observation:—"Rumour indeed says, that, with respect to the particular charge, her Majesty is provided with an unanswerable defence, which would put a ludicrous finale to this now very grave and serious business."

The *Courier* says there has been an increase of £743,235 in the Revenue of the Quarter ended on the 5th inst., as compared with the corresponding Quarter of last year. It is understood, however, that there has been a diminution in the produce of the whole year. The 3 per cent. Consols on Friday were at 68⅛ ¼. There is no foreign intelligence of moment.—No Mail due.

We regret to learn, that Capt. Wm. Gaiger, an old and respectable resident of Passage, was drowned at that place, while bathing, on Saturday. The body was found immediately.

Markets.—The general price of Butter, on Saturday, at the crane, was 90s. for first quality; yesterday, the same—tho' 91s. was paid for a few. Returns—Saturday, 506—yesterday, 162.

At the London Corn-Exchange, on Friday, prime Wheat was in brisk demand, and Oats 1s. per quarter dearer.

ITALIAN LANGUAGE.

Signor ZANDOTTI, Native of Rome, Member of the celebrated *Academy of the Arcadi*, and *Professor of the Italian Language*, has the honour to inform the Nobility and Gentry of the City of Waterford and its Vicinity, that he proposes giving INSTRUCTIONS in the above Language, during the Summer, to such Ladies and Gentlemen as may be pleased to honour him with their Commands, addressed to him at Madame de Signoretti's, in William-street. Waterford, 10th July, 1820.

LISMORE SCHOOL.

At an EXAMINATION, held on the 29th and 30th June, the following young Gentlemen obtained or cut for Premiums:

Greek—Palmer, 1mus, Gillman, 2dus, Fitzmaurice, Digby, Blennerhassett, 2dus, Cameron, sen. Creaghe, jun. Currey, Palmer, 3tius, and Garde.

Latin—Welsh, Creaghe, sen. Massy, jun. Savage, Fitzmaurice, Blennerhassett, 2dus, Cameron, sen. Foley, O'Shea, Stokes, Armstrong, Kennah, Poole, Hunt, sen. and Quinlan.

French—Blennerhassett, 2dus, Palmer, 1mus, Gillman, 2dus, and Armstrong.

English Grammar—Creaghe, sen. Gillman, 1mus, and Massy, sen.

History—Welsh, Massy, sen. Gillman, 2dus, Massy, jun. Franks, Blennerhassett, 2dus, Twiss, Smith, jun. & Currey.

Mythology—Palmer, 2dus, Blennerhassett, 3tius, Twiss, and Smyth, jun.

Modern Geography—Creaghe, sen. Gillman, 1mus, Massy, jun. Massy, sen. Blennerhassett, 2dus, Cameron, sen. Twiss, Kennah, Fetherston, and Hunt, sen.

Ancient Geography—Creaghe, sen. and Palmer, 1mus.

Use of the Globes—Welsh and Gillman, 1mus.

Drawing Maps—Massy, sen.

Logic—Creaghe, sen.

Euclid—Welsh, Herbert, and Gillman, 2dus.

Algebra—Palmer, 1mus, Massy, sen. and Massy, jun.

Composition—Palmer, 1mus, Massy, jun. Fitzmaurice, and Cameron, sen.

Elocution—Massy, jun. Savage, Cameron, sen. Palmer, 3tius, Currey, Collis, and Kenney, jun.

Spelling—Creaghe, sen. Savage, Blennerhassett, 2dus, Palmer, 3tius, and Kennah.

Writing—Massy, sen. Browne, 1mus, Welstead, Franks, Splaine, Cameron, jun. and Kenney, sen.

Arithmetic—Creaghe, sen. Gillman, 2dus, Fitzmaurice, Blennerhassett, 2dus, and Stokes.

Good Conduct—Campion, Gillman, 1mus, Blennerhassett, 2dus, Hunt, jun. Foley, Massy, sen. and Palmer, 3tius.

The *Medals* were adjudged to Blennerhassett, 2dus, and Massy, sen., for having obtained the greatest number of good Judgments and Premiums during the Year.

M. STOKES.

*** *Vacation will end the 1st August.*

WATERFORD:
Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PERRY, Chronicle-Office, Quay.

Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No. 12,578. THURSDAY, JULY 13, 1820. PRICE FIVE PENCE.

PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—THURSDAY, JULY 6.

On the motion of Lord MOUNT-CHARLES, accounts were ordered of all Timber imported into Ireland for the last ten years.

Mr. W. PARNELL brought in a Bill for amending the laws with respect to the removal of the Irish Poor from England to Ireland, which was read the first time. A brief explanation took place, from which it appeared, that it is not intended to press it through all its stages this Session.

The Irish Court of Chancery Bill, on the motion of Sir John Newport, was read a third time and passed.

IRISH SPIRITS ACT.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee upon the Excise Regulation Act of 1817,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER observed, that from the time of the Union, Irish spirits had been imported into this Country without any obstruction in the state in which they were manufactured, but that in the Act under consideration, a clause was introduced, imposing a prohibition of the import of any raw spirits into this Country, unless received into the stock of a rectifier. By this clause it was complained that the Irish distillers were subjected to a very great grievance, and upon that representation being made to his Majesty's Government, the case was fully considered. The result of that consideration was a thorough conviction, that in common justice and fairness, the clause objected to ought to be repealed. It was, indeed, felt that such a clause must have been originally inserted through very imperfect considerations, and hence he deemed it his duty to move that the Chairman should be directed to move for leave to bring in a Bill for the repeal of the clause to which he had referred.

Mr. BRIGHT said, that if the facility for the import of Irish Spirits were afforded, which the proposition of the Right Hon. Gentleman was calculated to produce, it would be impossible to prevent that part of the English coast with which he was more immediately connected, as well as the coast of North Wales, from being deluged with that article. He maintained that the clause referred to did not involve any violation of the Act of Union, as a fair review of the system of the countervailing duties would fully manifest. The fact was, that the Irish spirit generally imported into this Country required rectification before it was fit for use, and therefore it was no grievance to let the clause stand as it did. At least it was no grievance to the People of England, who might be disposed to consume such spirits. But he begged the House to consider the consequences likely to follow from making such ardent spirits cheap in this Country, how likely to injure the health and morals of the People.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied, that the Act of Union authorised the introduction of Irish spirits into the English market; the 54th of the King regulated that upon a duty in proportion to the height of the proof. The 57th of the King altered that; and he was merely anxious to restore it to the same state it held between the Acts of the 54th and 57th.—He meant that the Irish spirits should be admitted here, not above one to ten of proof on the hydrometer—the same strength as that at which the English spirit entered the market from the rectifier.

Mr. M. FITZGERALD began by expressing his surprize how such a clause as that to which the motion referred happened to be smuggled into the Act before the Committee. This clause was evidently devised to interfere with the free and fair trade of Ireland, and to prevent the Irish distillers from coming into competition with those of England. That it was cunningly continued with that view, there could be no doubt whatever. But as to the notion that such a clause was calculated to prevent smuggling or illicit distillation, a greater fallacy could scarcely be imagined. For inasmuch as such a clause was calculated to injure the legal distiller, it must serve to encourage smuggling and illicit distillation. While he bore testimony to the candour of the Chancellor of the Exchequer towards Ireland on this occasion, he begged it to be understood that he differed very materially from that Right Honourable Gentleman as to his construction of the Act of Union. Spirits formed, he maintained, a distinct manufacture in Ireland, and was as free from the regulation of the English Excise as its linen manufacture. The spirits distilled in Ireland were recognised by several laws of the Legislature of that Country, previous to the Union, as a distinct manufacture, and the principle of these laws ought to be respected by the Imperial Parliament. It was not any reason for placing Irish spirits under the controul of the English Excise, that they were of greater strength than the spirits distilled in this Country. But as the terms of the clause referred to in the motion mentioned raw spirits, he was prepared to argue, that it did, correctly speaking, extend to Irish spirits. For the Irish spirits, as he was enabled to shew, was not a raw, but a complete spirit. The English definition for raw spirit was, that which was once distilled from corn. Now Irish spirits was not of that description. Comparing it with British spirit, it was a complete spirit; it was, indeed, much more a complete spirit than rum, and yet the produce of the colonies, to which England was not bound by any such compact as the Act of Union, was treated with more liberality than the spirit of Ireland, for it was not required that the former should be put into the hands of the British rectifiers; nor was it so required with respect to brandy either, which was the produce of a Country generally called the natural enemy of England. Upon what ground then should that measure of liberality be refused to Ireland, which was granted to the British colonists, and to the traders of France? Why should Ireland be worse treated than either. Upon what pretence should the English Board of Excise demand that Irish spirits should be subjected to British rectifiers, in order to have it mixed with deleterious articles, and denominated rum or brandy, before it was brought to sale? Such a system was quite absurd, and calculated to injure the character, because it must serve to spoil the quality of the Irish spirits. Thus, indeed, Irish spirit lost its favour with those in this Country who would otherwise be delighted with that article. (*Hear! and a laugh.*) The fact was, that through the preposterous system of the English Board of Excise, the Irish spirit was not brought to sale in England until it was actually spoiled. But he maintained that the English Board of Excise had no right whatever to meddle with that article, or to subject it to any process that might deprive it of its character before it came to be disposed of in the English market, and then it was passed off as English spirit.—For himself he could declare, that he had no connection whatever with the Irish Distilleries; but he took up this question entirely upon public grounds, knowing that a large capital was embarked in the business of distillation in Ireland—that this capital gave employment to a great deal of industry, and that it was most materially advantageous to the agriculture of his Country. But, regarding the spirits distillation as a distinct manufactory in Ireland, he must deprecate as much any attempt to interfere with that manufacture by the English Board of Excise, as an attempt to meddle with the linen trade, by ordering that article to be subjected to some chemical process on the part of English bleachers, before it was exposed for sale in this Country. It was clear to his view that the English Board of Excise sought by the clause referred to in the motion, to break down the Irish distillation of spirits, as far as that could be done, by excluding that article from the British ports, or destroying its character after it was imported. Yet it was pretended that the English distillers were not jealous of the Irish.—But how did the liberality of the English distillers appear? Why, that the proposed motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon this subject was scarcely made known, when a Petition was laid upon the Table from the English rectifiers, decidedly against it. But he trusted that Parliament would not be influenced by the narrow illiberal views of any set of men, and above all, that it would never sanction a positive act of injustice, by injuring the trade of Ireland, and violating that solemn compact, the Union. The trade of Ireland with this Country, in spirits, had, it was known, most materially improved within a few years. For although the import of that article into this Country had amounted in 1803, to between 2 and 300,000 gallons, it exceeded 1,100,000 before the Act to which the motion referred. At this import the English distiller became alarmed, and in order to check the competition, the clause under consideration was enacted. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer would recollect that he was Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland as well as for England, and that it was his duty to attend to the interest of the one Country as well as to that of the other. That the Right Hon. Gentleman would by no means neglect that duty, he was encouraged to hope from the fairness which he evinced in the present case. The Right Hon. Gentleman would no doubt feel that some degree of particular attention was due to Ireland, in consequence of the loss which she had sustained of a local superintendance of her affairs through the extinction of her local Legislature, and that the best mode of promoting the spirit of the Union, was by assuring the Irish that they should experience justice and liberality from the conduct of the Imperial Parliament. (*Hear, hear!*)

Mr. W. DUNDAS expressed his concurrence in the motion; but he could not help requesting his Right Hon. Friend to remember that he was Chancellor of the Exchequer for Scotland as well as for Ireland, and to reflect that if the Irish distillers were allowed the free import of their spirits into England, it was but common justice that the same privilege should be granted to the poor distiller of Scotland.

Mr. MARRYATT said, that it was impossible, if fairly manufactured, that either Scotch or Irish spirits could find a market in this Country, yet a large quantity did find its way here, and every gallon which was imported turned out of consumption a gallon of English spirits, paying a higher duty. This might be claimed as an indulgence, for the Act of Union did not give it; the Irish spirit comes here now only because it pays a lower duty than the English distiller has to pay on his manufacture; and yet they come and ask for a further exemption; they now with their spirits not to pass through the hands of the rectifiers, which regulation was, independent of every other consideration, most necessary and effectual for the protection of the revenue. The consequence would be, if the resolution was carried, that the market would be entirely supplied by illicit distillation. He was the more surprised at this measure being now introduced, as a neighbour of his (a distiller) had informed him, he had seen a letter from the Chancellor of the Exchequer which disclaimed any such intention. If the measure passed into a law, the English distillers would certainly be entitled to claim an indemnity, as their business would be destroyed, and they might as well at once sell off their stills for old copper.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the Board of Excise had suggested to him that this measure might affect the security of the revenue; but he was bound not to let any consideration of revenue interfere with the due execution of the Act of Union, and if any of the clauses of that Act were of doubtful meaning, the House was equally bound, in justice and liberality, to explain them in the sense most favourable to Ireland.

Sir J. NEWPORT deprecated the language of the Hon. Member for Sandwich, in so loosely casting an imputation upon the conduct of the Irish and Scotch Distillers. The Hon. Member had not, he ventured to say, a particle of evidence to sustain the charge that the spirit of Ireland was not as fairly manufactured as that of England. But the fact was, that the Irish spirit was of a much superior manufacture, or it would not have had so much sale in competition with the spirit manufactured in England. It was not then becoming in the Hon. Member to prefer any such charge as his observations implied, for that charge implied something like fraud. The Irish Distillery was, he would maintain, under the special protection of the Union. But such was the superior quality of Irish spirit, that a great quantity of it was imported into this Country before the Union, as might be seen upon reference especially to the imports of 1797. The import of this article had, however, considerably increased since the Union, and nothing could prevent that increase from going on, if the Irish spirits were not deteriorated by the interposition of other and jealous manufacturers. Let the spirit be sold in the state in which it was originally manufactured, and there could be no doubt whatever of a general and increasing demand for it in England. The Irish Distillery had to be sure improved since the Union, but then it was to be recollected, that other Irish manufactures had fallen off in consequence of that event. Would the Imperial Parliament then deprive Ireland of what it gained by the Union, while it made no compensation for what it lost through that measure. (*Hear, hear, hear!*) But the compact of the Union was one of those laws which would, he hoped, be always held sacred, and that no partial interests or petty jealousies would ever be allowed to interfere with its object or execution, especially with respect to Ireland, which it was most material cordially to reconcile to the existence of that solemn arrangement. (*Hear, hear!*) Ireland felt a great interest in the success of it's Distilleries, and whatever it gained from that source could never be regarded as a gain at the expense of England, as every wise Statesman must feel that the gain of any part of the United Kingdom was the gain of the whole, as the strength of any part contributed to the strength of the Empire at large. (*Hear!*)

Mr. MARRYATT disclaimed any intention to cast an imputation upon the character or conduct of the Irish Distillers.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, that, previous to the Union, this subject had come under Mr. Pitt's consideration, and he had received several representations, stating that the effect of it would be, that a large portion of the trade and capital of the distilleries would be transferred from England to Ireland. He replied as a Statesman of enlightened views ought, that it was a matter of indifference to him to what part of the empire the capital was transferred. On that principle the Union was framed, and he thought they had no right to consult the question of revenue at the expense of the first principles of the Union. He could not conceive how the generally clear understanding of his Hon. Friend (Mr. Marryatt) could have taken the view he had of the subject, unless his mind had been perverted by visiting that neighbour of his that he had mentioned, and partaking of some of his deleterious beverage.

Mr. WM. SMITH contended at considerable length against the proposed alteration of the law. He acknowledged that this Country owed a debt of fearful magnitude to Ireland arising from the misgovernment of that Country for many ages; but he did not think that debt would be judiciously paid by allowing the People to manufacture spirits of a strength inconsistent with their morals, and by means of those spirits also to debauch the morals of others. He strongly supported the interests of the English and Scotch Distiller; and contended, that it was impossible the intercourse in spirits among the three Countries, could be carried on with reciprocal advantage and with safety to the Treasury, unless the mode of carrying it on were assimilated, an operation which would be attended with extreme difficulty.

After a few words from Mr. Foster and Sir H. Parnell, the Resolution was agreed to, and the House having resumed, leave was given to bring in the Bill.

FRIDAY, JULY 7.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE CORONATION.

Colonel BEAUMONT wished to give notice, that on Monday next he would move an address to the King to suspend the Coronation until the conclusion of the proceedings against his royal consort. He had also to express a hope that a perseverance in the motion would be rendered needless, as an expectation had been held out that the Crown would consent to a delay without it.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, that the motion of which the Honourable Member had just given notice was unnecessary, because his Majesty had already signified his intention, that the ceremony of the Royal Coronation shall not take place on the day originally named, nor was any other day fixed for that purpose. With respect to the proceedings against her Majesty (we understood the Noble Lord to say), that no doubt those proceedings would be carried on with as little delay as justice would admit.

Mr. BEAUMONT was heartily glad to find that such was the Noble Lord's intention; and he regarded the voluntary postponement of the ceremony by Ministers as an evidence of their wish not to prejudice the proceedings against her Majesty.

Lord CASTLEREAGH wished that it might be distinctly understood that the motives of the postponement were not in the remotest degree connected with those proceedings.

Mr. LAMBTON wished to know, whether those proceedings were likely to be carried on on Monday next?

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, that a question respecting proceedings in the other House of Parliament, was the last question he would expect the Hon. Gentleman to put to him.

The notice was withdrawn.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL gave notice of a motion for next Session, for leave to bring in a Bill for the abolition of a punishment supposed to be against law, and admitted on all hands to be against justice—transportation for libel in Scotland.

INCOME OF THE DUKE OF YORK.

Mr. HUME said, that in moving for an account of the Income of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, he was not at all prepared to say, that the income of his Royal Highness was too great, but as the income of the other Royal Dukes was fixed and ascertained, so he thought should be the income of the Duke of York. The Honourable Gentleman then moved for a Return of the Income, which his Royal Highness received out of his Civil and Military Employments, the Amount of Pensions and of Grants out of the Droits of the Admiralty, since the year 1800.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said, he could see no ground whatever for the proceeding suggested by the Hon. Gentleman; and whether, in the painful circumstances of the Royal Family at this moment, it was directed to objects out of doors, or to objects within, he thought the House must be fully aware of its impropriety.

Mr. HUME disclaimed the purpose insinuated by the Noble Lord; it was irregular to ascribe motives to any Member of that House, and he could assure the Noble Lord that he spurned his imputation. He should now move, that there be laid on the table a return of all income received by his Royal Highness the Duke of York, whether arising out of the emoluments of any civil or military appointments, pensions, or grants from the Droits of Admiralty, since the year 1800.

Mr. HUSKISSON did not mean to impute any motives to the Honourable Gentleman; but he must observe that it was usual, on moving for a document, to state with what view its production was moved for. The public had already information of every grant which had been made at different periods to the members of the Royal Family, and to the Duke of York in particular. All which his Royal Highness had received in any form was matter of notoriety.

so easily imagined that an individual in that high station need not long be ignorant of what is passing in this House with regard to herself, and when not many days since it was never thought of urging that objection against hearing her Majesty by her Counsel, in compliance with the prayer of her Petition. I certainly felt upon that occasion, that there were objections to that course of proceeding, but none were made by the Noble Lords on the other side, and the House agreed without opposition to hear her Majesty's Counsel. That having been done, I cannot see how we can consistently refuse to comply with the prayer of the present Petition of her Majesty, particularly as the case is now so much the stronger. Upon the former Petition it might have been urged that the question merely was as to the mode of proceeding in the House; but now there is a specific charge, and that of the gravest nature, against the Queen, actually laid upon the table, supported by all the weight and authority of a Secret Committee of your Lordships' House. Under these circumstances, and with no precedent to guide us, I cannot think that we ought to refuse the prayer of the Queen's Petition. We are at present ignorant of the nature of the Bill which the Noble Earl on the other side intends to introduce, but, assuming it to be a Bill of Divorce, let us see how the case stands. In all ordinary cases of this description there are previous proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts, and in the Courts below, in the course of which the party accused has the means of bringing forward witnesses, but in this case none of these preliminary proceedings are to take place; the party accused is charged at once with adultery by the Report of a Secret Committee, and after a part of our own body have thus prejudged the case, we are to proceed to the final adjudication. In a case so entirely unprecedented, it does not appear to me that, after hearing Counsel in the former instance, we can consistently refuse to hear Counsel also in the present, according to the prayer of her Majesty's Petition.

The LORD CHANCELLOR observed, that he had heard a great deal said against Secret Committees. He would not say one word upon that point further than to state, that if it was necessary to go through the whole of the proceedings again, he would think it right that the very same measures should be resorted to as had been already adopted. As for the proposition now submitted to the House, he considered it nothing short of calling on their Lordships to surrender their privileges. No one could know what passed there, but in a constitutional way; and he wished to be informed if there was any case, in the whole history of Parliament, in which Counsel had been heard against a Bill not proposed? There was no such case, and their Lordships ought not to do an act that would amount to the surrender of their privileges, sanctioned by custom and immemorial usage. As to prejudgment of the case, the proceedings of the House did not do that. He would, as a Peer, be ashamed of himself, if he did not do what the meanest Juryman in the Country could do, discharge from his mind a previous impression—it happened every day. The House would not be consulting the great functions which it had to perform, if it heard Counsel to prevent the introduction of a Bill of which nothing yet was known. It was one of the most extraordinary propositions he had ever heard, and could not be acquiesced in, if the House consulted its duties and its privileges.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN.—My Lords, the difficulty and embarrassment which I previously felt, with regard to this question, have been materially increased by the speech of the Noble and Learned Lord, because, after your Lordships agreed to hear Counsel on behalf of her Majesty in the former instance, when, in point of fact, what was petitioned against was merely a proceeding within the House itself, and did not amount to a charge against the Queen; I cannot see upon what principle it is that your Lordships can now refuse to hear her Majesty's Counsel when a heavy and serious charge is actually laid upon the table against her Majesty? There may be doubts as to the course of proceeding fit to be adopted, but when your Lordships have already adopted the course of hearing Counsel in a stage of the proceeding where the motives for it were by no means so strong as in the present instance, I do not see upon what grounds, in the absence of all precedent, you can consistently refuse to comply with the prayer of the Petition.

Lord REDESDALE said, that the chief argument which he had heard for receiving the Queen's proposition, amounted to this, that the House had done wrong before in acceding to a similar request, and now ought to do wrong again. He repeated the argument that her Petition was not against any measure which had been taken by the House, but was intended to oppose some measure about to be taken, and said that, if Counsel were admitted on such a proposition to the Bar, there could be no restraint upon them, they might talk on anything or everything they pleased, as by the terms of the Petition there was no particular subject or limitation.

Lord HOLLAND remarked, that the Noble and Learned Lord seemed to misunderstand the prayer of the Petition. It had two distinct objects, one of which was, to be heard against the allegations in the Report, and the other to communicate certain weighty matters which might be of importance to her future defence. It was said that it would put the House in an extraordinary situation; but the House had been put in an extraordinary situation by the proceedings which led to it; now, indeed, there was a great deal of talk about forms; but was this a case, which, after breaking through all regularity, all analogy of proceeding, could now allow them to envelope themselves in technical nicities, & look cautiously about for precedents? It was no argument, in a case like this, to talk of the impossibility of the proceedings of the House being known to her Majesty. It would be a waste of words to dwell upon it.—He was as much attached to forms as any man; but in a case like this forms were of no consequence whatever. This, he contended, was a case unexampled and anomalous. The Noble Lord (Ellenborough) says he would do equal and impartial justice, the same to the Queen as to the lowest individual; but can he adduce an instance of a Secret Committee having Papers referred to them respecting the conduct of any humble individual, and laying a direct and positive charge against that individual upon the table of this House? Where, then, is the analogy, and how can the case of the Queen be disposed of by such an argument? The Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack, with regard to the charge of our prejudging the case through the medium of that Report, says, that Jurymen are in the habit of divesting their minds of what they have heard, when a Prisoner is to be tried who has previously confessed his guilt. But will the Noble and Learned Lord assert, that the same Jurymen try the Prisoner who heard his confession of guilt? And is it not a valid objection to a Juryman that he had already investigated the case of the Prisoner whose trial is called on? I cannot, therefore, see, under all the circumstances of this extraordinary case, what objection there is to the hearing Counsel on behalf of her Majesty, as prayed by this Petition.

The Marquis of BUCKINGHAM concurred with his Noble Friend, that the House had placed itself in a situation of some difficulty, by agreeing, in the former instance, to hear Counsel at the Bar. In the present instance their Lordships had appointed a Secret Committee, they had suspended the sitting of that Committee, and in the interval her Majesty had applied to be heard by Counsel against the proceeding. It was possible that their Lordships might, after the arguments of Counsel, have prevented the meeting of the Secret Committee, and voted that they should proceed no further. But what was their situation now? The Committee had made their Report, and the Noble Earl had given notice of a Bill founded on that Report; in the interval there was no proceeding. Suppose, then, that they were permitted to plead, on what proceeding could the House divide after having heard the arguments? They would not determine that the Noble Lord should not bring in his Bill. What then could they do the moment after Counsel had withdrawn, which they could not have done without hearing one word of the argument? Her Majesty did not pray to be heard against the proceeding. There was none before the House. When the proceeding was instituted, then was the time to make any application connected with her defence; and God forbid that he, or any one, should object to grant anything which might be necessary to her defence, or, if possible, her justification.

The Earl of DARNLEY contended, that the Report of the Committee was a proceeding, and one of the most serious nature, on which her Majesty had a right to present a Petition. The situation in which they stood was one in which they had no analogy to guide them, and they were placed in that situation by a series of measures which appeared to him and his Noble Friends objectionable in many respects. But how did they stand at present? After referring the case of the Queen to a Secret Committee, a Committee, he would admit, of the most honourable men, of men who were incapable of bringing in any Report but what the evidence would seem to justify, her Majesty had petitioned to be heard by Counsel. He knew nothing of the facts; he wished much that it was possible for him to know no more; but if they refused the request of the Queen in the present instance, it would seem as if they had not granted her all the advantages which her defence required, and which were granted to other petitioners. He trusted, therefore, that the House would not be induced, by the arguments of the Noble Marquis, to refuse the application to be heard by Counsel on the present occasion.

Lord DACRE said, that her Majesty having heard, no matter by what means, that distinct charges were preferred against her, was naturally anxious, and prepared to defend herself as far as it was possible to proceed at present, and to state weighty matters, which in justice to her further defence required to be stated in this stage of the proceedings. He trusted that the House would feel the propriety of acquiescing in such a request.

The question for proceeding to call in Counsel was then put from the Woolsack, and negatived without a division.

BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL then said—"My Lords, in the discharge of a most painful duty, I rise to present the Bill which I now hold in my hand. In doing so I feel that I shall best consult your wishes, my own inclinations, and the delicacy which is due to all parties concerned, by abstaining in the present stage from any details respecting the important matter referred to in the preamble of the Bill. That preamble will speak for itself, and it will be for those who are officially employed in this distressing case, to prove at your Lordships' bar the allegations contained in the preamble. Under these circumstances your Lordships would no doubt be impressed with the deepest regret, if any thing should take place that could have a tendency to create more prejudice than seems to arise necessarily out of every case of accusation. Neither am I disposed to revive former discussions by what I said of this matter; but I must say with my Noble Friend on the Woolsack, that after the best consideration I could give the question, I still remain of opinion, that if we were to retrace our steps again, I know not how the House could move in any other manner. I know that the course of impeachment was suggested, but I stated before the difficulties to which that proceeding was liable. Without arguing the objections over again, or undervaluing the arguments opposed on the other side, I must still assert that the course adopted was that which recommended itself upon every ground of constitutional principle and analogy. It was at least doubtful whether an impeachment could be sustained under all the circumstances of the case.—My Noble Friend on the Woolsack doubted it. Another Noble Lord (Erskine), who has also sat on the Woolsack, and who was equally conspicuous for his talents and his knowledge of the criminal laws of this Country, doubted it; so that looking at it as a question of doubt alone, I ask your Lordships whether we should be justified in commencing any proceeding with an uncertainty before our eyes as to whether we should be able to bring it to any conclusion or not?—That being the state of the course of Impeachment, the Bill which I now present was the only one open to your Lordships upon this subject. You know that the case could not be tried in the Ecclesiastical Courts, or in the Courts of Law. A legislative proceeding was all that remained, and the only question then was, in which of the two Houses of Parliament the proceeding ought to commence? I stated on a former occasion, that it was competent to either House of Parliament to commence it, but that it was more peculiarly fit for this House to do so in the present instance, because the forms of the House, and the power it possesses to examine evidence upon oath, afford a better chance that justice shall be done to both parties; I stated further, that this was not in the ordinary sense a Bill of Divorce, that it was not a case between two individuals, that it was not a mere question of injury between the King and the Queen, but between the Queen and the State also. Yet as it must refer in some degree to the marriage between the illustrious persons, I thought, and I still think it better that the proceeding should originate with this House. The only question that remains is, whether the Bill ought to have been brought forward in the first instance on the responsibility of Ministers, or whether a Secret Committee ought to have been interposed? I have considered this point maturely, I have considered it both with reference to precedent and to principle, and upon either ground I conclude that the course which we have adopted is correct. Your Lordships will not find that any legislative measure of this kind has ever been adopted without previous inquiry. It was not the that the Executive Government shrunk from the responsibility, but that it was necessary to avoid the adoption of such a measure on the mere *ipse dixit* of the Minister of the day, and to inquire the interposition of some intermediate body. It was not merely the question whether the evidence was sufficient, that the Committee had to determine, but all the various considerations connected with the nature of the evidence, and the dangers of disclosure, and whether these considerations were such as to warrant or discountenance the adoption of any proceeding. There is no mode of shaping an accusation so as to avoid the excitement of some prejudice against the accused. The mere commitment of an individual by a Magistrate, excites a prejudice against that individual to a certain extent. It is an evil, but an evil that cannot be avoided; it is an imperfection, but one that is inseparable from the administration of justice; and all that remains for us is, to choose between the alternative which necessity imposes, either to abandon investigation altogether, or to adopt it under a disadvantage from which we have no power to seperate it. But this is not a question respecting an individual only, it is a great State question, and I do not feel that the course we have adopted, is in any degree inconsistent with those principles of justice which we have all an equal interest in maintaining. The preamble states as much, particularly with sespect to the number and nature of the offences, as will justify Parliament, I presume, if the allegations can be proved, in depriving her Majesty of all her rights and prerogatives as Queen Consort, and dissolving the marriage as a necessary consequence. This is the full extent of the Bill—there are no other penal consequences in its enactments, which are framed in such a manner as not to bear with any severity that could be avoided against the Illustrious Individual who is the object of them. As to the question of the provision which it may be proper to make for her Majesty, in case the charges should be substantiated by evidence, that will more properly become the subject of consideration hereafter in another place. The essence of the charge is founded in the preamble. On that ground, when the Bill proceeds to the second reading, it will be necessary that we should go to the proof. Your Lordships will, no doubt, discharge this duty as you have done every other in which you have been engaged, in such a manner as to entitle you to the respect and confidence of the Country. It is my intention to move, if your Lordships should consent to the first reading of this Bill, that a copy of it shall be furnished to the Illustrious Person whose station and privileges it affects. I am indifferent whether I now appoint a day for the second reading, subject to [illegible] take place. [illegible] Lordships, [illegible] other man in the Country, [illegible] We all feel deeply on [illegible] occasion, [illegible] if there is any one class of persons who may be supposed to feel more than others, it is natural to think that those who are entrusted by His Majesty with the Executive Government, and who, in the performance of their duty, came forward on this painful occasion, should be the persons to feel the most. It has been our endeavour to discharge our duty with all justice and lenity towards the Illustrious Person, and it is a satisfaction to reflect that there are no precedents for the last two hundred years, except in the case of one individual, who never came to this Country, or appeared as Queen, in which even a whisper has been known to circulate against the character of the Queen Consort. It is a satisfaction to reflect also upon the benefit which the Country has experienced during the last sixty years from the example of the Illustrious Individual who filled the Throne, and reflected by her conduct such purity on the public morals. It would have been a fortunate circumstance, I shall always contend, if the shame and scandal which must attend such an investigation, whatever the result may be, could have been avoided; but we are placed in a situation which leaves us no alternative. The question is not the impunity of guilt, but the trial of guilt. God grant that the accused may be able to disprove the charges; but however that may be, there remains but one straight-forward course for you, my Lords. I am confident you will adopt it; I am confident you will do your duty; and whatever momentary clamour may exist, the Country in the end will do you justice."

The Bill, of which the following is a literal copy, was then read by the Clerk:

"A BILL

To deprive her Majesty, Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, of the Title, Prerogatives, Rights, Privileges, and Pretensions of Queen Consort of this Realm, and to dissolve the Marriage between his Majesty and the said Queen.

"Whereas, in the year 1814, her Majesty, Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, then Princess of Wales, and now Queen Consort of this Realm, being at Milan, in Italy, engaged in her service, in a menial situation, one Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, a foreigner of low station, who had before served in a similar capacity:

"And whereas, after the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, had so entered the service of her Royal Highness, the said Princess of Wales, a most unbecoming and disgusting intimacy commenced between her Royal Highness and the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami:

"And whereas her Royal Highness not only advanced the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, to a high situation in her Royal Highness's Household, and received him into her service, and that in high and confidential situations about her Royal Highness's person, but bestowed upon him other great and extraordinary marks of favour and distinction, obtained for him Orders of Knighthood and Titles of Honour, and conferred upon him a pretended Order of Knighthood, which her Royal Highness had taken upon herself to institute, without any just or lawful authority:

"And whereas her said Royal Highness, whilst the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, was in her said service, further unmindful of her exalted rank and station, and of her duty to your Majesty, and wholly regardless of her own honour and character, conducted herself towards the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, and in other respects, both in public and private, and in the various places and countries which her Royal Highness visited, with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom, and carried on a licentious, disgraceful, and adulterous intercourse with the said Bartolomo Pergami, otherwise Bartolomo Bergami, which continued for a long period of time, during her Royal Highness's residence abroad, by which conduct of her said Royal Highness great scandal and dishonour have been brought upon your Majesty's Family and this Kingdom.

"Therefore, to manifest our deep sense of such scandalous, disgraceful, and vicious conduct on the part of her said Majesty, by which she has violated the duty she owed to your Majesty, and has rendered herself unworthy of the exalted rank and station of Queen Consort of this Realm, and to evince our just regard for the dignity of the Crown and the honour of this Nation, we, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled, do hereby entreat your Majesty that it may be enacted, and be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that her said Majesty, Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, from and after the passing of this Act, shall be, and is hereby, deprived of the title of Queen, and of all the prerogatives, rights, privileges, and exemptions appertaining to her as Queen Consort of this Realm; and that her said Majesty shall, from and after the passing of this Act, for ever be disabled and rendered incapable of using, exercising, and enjoying the same, or any of them; and moreover, that the marriage between his Majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth be, and the same is hereby from henceforth for ever wholly dissolved, annulled, and made void, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."

After the Bill was read a first time,

The Earl of LIVERPOOL moved, "that Copies should be sent to her Majesty, and her Majesty's Attorney-General, and also to the King's Attorney-General;" which was agreed to.

Earl GREY said he rose for the purpose of pointing out the necessity of having the Bill drawn out in that form, and of pursuing such a course as would enable the Queen to make every necessary preparation for her defence. In every case of a Bill of Indictment being preferred before a Grand Jury, the time and place at which the crime laid in the indictment was alleged to be committed, was specifically mentioned therein.—But such was not the case in the present Bill; the Queen was merely stated to have proceeded in a course of criminality; but the legal description of that criminality was not accurately given, so as to enable her Majesty to prepare for her defence. He therefore wished to know, whether the Noble Earl intended to adopt any other mode of proceeding subsequently, with a view to supply that defect? He wished also to ask, whether any course was in contemplation for supplying her Majesty with the names of the witnesses which are about to be produced against her?

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that the second reading of the Bill would be the proper time to enter into the discussion. He had no difficulty, however, in stating, that the specification in the preamble was as particular as any other to which they could refer, and was in all respects sufficient to guide her Majesty's defence. With regard to the names of the witnesses, it was unprecedented in the history of Parliamentary proceedings to furnish them, while a Bill of Pains and Penalties was depending. It was unusual in all proceedings, except in trials for High Treason; but as her Majesty had claims to the utmost indulgence, sufficient time would be allowed her to collect her evidence, and this would do away the only plausible ground that existed for demanding a list of the witnesses.

Lord DACRE moved, "That her Majesty's Counsel should now be called to the Bar, in order to state points which were necessary to her defence." He did this upon information which he had received very recently.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL suggested that the Noble Lord might obtain his object without resorting to a course which was contrary to the whole analogy of their proceedings, and promised that if a Petition was presented to-morrow, the Bill being in progress, he would not then object to it.

Lord DACRE assented, and did not press the motion.

Earl GREY thought, that whatever course was taken under the present proceeding, it must be attended with great disadvantage. The commencement of a prosecution, grounded upon evidence which could not be met for a considerable time after the evidence had produced its impression, was unfavourable to the ends of justice. It would be more conducive to that end if the whole could be postponed until there was an opportunity for proceeding with the accusation and defence together. In all Divorce Bills, the accused party had the advantage of the knowledge to be derived from previous proceedings, in which every thing was specified distinctly, so that she was aware of all that could be urged against her. The Noble Earl had alluded to the management of the case at the Bar; but he wished to know by what authority, or at whose direction any person could appear at that Bar to conduct the prosecution?

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that the Attorney-General might be called upon by the authority of the House, either to appear himself, or to provide some person to conduct it.

Earl GREY observed, that from the Noble Lord's statement it would appear as if the House itself had assumed the character of a prosecutor in the case which it was about to try.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL stated, that the House had actually appointed Counsel in other cases, and there could be no doubt that they would see justice done between the parties.

Earl GREY said he was aware that the House had appointed Counsel in other cases, in that for instance of the Berkeley case, but here was a case of prosecution for which he had not heard any precedent. He was as far as the Noble Lord from suspecting the justice of the House; but, as he had said upon former occasions, it was not only necessary that they should be just, but that they should appear above suspicion.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL maintained, that if fair issue was joined, it was impossible that they could be at a loss to try the case. It could not be the wish of any one that guilt should go unpunished, or that justice should not be done.

Earl GREY repeated his objection, and wished to protect the House against being placed in a situation in which it must exercise conjointly the functions of a Public Prosecutor, Legislator, and Judge.

The LORD CHANCELLOR defended the proceeding by a Bill of Pains and Penalties originating in that House, and justified the interposition of a Secret Committee. The Attorney-General was one of the legal assistants of that House, in which capacity he was liable to be called upon to conduct the proceeding.

Lord HOLLAND remarked, that the Attorney-General was a Member of another House, and might therefore be objected to as the manager of a prosecution in the House of Lords, upon which he would have to pronounce hereafter in the House of Commons. He expected that the Noble Lord would have stated some reasons, after so many professions of the laborious consideration he had given to the subject, but he had not stated distinctly on what precedent he wished the House to act. He hoped that this would be done before any direction was given to the Attorney-General.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, that though the order was given to the Attorney-General, he would not be obliged to appear personally, but might send some other person, as had occurred in many cases.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—WEDNESDAY, JULY 5.

TITHES IN IRELAND.

Sir HENRY PARNELL rose to make his promised motion relative to Tithes in Ireland.—He said he did not imagine he need go much at length into the subject of the collection of the tithes in Ireland, in order to shew the evils of the system prevailing there, which in practice led to great injustice and oppression. The litigation also to which it gave rise was inconceivable. In one year there were in five counties no less than 1400 tithe actions at the Quarter Sessions, besides those in the Court of Exchequer. The Hon. Baronet then read a statement to shew that the greater part of the tithes in Ireland were collected from very poor persons, as the sums did not exceed twenty shillings, of four-fifths of the persons in his statement. To remedy these inconveniences, he meant to propose the revival of a measure which passed that House in 1817, to enable ecclesiastical persons to lease their tithes, so as to bind their successors, and that was a measure to which he was persuaded the Clergy were friendly, as it would relieve them from the unpleasant situation in which they were placed. The Bill he intended to bring in was similar to that of the year 1817, which passed that House nearly unanimously, and had the sanction in Committee of two great men now no more (Mr. Ponsonby and Sir Samuel Romilly), whose opinions, as legal men, were, in their time, considered the best authority. It was not carried through the other House for reasons which he could not explain. It was not his intention to press the Bill through the House this Session, but if leave was given him to bring it in it might be passed through the first stage and printed, and the Members would be in possession of the meaning of the measure when they again met.

Sir JOHN NEWPORT seconded the motion, and said, that the Bill would in a great measure reconcile the People of Ireland to the payment of tithes. With respect to the parochial clergy, from his own knowledge he could declare, that they would hail any measure as a great benefit where they could collect their tithes without being obliged to employ Proctors, and the Bill would put an end to a question which had caused much disturbance, that of subjecting articles to tithes that were not before titheable. He, however, thought it was necessary now to give notice, that he would, after the recess, bring the subject of building glebe houses in Ireland before the consideration of the House; for since the union of parishes glebe houses had been built to that extent, if the parishes should be hereafter divided, that a Clergyman only holding a part of them, from want of income, would not be able to occupy the glebe-house.

Lord CASTLEREAGH said that he did not rise for the purpose of objecting to the Bill being brought in, if it was only intended to be printed, and to be put into Members' hands at present.—He would however object to it if it went to the commutation of tithes, and it would be his duty to see that it guarded against any fraud in granting leases.

After some further conversation, leave was given to bring in the Bill.

THE QUEEN.

Lord CASTLEREAGH moved for the appointment of a Committee to examine the Journals of the House of Lords, in order to ascertain whether any and what proceedings had taken place in that House with respect to her Majesty, and to report their opinion thereupon to the House. The motion was agreed to, and the Committee was appointed accordingly.

The Noble Lord then said, that he had submitted this motion with the view which it implied; and, if, from the Report of the Committee, it should appear that the other House had instituted any proceeding, he should then consider whether, pending that proceeding, the notice of a motion which he had given for to-morrow should not be dropped: and also whether he should not to-morrow move the reading of the Order for taking his Majesty's Message into consideration on Friday, with a view of moving the postponement of that Order until some future day. This postponement he should feel to be proper, in order that the House might wait the result of the proceedings in the House of Lords, still reserving to itself the right of taking his Majesty's Message into consideration, if that should be thought necessary. But until the result of the proceedings of the Lords should be made known, he submitted that it would be very inconvenient for that House to adopt any measure.

Sir J. NEWPORT asked, whether it was the intention of the Noble Lord to keep the order which was fixed for Friday in abeyance, until the Lords should pronounce their decision upon the subject; observing, that if such were the Noble Lord's intention, it would be a very uncommon course of proceeding.

Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that the proceeding instituted by the Lords might never be brought in any legislative way before that House, and, therefore, he proposed only that the order for considering his Majesty's Message should be delayed, but that the House should by no means abandon its right of inquiry upon the subject.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY expressed his hope that the House would not agree to the course proposed by the Noble Lord, declaring that if no other Member would take the sense of the House upon the subject, he should himself feel it his duty to do so.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF LORDS—THURSDAY, JULY 6.

THE QUEEN.

Lord DACRE rose and said he had again a Petition to present from her Majesty, praying that she might be now heard by Counsel against the proceeding which their Lordships had instituted. He would not trouble them with any remarks, as he supposed there would be no objection taken to the hearing of Counsel in this stage.—The Petition was then read by the Clerk as follows:—

"CAROLINE REGINA.

"The Queen has heard, with inexpressible astonishment, that a Bill conveying charges, and intended to degrade her, and to dissolve her marriage with the King, has been brought by the first Minister of the King into the House of Lords, where her Majesty has no Counsel or other officer to assert her rights. The only alleged foundation for the Bill is the Report of a Secret Committee, proceeding solely on papers submitted to them, and before whom no single witness was examined. The Queen has been further informed, that her Counsel last night were refused a hearing at the Bar of the House of Lords, at that stage of the proceeding when it was most material that they should be heard, and that a list of the witnesses, whose names are known to her accusers, is to be refused to her. Under such circumstances, the Queen doubts whether any other course is left to her, but to protest in the most solemn manner against the whole of the proceeding; but she is anxious to make one more effort to obtain justice, and therefore desires that her Counsel may be admitted to state her claims at the Bar of the House of Lords."

The Petition being read, Lord DACRE moved, that the Counsel be called in.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that he never could consent that Counsel should be permitted to appear at their bar, and address themselves generally to every topic which they might think proper to connect with the proceeding before their Lordships. The Petition did not explain the points to which it was the Queen's wish that her Counsel should be heard, it would therefore be, as he conceived, their Lordship's duty to prescribe to the Counsel the points and circumstances to which they should address themselves. He could have no objection that the Counsel should be called in, and asked as to the points to which they meant or were instructed to speak.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL having expressed his perfect concurrence in the suggestion of his Noble and Learned Friend, moved that Counsel be called in, and asked as to what points it was their intention to address the House.

An order to this effect being made, Counsel were called in.

Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman immediately appeared in their full dress, and advanced to the Bar.

The LORD CHANCELLOR addressed them and said, he had been commanded by the House to ask them upon what points they had intended to address the House?

Mr. BROUGHAM answered, that his Royal Client had been furnished by the Black Rod attendant on their Lordships' House with an official copy of a Bill which had been laid upon their table, read a first time, and ordered to be printed. With respect to this Bill, he had been instructed to complain of the proceeding that had been so instituted before their Lordships against her Majesty, and of the mode in which that proceeding was proposed to be carried on. Of this he was to complain *funditus*. He was also to express to their Lordships her Majesty's sorrow that the prayer of the Petition, which her Majesty caused to be addressed yesterday to their Lordships, had been rejected, and that her Counsel had not been permitted to state such matters of fact as would be, in her opinion, necessary for her defence. Her Majesty's Counsel had also to remark to their Lordships, that there had appeared in the public newspapers a certain publication, purporting to be a Report from a Committee of their Lordships' House, imputing to her Majesty crimes of the greatest and most appalling magnitude. Of this Report, as emanating from their Lordships' House, it was to be supposed that the Queen could know nothing. Her Majesty, however, could not but be aware that such a Report was known, every word and letter of it, to every man, woman, and child in the Kingdom capable of reading or of hearing; and she could not but feel that it imputed such circumstances of criminality to her as could not fail of leaving a dark stain upon her character. If such a Report did not emanate from that House, it became their Lordships' duty to inflict the severest punishment upon those who dared, by tongue or pen, so to abuse the authority of their Lordships' name, impute such charges to the Queen Consort of this realm, and utter so gross, false, and malignant a libel upon her character; for, if it were a fabrication, so he could not hesitate to designate it. The charges contained in this Report went much beyond what was contained in the most strange, most anomalous, and most extraordinary preamble of this most strange, most anomalous, and most extraordinary Bill, which he held in his hand. Beyond the charges contained in the Bill, there yet remained much of direct imputation against her Majesty, which would neither be established by the enactment of the Bill, nor contradicted by its being thrown out. He had lastly to speak to time—the time of proceeding, and the time or times for which it might be thought expedient, as occasions would arise, to adjourn or interrupt the proceedings. He had it in command from her Majesty, upon this point, to demand an *immediate* investigation, without interruption or adjournment, that these charges might not rest upon her character one hour if possible, and that the proceedings should be *immediate* in point of commencement, and *continuous* in proceeding.

The Learned Gentleman having concluded, the House ordered that Counsel should withdraw.

The LORD CHANCELLOR then rose and said, that he never could consent that Counsel should be permitted to address themselves to so many and to such points as were embraced within the instructions of the Learned Counsel at the bar. The House could not permit Counsel either to arraign the proceedings which had hitherto been adopted, or to advise them upon those which it might be necessary to pursue. He should have no objection to permitting Counsel to speak to the mode of proceeding upon the Bill now before the House, and to the point of time; but he trusted that no precedent would be established in this point which it might be found inexpedient to apply to all others.

Earl GREY remarked, that a permission to this extent only would be far too limited to meet the object of the Queen, with regard to the nature of the proceeding before the House. The Learned Counsel at the bar had stated, that he had been instructed to argue against the whole proceeding *funditus*; and if their Lordships were to limit the permission so much as was now proposed, they might possibly prevent the attainment of strict justice. The prayer of the present Petition ought not, as he thought, to be refused, especially as the House had received a Petition of a similar nature on a former evening, and permitted Counsel to speak to any point. To the receiving of the former Petition, he had indeed seen some objections, founded upon the general principles of parliamentary proceeding; but in a case like the present, so anomalous in its nature, where they had no light from precedent to guide them, he should far prefer a partial deviation from a strict rule, than to encounter the danger of inflicting an injustice. (*Hear, hear!*) The Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack had spoken of the danger that might arise from establishing a precedent in this case; but from this he thought no inconvenience could possibly arise, at least he trusted that no occasion would thereafter arise that would render the application of any principle now established necessary.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL concurred in the opinion expressed by his Noble and Learned Friend on the Woolsack, and moved that it be an instruction to the Counsel for the Queen to speak only to the mode of proceeding *upon* the Bill, and to the *time* of proceeding.

Upon this point some conversation arose, in which the Lord Chancellor, Lord Holland, the Marquis of Lansdown, Earl Grosvenor, Earl Lauderdale, and Earl Grey took a part, and Lord Liverpool's motion was carried.

Counsel being again called in,

Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman advanced to the bar.

The LORD CHANCELLOR addressed them, and told them that he was commanded by the House to inform them that it was their Lordships' command, that the Counsel should address themselves solely to the mode of proceeding *upon* the Bill, and to the *time* of proceeding.

Mr. BROUGHAM then addressed the House, and said, that he found no inconsiderable difficulty in comprehending fully the import of their Lordships command with respect to the first point of their instructions, but he should to the utmost of his understanding endeavour to conform in every respect to its direct purport, and should he unfortunately during the course of his argument deviate in any degree from the strict line which had been prescribed to him, he threw himself upon their Lordships' indulgence, and entreated them not to impute any such unintentional error to any desire upon his part not to evince towards their Lordships' instructions the most humble and submissive deference. As far then as he could understand these instructions, he was required to address himself to the *mode* of proceeding upon the Bill, and to the *time* of proceeding. Not being aware of what the opinions of their Lordships were upon this subject, he was in the first place bound to presume that their Lordships had determined upon the propriety of proceeding by Bill, and that this question was no longer open for his observations—

The LORD CHANCELLOR—"By *this* Bill."

Mr. BROUGHAM.—He was then to understand by the few words that had fallen from the Noble and Learned Lord on the woolsack, that the House had in fact decided two points: one, that it would proceed by Bill; the other, that it would proceed by the particular Bill which was now laid before their Lordships. By this second resolution his line of argument was still more limited than