

CORONER'S INQUEST.

(From the Cork Southern Reporter of July 8.) Yesterday an Inquest was held at the North Infirmary, before Henry Hardy, Esq. Coroner, on the body of Anthony Coleman, who had been mortally wounded on the preceding day, under the circumstances described in the subjoined evidence, in consequence of which he died. At three o'clock the inquest sat, and the proceedings did not terminate till eleven last night. The following Jury were sworn:— Daniel Sullivan, Jeremiah O'Sullivan, John Neenan, Richard O'Leary, John Deane, Walter Moringh, Denis Coleman, Thomas Casey, John Barry, Michael Haynes, Laurence Lynch, John Byrne.

Doctor Sharpe was first examined. He said he first saw deceased yesterday evening; he was brought to the North Infirmary, labouring under a severe wound, inflicted apparently by a musket ball, which passed through the left side of his chest out under the shoulder blade, causing a circular wound of about an inch in diameter. He lived about 24 hours after having received the wound; thinks the person who fired the shot must have been tolerably close to deceased, as the ball passed thro' his body.

Daniel Dorgan, a Schoolmaster, who kept a school at the Killinena, was standing the day before at his school-house door at about one o'clock. Saw Mr. Rogers High Constable, Mr. Bird, Churchwarden of Lower Shandon, and Mr. Bailey, Master of the Green-school, a tall young man whom witness did not know, with another, and five Grenadiers and a Corporal of the 35th regiment. They went to K. Leber's place, on the lands, and went into the yard. Mr. Bird asked Mrs. K. whether for £9 0s. 10d. for Church Rates, and at the same time showed witness a book in which it was entered; there was then nobody by but the witness and Mrs. Keleher, who said she had not the money. He offered to take her note at six months, but she would not give it. Witness then said to Bird, that the man of that house had been devalued for three years, and it was a shame to detain his cattle. Bird replied, he must begin somewhere, as there could be no ending without a beginning. Mr. Bird then desired the men to go and collar the two horses, and Mr. Rogers observed, he did not think the two horses were enough for the rate, and they had better take some pigs that were there too. Witness again said it was a shame to take the devalued man's cattle, and they asked him whether he would pass his note for the rate; he said he wouldn't, that he had nothing to do with it, being only a teacher in the Parish. At this time there were forty to fifty people assembled at the end of the lane, men, women and boys. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bird said to witness, if he would send down Keleher on Saturday, witness would leave the cattle; he said he certainly would, and if (Keleher) did not go, witness said he would go down himself and let Mr. Bird know. Mr. Rogers desired the Soldiers, before they left the yard, to prime and load, and if they saw him or any of the party molesting, to fire. They turned round and scattered about the field, and witness did not see them prime and load at that time. Witness did not see any other person join the country-people; they were sitting down quietly. The party then left the yard, and went down towards the people; they were quiet while they remained. Mr. Rogers appeared very black, when he gave these directions, and frightened, and threatening, and angry, and appeared to be determined to give battle. There was no sign of an attack being made, as the people were quiet and sitting down. The determination to give battle appeared to be in case Mr. Bird and his party were attacked, and saw no intimation of Mr. Rogers's party intending to attack the people unless they were attacked themselves. There was no quarrel or anger between the soldiers and country people. Mr. Rogers and his party then proceeded down the cross road to get to the high road on the way to Cork, but were not taking any distress, in consequence of witness promising that K. should go down. The people were at each side of the road, some of them sitting down, some lying, some talking, and a few standing quietly. Mr. Rogers, on coming up, said to them—"It was a fine day," they said "it was." He then asked them what made them wait? Some of them replied they were waiting for their wives. As they were passing on peacefully at both sides, a small boy threw a small stone from inside the ditch where the people were; he threw it at Mr. Rogers's horse; the soldiers were advanced on the high road at this time about five or six yards, but Mr. Rogers had not gone so far. When the stone was thrown, Mr. Rogers fired his pistol, and then ordered the party to fire. He was questioning a father, witness said he saw Mr. R. take the pistol from under his sash, and heard the report of a shot, but did not see him fire it. Mr. Rogers then ordered the army to fire; one of the men did, in the direction where the stone came from. When the shot was fired, the people came out on the road and took up stones; after the stone was thrown by the boy, one of the people ran away, and it was in the direction he took the soldier fired; can't say whether that shot hit any body. Witness was within 4 or 5 yards of the people. When the people threw the stones, all the soldiers fired; there were then forty or fifty persons assembled, more or less, not 100. Witness believes if the stone had not been thrown the party would have gone off peacefully without injuring any one. When the soldiers fired they got up a hill, and pointed and loaded, twenty or thirty people following, and

throwing stones, with about (as witness described) twenty yards of them. The soldiers primed and loaded and fired as they retreated. Witness can't say whether any people were shot on the first volley, as he went into the school and locked himself up. The people then followed the soldiers. Did not see the deceased among the crowd; but saw him before he was brought to the Infirmary. The distance from the corner of the hill where the soldiers ran, was 80, or 90, or 100 yards. Saw no more of the transaction. Can't say what became of the party, and saw no one of the country-people had no arms or any other weapons than stones.

In answer to a question from a Juror, the witness said, that he didn't hear the country-people threaten the party in Irish, and he repeated his statement of Rogers having directed the men to prime and load in the yard, and ordered them to fire when the stone was thrown by the boy. The people were very angry when they saw the man wounded.

Denis Daly, a farmer, residing at Killinena, was next sworn. He knew deceased, he said, who lived next door to him; he saw him dead in the next room. Between one and two o'clock on the day before, there were some men, women and children, standing at the school-house, where the affair happened. Witness was in a field close to it. Mr. Rogers and another gentleman came down on horseback; there were six soldiers with them, another man, and Dorgan (the last witness). On coming where the people were, Rogers said civilly, "Is there a deal of you there boys?" to which answer was made him, "We're waiting for our wives." Just as Mr. Rogers turned the corner, a stone was pitched out by a small boy about fifteen years of age from Keleher's field, where a number of the people were; some of them followed him to kick him, and scolded him for throwing the stone. It struck Mr. Rogers's horse, and he turned and called out, "What's that boys?"—and no sooner said it than he fired in the direction where the stone came from, and struck a smith who was there in the field, and ordered the soldiers to fire. One of them did, but his shot did not wound any body; they then ran to a height, the people following and attacking them with stones. The gentleman on horseback, who was with Mr. Rogers, then rode off another way; he did not harm, and if Mr. Rogers didn't fire there would be no mischief at all, as there was no intention of doing any thing till the little boy had the misfortune of throwing the stone, all of them being in good humour. He then said that stone wouldn't have fired; but there was no occasion for it. The people collected only to see what the soldiers were doing, and when there was only ten first, a great many came when they heard the shots fired. The soldiers fired as fast as they could, two or three always coming forward while the others were loading, and then they used to join and fire. The deceased was one of those who followed the soldiers; witness saw him when he was shot, and pressed himself into a ditch which he saw a soldier turned about the length of a field from them. He (the witness) got up to the deceased's face he fell, and in about ten minutes after he was shot; there were a good many of the people wounded at this time. Witness saw the hole in deceased's breast, and asked him if he felt his heart weak; he said not, that he felt strong, and the witness then put him against a ditch, where he remained till he was removed into a house, and from thence to the Infirmary.

In answer to a Juror, the witness said that some of the people were there to prevent the party from taking away any cattle they may distress, and he thinks, if they were taking them away, the people would prevent them if they could. James Jenkins, one of the Church-Wardens of Lower Shandon, was next called. It was suggested, that as this Gentleman was one of the party, with whom the military were when the firing took place, and as, in fact, he may be included in any proceedings that may be taken, he ought not to be examined. It did not appear, however, that the objection proceeded from any person acting directly, or empowered to act, for the friends of the deceased, and the Coroner proceeded to take Mr. Jenkins's evidence, who being sworn, said, that he went on the preceding day, with his brother Church-Wardens, to the lands of Killinena, to collect the Church-Rate. Mr. Rogers, the High Constable, was entrusted with a warrant to arrest two men who had rescued a distressed horse from the day before, and they accompanied him to the ground, with a party of military. They went to the house of one of the men, and probably succeeded in finding either of them, and probably could have as easily taken the other, and demand Church-Rate, which they did, but were refused by the woman of the house, whose name he didn't know. On her refusing to pay, they told her, that on her refusing the disagreeable necessity of distilling, and accordingly did take two horses; but on a young man coming up, whom he (the witness) understood to be a Schoolmaster in the neighbourhood, and telling them that the owner was devalued, and requesting them to be as lenient as they could, undertaking himself, if they gave up the distress, to send in and have it settled, they complied, and the people present thanked them for the manner in which they conducted themselves. They then took their departure for Cork, and arrived at the end of the lane turning to the high road, when they saw a great number of men collected in a field at the corner, and on the road. Witness was behind his own party, and also a great number of people were collected, he did not anticipate any hostility; but just as he turned the corner, one of the men in the field

threw a large flat stone at him, which struck him on the arm, and then lodged on his thigh. The man was not three yards from him, but witness would not know him. A shower of stones instantly followed, on which Mr. Rogers ordered the soldiers to prime and load (their guns not being loaded at the time), to retreat and fire. Witness then rode off, conceiving his life in imminent danger, and because he was cut off from his own party. He then proceeded with all speed to town, and went to M. Sculliff Whitey, told him what had occurred, and that he did not expect one of his party would return to Cork, as he feared when their ammunition was expended, there were such numbers of the people pointing in from all quarters of the Country, they would be overpowered and murdered. Witness was not by when any shots were fired, but when he left, the soldiers were proposing to prime and load, and he heard two shots. Thinks that the soldiers acted entirely on the defensive, and if they had not fired they would have all fallen a victim; there were about 25 people first, but they increased to 150 or 200. Witness and his brother Church-Wardens did not take Mr. Rogers with them to distress him, but to take advantage of his being present and they put themselves under his protection, as distresses had frequently been rescued from them before.

A person in the room expressed a wish that the witness should be asked whether the rate which the Church-Wardens went to collect was not a disputed one? The witness said he heard it was; but the Rev. Mr. Querry, the Rector of the Parish of Lower Shandon, objected to having that question entered into on the present inquest, and the Coroner concurring with the Rev. Gentleman, no further information was elicited; tho' in the course of the proceedings several efforts were made to renew the inquiry.

John Reardon was next examined. Being sworn, he said that he was a farmer's son, and lived at Rathcooney. He was at the Killinena the day before, having agreed with Mr. Bird, the Church-Warden of Lower Shandon, to show him the boundaries of the ploughlands, having been in the habit of attending Mr. Deeble, who had been a Rate-Collector in the Liberties. They went to Keleher's and took two horses for the Church-Rate, and brought them away from the field, when Mr. Dorgan promised to prevail on Keleher to go down to Mr. Bird in the course of the week. On that they left the horses, and came down the lane that led from the house to the high road to Cork. There was a body of men assembled at the corner, consisting of about 40; one man threw a stone at Mr. Jenkins, which struck him on the arm; witness saw the man throw it, and was within about 16 yards of him at the time; he knew that man partly—(was Anthony Coleman, the deceased); to the best of his belief it was—that is, he is sure it was. The people were scattered, and some of them came forward to Keleher; a shower of stones came down on the soldiers immediately; believes one of the soldiers was hit about the shoulder; does not know whether he was hurt; witness then ran up the road the way he came down and heard two shots; looked back and saw the smoke as if a soldier had fired; he then crossed the farm and rode to Fair Hill. Coleman had on a blue body cloth; saw him brought to the Infirmary; believes he wore a hat. He might mistake about Coleman being the man that threw the stone, but is sure he did not. After the first shower of stones, the people continued running after the soldiers and throwing stones. Did not hear any body desiring the soldiers to fire; the plough-shed and spoke out to each other. It positive shout was fired till after the stone was thrown; heard the men cry in Irish, "Your soul to the devil strike them," after Mr. Jenkins was struck, and before a shot was fired; it was only one man cried out, that was not Coleman.

This witness, against whom an unfavourable impression seemed to prevail, was examined as to whether he drank on that day, received money, or was instructed what to say on the Inquest? He admitted having drunk a glass of whiskey—having spoken with Mr. Rogers, Mr. Jenkins, and Mr. Parker Walsh on the subject; but he was not promised any thing for what he was to say on the Inquest, or at any other time, and would not, for all they could give him, say any thing but the truth. Michael Coleman, a farmer, and brother of the deceased, was then examined. He lives at the Killinena, and was at work the day before in a bog on the lands, with his brother, and several other people, when they heard about the men coming to distress the cattle at Mr. Baldwin's farm. The news went through the bog, where there was an immensity of men working. They took notice of it at first, thinking it would be nothing, as they often came before to distress, but went away peacefully without doing so. When they (the people in the bog) were going home to dinner, seeing an immensity of people running to the cross, they went there to see, as all the rest did. He (witness) suspected they assembled to prevent the cattle from being taken off, but they had no arms or sticks. His brother went into the field at the corner; he had a blue body coat on. Detained (waited) there a little time; saw the soldiers preparing themselves at Keleher's; they charged their guns, spring such an immensity of men below them on the road; they came down, without taking any cattle; there were two horsemen, one of them was Mr. Rogers, the High Constable; all was peaceable, and Mr. Rogers sat down, and they sat down him; "well boys," says he, "there are a good many of you there," "yes," said one, "there is"—and nothing else passed.

They went on, and as they were turning the corner, a little boy, about 12 or 13 years old, pointed a stone very innocently on the head part of Mr. Rogers's horse; he moved off some yards, and out a pistol, and held it into the field, as the people were; he was as far off as it would give a pistol enough to do to reach the shot mark. The body was wounded by that shot. There was a smith wounded in the field, but witness can't say by whom; there were other shots in the field, says Mr. Rogers. When Rogers fired the first shot, he moved on the road at a good pace, from the soldiers, and said, "soldiers why do you fire?" There were no stones thrown but those by the boy whom Mr. Rogers fired; come by the men in the field, and didn't see any thrown by the men of the road, but they might have been thrown without his seeing them. The 40 and country people then attacked each other; those of the former fired, and the latter threw stones. Mr. Rogers and the soldiers then went off, the country people following, and witness among them, having stones in his hands, and at the distance of about 40 or 50 yards his brother received a wound; witness had previously been wounded in the belly. Witness is sure the army would have gone away quietly but for the stone, and nothing would have happened but for Rogers. In answer to a Juror, there was a distress made there the day before. There cows were taken away, and a horse was rescued. Heard there were informations and a warrant to arrest one Gaiway. Heard after the firing that Rogers had a warrant.

Parker Walsh, a Peace-Officer, went with Mr. Rogers to execute a warrant against two men of the names of Gaiway and Callaghan, for an assault and rescue. They proceeded to Callaghan's house; on coming there they found the door shut; his wife was there, and Mr. Rogers asked where he was? she said, over the way; he asked her to show him to him, but she declined. Went into a farmer's house; the Church-Wardens demanded the rate, and witness described as the preceding witnesses had done, as to the arrangement that took place. Witness staid outside with two of the soldiers, and they took notice of a number of men collecting at the end of the lane. Described two of them particularly, one as wearing a white jacket, and the other a red handkerchief on his head. The rest welcomed him, and tapped him, as if he was a leader; a third had the sleeves of his shirt turned up. The crowd still continued to gather, and witness, apprehending some danger, told the soldiers to stop there, and not let any one pass till he told the High Constable. Did not know him, but he (the H. Constable) would not believe it was for any purpose of hostility, saying, "We will pass quietly, and they won't interrupt us." Went on towards the road, thro' the lane; witness kept his eye on them at each side; Mr. Rogers preceded the party; on coming to the high road, saw a round-faced man, sallow complexion and stout body, throw a stone overhead, which struck Mr. Jenkins on the side. There was then a cry, and immediately followed a shower of stones, one of which whizzed by witness's ears. They fell very thick—some of the soldiers said they were struck. The party were obliged to run away towards home, and in the run Mr. Rogers called out to the soldiers to load, retreat and fire; heard a shot immediately, but can't say who fired it; supposed it to come from the people in the field at the time, and still believes it did. As the soldiers ran on, they attempted to load, but having double packages in their pouches, there was some delay, so much so that one of the soldiers asked witness to draw out a package for him, and he found some difficulty in doing so. The people were all this time following them, and throwing stones. The soldiers' company moved and continued to fire, and witness believes it was over their heads, as the people became more desperate. The soldiers were very tired, and witness did not do any mischief, and waited to get away; witness and his party were afraid of being intercepted and murdered; the people beat them across the Bridge, a distance of a quarter of a mile, over which they did not follow them. Can't tell how many men were there, but there must have been a great number from the quantity of stones that were thrown.

Juror.—If you had come away when the business upon which you went was done, would all this have happened? A.—We went to take two men on a warrant from a Magistrate. Juror.—But you afterwards went with the Military to collect parish rates? A.—Mr. Bird was anxious to have their assistance. Another Juror.—It is amazing, if all these stones were thrown, how the soldiers escaped? A.—'Tis amazing how we escaped myself. The Coroner briefly charged the Jury, they having stated that it was unnecessary for him to read over the evidence, as he had already done so in detail at the conclusion of each witness's evidence. They retired, and in about half an hour returned the following verdict:— We find and present that the deceased came by his death in consequence of a wound received in the left side of his breast from a musket ball, from one of the soldiers acting under the directions of Mr. Robert Rogers, High Constable; and that he received such wound on the high road, near the lands of Killinena, in the north Liberties of Cork.

PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF LORDS—WEDNESDAY, JULY 12. DUBLIN ELECTION. Lord KENYON presented two Petitions from Merchants (being electors) of the City of Dublin, against a clause in the Court of Chancery Bill (Ireland), prohibiting Masters in Chancery in Ireland from sitting in the other House of Parliament, and stating, that Mr. Ellis, who holds that office, had just been returned by a large majority of the electors of the City of Dublin to serve in Parliament, and praying that he might not be affected by the clause in the Bill. The Noble Lord observed, that Masters in Chancery in England were not excluded from sitting as Members of the other House of Parliament, and he was of opinion those of Ireland should not be deprived of the same right. He therefore moved that the Petitions should be laid on the table. Lord HOLLAND said he did not rise for the purpose of objecting to the Petitions being laid on the table, but for the purpose of knowing whether it was the intention of the Noble Lord to oppose the Bill, and, if it was, in which of its stages he meant to give that opposition. The Noble Lord stated, that Masters in Chancery in England were qualified to sit in the other House of Parliament; he desired that it was the case— for by a standing order of their Lordships none of their servants could sit as Members of the other House of Parliament, and the Masters in Chancery in England performed service in their Lordships' House. Lord KENYON said he was not prepared to state in what stage of the Bill he intended to oppose it. Lord HOLLAND said a few words in explanation. The Earl of LIMERICK did not consider this was the proper time for discussion on the subject, and he only rose to say, that there was a vast deal of difference between the office of Master of Chancery in England and that in Ireland, which by the very showing of Mr. Ellis, in his evidence, as reported to the other House of Parliament, obliged those of the latter country to attend few months out of twelve to the duties of their office. The Masters of Chancery in this Country were on the spot, and might be able to attend their Parliamentary duty, which could not be the case of those of Ireland. After some conversation having taken place between Lord Rosslyn, the Lord Chancellor, and Lord Kenyon, the Petitions were laid on the table. MASTERS IN CHANCERY—(IRELAND). Sir J. NEWPORT wished to call the attention of the House to a notice which he would give for to-morrow, or else, if the forms of the House would admit of it, to a motion which he would then submit. The House would recollect, that in the progress of a Bill for regulating the offices of the Irish Chancery Court, a clause had been added, which prevented those who held offices from sitting in Parliament, leaving it to the option of the parties to choose which office they would retain. The clause had been passed by a considerable majority. Under these circumstances, he thought it was scarcely decent that the clause should have been commented on, as he found it had been in terms very little respectful, which he would read to the House, from the report of a meeting of the Guild of Merchants in Dublin. He then read extracts from the speeches and resolutions of a meeting of the Guild of Merchants, held at the Shakespeare Gallery, on Thursday last, in the City of Dublin. The extracts were as follow:— Dr. Blacker said, that "the Bill now pending in Parliament, a clause of which went to deprive them of their chosen Representatives; would be, if not aptly prevented, a wrong of the greatest magnitude; he had, therefore, been induced to put together a series of Resolutions; no doubt some persons might oppose the language too strong; but he would say, in reply to such persons, that their rights were infringed upon by the Minister. He would say, that the Minister, Lord Castlereagh, had infringed upon their rights; and he (Lord Castlereagh) must be told, in thundering language, the wrongs he had dared to put upon them, as soft language would have no effect upon him (Lord Castlereagh), he having degraded himself by his conduct." (Laughter.) The Noble Lord had one consolation, that he was not alone in this abuse. The Hon. Member for Knaresborough was included as well. He would read one of the Resolutions— "Resolved, That we contemplate with great alarm and constitutional jealousy the recent proceedings of the House of Commons, as regards the introduction of a clause into the Irish Chancery Bill, to prevent Masters in the Court of Chancery in Ireland from sitting or voting in the House of Commons, particularly as it tends to annul the elective election of our Respected Representative, Thomas Ellis, Esq. and this by a retro-spective effect (he not being at the time of his election disqualified by any law), operating thereby as an ex post facto law, and, consequently, in direct opposition to the leading principles of our glorious Constitution. "Resolved, That we consider the freedom and freeholders of this great City to be in every point of view the most competent judges of what may be for the advantage or disadvantage of their own immediate interests, as far as respects the Parliamentary conduct of their Representatives; and that great body having maturely weighed and considered the extent to which those interests might be affected by their Representative holding the situation of a Master in Chancery, and having, after such mature consideration, elected Mr. Ellis by a great majority, we cannot but view any measure tending to disturb that election, and to involve this City in the renewed horrors of another contest, as unwise, unjust, and unconstitutional. "Resolved, That from all the circumstances under which this clause was introduced into the House of Commons, we feel ourselves warranted in denouncing it as an attempt to degrade legislation to the purposes of party. "Resolved, That in the full confidence that the House of Lords will not give the sanction of their legislative authority to the enormity of principles so evidently inherent in the unconstitutional clause alluded to, we do respectively submit to that House a Petition grounded upon the foregoing Resolutions, and that a Committee be now appointed to prepare said Petition, and to send it forward without delay." He would read one more instance from a speech of one of the persons present. "He regretted the impudent assertion of Sir James Mackintosh, Member for the obscure borough of Knaresborough, in Yorkshire, who dared to legislate for the Citizens of Dublin as to their Representative."—(A Laugh.) He then commented on the audacity and violence of such proceedings, and by whom had this indecent violence been exhibited? By servants of the Crown; by those who professed to be signally loyal; by the chiefs of that wretched Orange faction, who admitted none to be loyal but themselves. He would move that the Master of the Guild should be required to attend the bar of the House. After some explanation with the Hon. Gentleman about him, who seemed to think that the printer of the newspaper should be first called upon, he changed his motion, and moved, that James Magee, printer of The Dublin Evening Post, should be required to attend the bar of the House on Thursday's morning. Lord CASTLEREAGH put it to the better consideration of the Hon. Burmet if it was desirable to take up such an affair so seriously. As far as he was concerned, he had no wish that the House should interfere. The very terms used in the discussion would render it harmless and of no weight. Perhaps the greatest punishment which could be visited on the parties would be not to notice them. Mr. TAYLOR hoped that the Hon. Baronet would not persist in his motion, as no one could hold the sentiments which he had just read in greater detestation than the Gentleman who conducted The Dublin Evening Post. Sir J. MACKINTOSH was ready to throw in his share of forgiveness to the offenders.—(Laughter.) Sir G. HILL wished to say a few words on behalf of some of the parties implicated, if any discussion could be allowed. Sir J. NEWPORT withdrew his motion, as his object in bringing it forward had been fully attained. He hoped the parties would not require him again to notice them, as in any future occasion they might not perhaps get so easily through. Sir GEORGE HILL then rose to present the Petition of the Guild on the subject of the clause in question. While he defended their opinion upon the question, he could not coincide in any abuse of his Right Hon. Friends on the floor, whom, independent of his political connexion with them, he considered to be some of the most honourable-minded that could possibly exist. Mr. PEEL took that opportunity, having missed it in the progress of the Bill, of expressing his regret that the clause should have passed. He was proceeding to argue on its impolicy, when— Mr. PLUNKETT spoke to order. The Right Honourable Gentleman was going into a discussion on a Bill which would have the House of Commons, there must be an equal right to offer arguments in its support, which he would not fail to make use of. The House would then be involved in discussion on a measure upon which it had already determined. The SPEAKER was of opinion that no disorder had been committed. If the right of petitioning against a Bill which had passed that House were admitted, as to any particular parts of it, and of

Lord CASTLEREAGH then rose to make the same motion on behalf of the King's Attorney and Solicitor-General. He admitted the distinction of the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Wynn). The parties were certainly not, they could not be in the same circumstances. But the law officers of the Crown who had advised the proceeding, were certainly the most proper persons to conduct it.—His Lordship, expatiated on the great advantage it would be to the proceedings of that House, in case the Bill should be sent down, to have two Gentlemen on each side of the House, who would be able, from their knowledge of the case, and after having cross-examined the witnesses, so materially to assist the inquiries of the Members. Mr. WYNN could not accede to this motion as willingly as the other; in the case of granting leave to the Queen's Attorney and Solicitor-General, it was not likely to be drawn into a precedent, because it would not occur again. But it was different with the King's Attorney and Solicitor-General, who might be called to plead in many Bills of very various descriptions. There was direct danger of such a case being by degrees turned into a precedent. Lord CASTLEREAGH thought that could scarcely happen, when it was to be declared, as in the first case, that it should not be drawn into a precedent. Mr. W. WILLIAMS did not see the same necessity for granting this leave as the first. Mr. BROUGHAM thought the difficulty offered by Mr. Wynn not quite got over by the explanation of the Noble Lord. The Queen could only be represented by the Counsel whom she might choose to appoint. The King was much better represented, in a proceeding by Bills, by the whole House of Peers. He would not oppose the motion, but he protested against the principle of the Noble Lord's argument drawn from the alleged similarity of the cases. Lord CASTLEREAGH maintained the equal necessity for allowing the King's professional Advocates to act in support of, as those of the Queen against the Bill. The motion was agreed to. Dr. LUSHINGTON said, that her Majesty the Queen having been pleased to signify her wishes, that he should act as her professional Advocate to those of her legal officers, he had to beg of the House the same indulgence which had been extended to the Counsel on both sides; of course he would bind himself by the same obligation entered into by her Majesty's Officers, not to vote upon the question. He moved for the same leave to be granted him, under the same conditions, and in the same terms as the others. Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that he had already given his opinion that any individual of that House was entitled to the indulgence. Sir J. MACKINTOSH remarked how necessary it was that the Queen should have one Civilian among her Counsel. The bar of the Civil Law was so small, compared with the bar of Common Law, the choice was so limited in the former case, that there was more than ordinary reason for granting the indulgence in this case. Mr. WYNN thought that there were no special circumstances in this case to require the indulgence. The Civil Bar was small, but there were Professors enough to choose from without selecting the Members of that House. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman was not of her Majesty's regular legal advisers. He did not see how such cases could be prevented from being drawn into precedents. Mr. BANKES did not approve of extending the indulgence. He would negative the motion. The motion was agreed to by the House. MISCELLANEOUS INTERCOURSE BILL. On the clause being read which prohibits any retailer, distiller, or rectifier from having for sale any spirits not being spirits of wine, brandy, rum, or Geneva, of a higher strength than 22 per cent. under proof by Sykes's hydrometer— Mr. M. FITZGERALD rose and said, the clause was quite inconsistent, not only with the letter and principle of the Act of Union, but contrary to the express pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said a few words, the purport of which, from the noise in the gallery, we could not gather. Mr. W. SMITH was at a loss to conceive why the Right Hon. Gentleman should propose the repeal of a clause on the present occasion, and intimate his intention of bringing another for the protection of the English distiller on a future opportunity. Mr. D. BROWNE contended, that by the articles of Union, Ireland was, up to the year 1810, fairly entitled to bring her spirits, in the manner in which she had been in the invariable habit of manufacturing it, into the English market. This stipulation was, however, owing to the powerful interest of the English distiller, attempted to be infringed by the introduction of a clause into the Spirit Intercourse Act, in 1816; but its obvious violation of the Union compact defeated the attor-

mentative Thomas Ellis, Esq. and this by a retro-spective effect (he not being at the time of his election disqualified by any law), operating thereby as an ex post facto law, and, consequently, in direct opposition to the leading principles of our glorious Constitution. "Resolved, That we consider the freedom and freeholders of this great City to be in every point of view the most competent judges of what may be for the advantage or disadvantage of their own immediate interests, as far as respects the Parliamentary conduct of their Representatives; and that great body having maturely weighed and considered the extent to which those interests might be affected by their Representative holding the situation of a Master in Chancery, and having, after such mature consideration, elected Mr. Ellis by a great majority, we cannot but view any measure tending to disturb that election, and to involve this City in the renewed horrors of another contest, as unwise, unjust, and unconstitutional. "Resolved, That from all the circumstances under which this clause was introduced into the House of Commons, we feel ourselves warranted in denouncing it as an attempt to degrade legislation to the purposes of party. "Resolved, That in the full confidence that the House of Lords will not give the sanction of their legislative authority to the enormity of principles so evidently inherent in the unconstitutional clause alluded to, we do respectively submit to that House a Petition grounded upon the foregoing Resolutions, and that a Committee be now appointed to prepare said Petition, and to send it forward without delay." He would read one more instance from a speech of one of the persons present. "He regretted the impudent assertion of Sir James Mackintosh, Member for the obscure borough of Knaresborough, in Yorkshire, who dared to legislate for the Citizens of Dublin as to their Representative."—(A Laugh.) He then commented on the audacity and violence of such proceedings, and by whom had this indecent violence been exhibited? By servants of the Crown; by those who professed to be signally loyal; by the chiefs of that wretched Orange faction, who admitted none to be loyal but themselves. He would move that the Master of the Guild should be required to attend the bar of the House. After some explanation with the Hon. Gentleman about him, who seemed to think that the printer of the newspaper should be first called upon, he changed his motion, and moved, that James Magee, printer of The Dublin Evening Post, should be required to attend the bar of the House on Thursday's morning. Lord CASTLEREAGH put it to the better consideration of the Hon. Burmet if it was desirable to take up such an affair so seriously. As far as he was concerned, he had no wish that the House should interfere. The very terms used in the discussion would render it harmless and of no weight. Perhaps the greatest punishment which could be visited on the parties would be not to notice them. Mr. TAYLOR hoped that the Hon. Baronet would not persist in his motion, as no one could hold the sentiments which he had just read in greater detestation than the Gentleman who conducted The Dublin Evening Post. Sir J. MACKINTOSH was ready to throw in his share of forgiveness to the offenders.—(Laughter.) Sir G. HILL wished to say a few words on behalf of some of the parties implicated, if any discussion could be allowed. Sir J. NEWPORT withdrew his motion, as his object in bringing it forward had been fully attained. He hoped the parties would not require him again to notice them, as in any future occasion they might not perhaps get so easily through. Sir GEORGE HILL then rose to present the Petition of the Guild on the subject of the clause in question. While he defended their opinion upon the question, he could not coincide in any abuse of his Right Hon. Friends on the floor, whom, independent of his political connexion with them, he considered to be some of the most honourable-minded that could possibly exist. Mr. PEEL took that opportunity, having missed it in the progress of the Bill, of expressing his regret that the clause should have passed. He was proceeding to argue on its impolicy, when— Mr. PLUNKETT spoke to order. The Right Honourable Gentleman was going into a discussion on a Bill which would have the House of Commons, there must be an equal right to offer arguments in its support, which he would not fail to make use of. The House would then be involved in discussion on a measure upon which it had already determined. The SPEAKER was of opinion that no disorder had been committed. If the right of petitioning against a Bill which had passed that House were admitted, as to any particular parts of it, and of

Lord CASTLEREAGH then rose to make the same motion on behalf of the King's Attorney and Solicitor-General. He admitted the distinction of the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Wynn). The parties were certainly not, they could not be in the same circumstances. But the law officers of the Crown who had advised the proceeding, were certainly the most proper persons to conduct it.—His Lordship, expatiated on the great advantage it would be to the proceedings of that House, in case the Bill should be sent down, to have two Gentlemen on each side of the House, who would be able, from their knowledge of the case, and after having cross-examined the witnesses, so materially to assist the inquiries of the Members. Mr. WYNN could not accede to this motion as willingly as the other; in the case of granting leave to the Queen's Attorney and Solicitor-General, it was not likely to be drawn into a precedent, because it would not occur again. But it was different with the King's Attorney and Solicitor-General, who might be called to plead in many Bills of very various descriptions. There was direct danger of such a case being by degrees turned into a precedent. Lord CASTLEREAGH thought that could scarcely happen, when it was to be declared, as in the first case, that it should not be drawn into a precedent. Mr. W. WILLIAMS did not see the same necessity for granting this leave as the first. Mr. BROUGHAM thought the difficulty offered by Mr. Wynn not quite got over by the explanation of the Noble Lord. The Queen could only be represented by the Counsel whom she might choose to appoint. The King was much better represented, in a proceeding by Bills, by the whole House of Peers. He would not oppose the motion, but he protested against the principle of the Noble Lord's argument drawn from the alleged similarity of the cases. Lord CASTLEREAGH maintained the equal necessity for allowing the King's professional Advocates to act in support of, as those of the Queen against the Bill. The motion was agreed to. Dr. LUSHINGTON said, that her Majesty the Queen having been pleased to signify her wishes, that he should act as her professional Advocate to those of her legal officers, he had to beg of the House the same indulgence which had been extended to the Counsel on both sides; of course he would bind himself by the same obligation entered into by her Majesty's Officers, not to vote upon the question. He moved for the same leave to be granted him, under the same conditions, and in the same terms as the others. Lord CASTLEREAGH observed, that he had already given his opinion that any individual of that House was entitled to the indulgence. Sir J. MACKINTOSH remarked how necessary it was that the Queen should have one Civilian among her Counsel. The bar of the Civil Law was so small, compared with the bar of Common Law, the choice was so limited in the former case, that there was more than ordinary reason for granting the indulgence in this case. Mr. WYNN thought that there were no special circumstances in this case to require the indulgence. The Civil Bar was small, but there were Professors enough to choose from without selecting the Members of that House. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman was not of her Majesty's regular legal advisers. He did not see how such cases could be prevented from being drawn into precedents. Mr. BANKES did not approve of extending the indulgence. He would negative the motion. The motion was agreed to by the House. MISCELLANEOUS INTERCOURSE BILL. On the clause being read which prohibits any retailer, distiller, or rectifier from having for sale any spirits not being spirits of wine, brandy, rum, or Geneva, of a higher strength than 22 per cent. under proof by Sykes's hydrometer— Mr. M. FITZGERALD rose and said, the clause was quite inconsistent, not only with the letter and principle of the Act of Union, but contrary to the express pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said a few words, the purport of which, from the noise in the gallery, we could not gather. Mr. W. SMITH was at a loss to conceive why the Right Hon. Gentleman should propose the repeal of a clause on the present occasion, and intimate his intention of bringing another for the protection of the English distiller on a future opportunity. Mr. D. BROWNE contended, that by the articles of Union, Ireland was, up to the year 1810, fairly entitled to bring her spirits, in the manner in which she had been in the invariable habit of manufacturing it, into the English market. This stipulation was, however, owing to the powerful interest of the English distiller, attempted to be infringed by the introduction of a clause into the Spirit Intercourse Act, in 1816; but its obvious violation of the Union compact defeated the attor-

mentative Thomas Ellis, Esq. and this by a retro-spective effect (he not being at the time of his election disqualified by any law), operating thereby as an ex post facto law, and, consequently, in direct opposition to the leading principles of our glorious Constitution. "Resolved, That we consider the freedom and freeholders of this great City to be in every point of view the most competent judges of what may be for the advantage or disadvantage of their own immediate interests, as far as respects the Parliamentary conduct of their Representatives; and that great body having maturely weighed and considered the extent to which those interests might be affected by their Representative holding the situation of a Master in Chancery, and having, after such mature consideration, elected Mr. Ellis by a great majority, we cannot but view any measure tending to disturb that election, and to involve this City in the renewed horrors of another contest, as unwise, unjust, and unconstitutional. "Resolved, That from all the circumstances under which this clause was introduced into the House of Commons, we feel ourselves warranted in denouncing it as an attempt to degrade legislation to the purposes of party. "Resolved, That in the full confidence that the House of Lords will not give the sanction of their legislative authority to the enormity of principles so evidently inherent in the unconstitutional clause alluded to, we do respectively submit to that House a Petition grounded upon the foregoing Resolutions, and that a Committee be now appointed to prepare said Petition, and to send it forward without delay." He would read one more instance from a speech of one of the persons present. "He regretted the impudent assertion of Sir James Mackintosh, Member for the obscure borough of Knaresborough, in Yorkshire, who dared to legislate for the Citizens of Dublin as to their Representative."—(A Laugh.) He then commented on the audacity and violence of such proceedings, and by whom had this indecent violence been exhibited? By servants of the Crown; by those who professed to be signally loyal; by the chiefs of that wretched Orange faction, who admitted none to be loyal but themselves. He would move that the Master of the Guild should be required to attend the bar of the House. After some explanation with the Hon. Gentleman about him, who seemed to think that the printer of the newspaper should be first called upon, he changed his motion, and moved, that James Magee, printer of The Dublin Evening Post, should be required to attend the bar of the House on Thursday's morning. Lord CASTLEREAGH put it to the better consideration of the Hon. Burmet if it was desirable to take up such an affair so seriously. As far as he was concerned, he had no wish that the House should interfere. The very terms used in the discussion would render it harmless and of no weight. Perhaps the greatest punishment which could be visited on the parties would be not to notice them. Mr. TAYLOR hoped that the Hon. Baronet would not persist in his motion, as no one could hold the sentiments which he had just read in greater detestation than the Gentleman who conducted The Dublin Evening Post. Sir J. MACKINTOSH was ready to throw in his share of forgiveness to the offenders.—(Laughter.) Sir G. HILL wished to say a few words on behalf of some of the parties implicated, if any discussion could be allowed. Sir J. NEWPORT withdrew his motion, as his object in bringing it forward had been fully attained. He hoped the parties would not require him again to notice them, as in any future occasion they might not perhaps get so easily through. Sir GEORGE HILL then rose to present the Petition of the Guild on the subject of the clause in question. While he defended their opinion upon the question, he could not coincide in any abuse of his Right Hon. Friends on the floor, whom, independent of his political connexion with them, he considered to be some of the most honourable-minded that could possibly exist. Mr. PEEL took that opportunity, having missed it in the progress of the Bill, of expressing his regret that the clause should have passed. He was proceeding to argue on its impolicy, when— Mr. PLUNKETT spoke to order. The Right Honourable Gentleman was going into a discussion on a Bill which would have the House of Commons, there must be an equal right to offer arguments in its support, which he would not fail to make use of. The House would then be involved in discussion on a measure upon which it had already determined. The SPEAKER was of opinion that no disorder had been committed. If the right of petitioning against a Bill which had passed that House were admitted, as to any particular parts of it, and of

WATERFORD: Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PERREN, Chronicle-Office, 21, Cross Street, near the Market. Agents for England—Messrs. NEWTON and CO. War Office, London.

