CORONER'S INQUEST, WATERFORD.

At an Inquest, held at the Palace in this City, on Monday, the 2d, and continued by daily adjournments to the evening of Wednesday, the 4th instant, before MICHAEL EVELYN, Esq. Coroner, and a respectable Jury, on view of the Body of Richard Darcey, there lying dead, a verdict of *Fratricide* was found against James Darcey, Brother of the Deceased, upon the following

EVIDENCE.

THOMAS L. MACKESY, of said City, Esq. Doctor in Physic, being duly sworn and examined, saith:—That Informant knew Richard Darcey, deceased, on whose body this Inquest is holding, for several years past, and that said Richard Darcey was, as Informant believes, Steward and Gardener to the Lord Bishop of Waterford and Lismore. Saith, that having been sent for, Informant professionally visited the said Richard Darcey on the 23d of August last, at the Palace, and found him labouring under what he then considered a *Cholera Morbus*. That Informant prescribed for him, and he got better so as to be able to go out and see his wife, who was then lying ill at the Garden House, similarly affected, tho' in a more advanced stage of the complaint. That on the 28th day of August aforesaid, the said Richard Darcey appeared to have relapsed, and to be worse that he had been for the three or four days preceding, which Informant *then* attributed to the said Darcey's going out, contrary to Informant's wish.—That said Darcey got better afterwards, and when Informant visited him on the 2d of September last, he considered him nearly convalescent, and the Deceased observed he was so much better, that he was sure Informant would allow him to go out the next day. Saith that, on visiting the Deceased the next morning, Informant was surprised to find him extremely ill, and and to hear he had spent a very bad night. Deceased had violent retching—vomiting mucous, mixed with bile—purging, & discharging watery stools, with blood. He had also a hiccup, and complained of pain and a burning sensation in his stomach, and anxiously requested draughts of cold water to cool his inside, but which he threw up almost as soon as he had taken them; general disquietude and restlessness were also apparent. This was about 10 in the morning, when his morning visits were paid—his evening visits being about eight. Saith, that, on Informant's expressing his surprise at the symptoms and general bad state of the patient, his Brother, James Darcey, (who had attended him the night before, and several other nights, as Informant believes,) declared, that he attributed the change in his Brother, the Deceased, to some wine whey which Informant had ordered for him the preceding night.—On inquiry, the said Richard denied that he had taken any wine whey in the course of that night, save some that Mrs. Rickards, the house-keeper, had given him, and declared that it was water the said James had given him, and he complained that it had a very ugly taste. Saith, that seeing him so very ill, Informant himself gave him some alkaline medicine, effervescing with lemon juice, which he had previously prescribed with good effect. Saith, that there then remained in the bottle about three table spoons full or less of the said medicine. That Mrs. Rickards and Informant then left the room, leaving the Deceased in the care of his brother, and Informant went to see the Deceased's wife, having previously left directions with the brother, that the before-mentioned medicine, with the lemon juice, should be repeated every hour or two hours during the day. That about two o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, he received a message to go to the Palace, when he saw the said Richard Darcey, and found the said symptoms unabated, and the patient attended by one of the female servants, his brother not being then there. Saith, that on going into the room of Mrs. Rickards, she appeared agitated, and declared she did not think the Deceased was getting fair play for his life; she added, that on her returning to his room in about 20 minutes after Informant and she left it in the morning, she found the bottle before mentioned, in which the alkaline medicine was, rather more than half full, and observed a white powder in the bottom of it—that she took the bottle, which the said James Darcy attempted to snatch from her, but that she had succeeded in keeping it. That Informant received from Mrs. Rickards in a tumbler the contents of the said bottle (as she informed him), and which contents he poured into a bottle, and has still in his possession, except as herein after mentioned. Saith that Informant then directed, that Deceased's brother should no longer be permitted to attend him, and that a nurse-tender should be procured for the purpose, and one was accordingly hired. That having giving the Deceased some medicine, he appeared rather better that night and next morning, but in the course of the day, being Monday, the 4th of September last, he complained of great pain and a sense of tightness and fullness in the stomach—also of numbness in his hands and feet—which symptoms of the stomach induced Informant to think that inflammatory action was going forward. Saith, that in a day or two after there was total paralysis of the superior extremities up to the elbow joints, and partial to the shoulders—and of the lower extremities total paralysis up to the knee joints, and partial to the hips. That the Deceased seemed to rally and get a little better for a few days, but his constitution sunk, and he died on the night of Sunday, the first day of October instant, between 9 and 10 o'clock.—Saith, that Informant has analysed the substance which he received in the manner before mentioned from Mrs. Rickards, and has found, from several experiments, that it contains a portion of oxide of white arsenic, which is the poison generally sold in the shops; and he got some white arsenic from the shop of Mr. Mackesy, Apothecary, for the purpose of making a comparison, and found by experiment a similar result. Saith, that the oxide of white arsenic is, in his opinion, one of the most active and deadly poisons known to the profession. Saith, that he sent a portion of the said white powder (the contents of the bottle) to Francis Barker, Esq. Doctor in Physic, and professor of Chemistry, in Dublin, who has, by letter, informed him, that he had found it to contain oxide of white arsenic. Saith, that after Informant had directed the said James Darcey to be dismissed from attending the Deceased, he deemed it right to explain to him (Deceased) why he had done so, and he told Deceased that he was of opinion, that his brother had not dealt fairly with him, in which the Deceased coincided, and also complained that his said brother, during the nights, did not seem to feel for or mind him—but, instead of comforting him, was accustomed to say—"Oh! Richard, you are dying—you will never recover!"—Saith, that the Deceased also said that he had made a will, leaving all he possessed to said brother, and on being asked if he wished that will to stand, replied, "Do you think I would leave my property to a man who has removed my wife from this world, and reduced me to the state I am in?" Saith, that the wife had died about the 4th or 5th of September last, under symptoms very similar to those which affected her husband. Saith, that the symptoms which appeared in the case of the said Richard Darcey were, in Informant's opinion, similar to those which would be produced by a person taking corrosive poison, such as the oxide of white arsenic is, and particularly the symptoms which appeared in said case since the 2nd of September last.—Saith, that on the 2nd day of October instant, Informant opened the body of the said Richard Darcey, in the presence of Matthew Poole, Esq. Doctor in Physic, and John Briscoe, Esq. Surgeon—and upon inspection of the stomach, found some appearances of extravasated blood upon the inner coat of the stomach and smaller intestines—no appearance of disease in any of the other cavities, but the body was extremely emaciated. Informant thinks, that death may ensue from poison without leaving any other or further appearances on the stomach or intestines than those described to have been there. That on opening the head, the brain appeared in a sound state, as also did the superior part of the spinal marrow. Informant is therefore of opinion, that the state of paralysis of the limbs of Deceased did not proceed from any affection of the brain or spinal marrow; and saith he is of opinion, that such paralysis might have been occasioned by the absorption of white arsenic or mineral poison into the system.

MATTHEW POOLE, Esq. Doctor in Physic, and JOHN BRISCOE, Esq. Surgeon, both of said City, being duly sworn and examined, say that they attended the opening of the body of Richard Darcey, by Doctor Mackesy, and concur with him in the evidence he has given on the subject.

PATRICK MULLERY, garden boy, or helper, in the garden of the Lord Bishop of Waterford, sworn. Saith, that he had been employed under Richard Darcey, deceased, who was Steward and Gardener to the said Lord Bishop. That he knows James Darcey, brother of said Richard, and who had been with him near a year. That on or about last Saturday month, to the best of Informant's recollection, the said James Darcey told him that he wanted to write a note to Mr. Mackesy, Apothecary, and that Informant should go with it. Saith that when said James Darcey wrote the note, he gave it to Informant, and desired him to take it to Mr. Mackesy, and to bring to him what he should get. Saith, that on delivering the note to Mr. Mackesy, he gave Informant some white powder, which Informant brought and delivered to said James Darcey in the Bishop's garden; whereupon the said James said, "This is poison, which I want to lay for some rats that are resorting the melon pit." Saith, that there were rats generally or always in the garden, but not more then than usual; nor did he ever see a rat at the place where the said James Darcey said he wanted to lay the poison; neither has Informant been able to discover any appearance of rats in or about the said melon pit. That said James Darcey also told Informant, that he had laid pills of said poison there; but although Informant looked about the place, he has not been able to see any pill. Saith, that the said Richard Darcey and his wife had been sick about three weeks before the poison was procured. That the said James Darcey several times told Informant, that his brother was very bad and would not recover, and that he would like to live in his place with the Bishop, if he removed from Waterford; he further said, that his brother's wife would likewise die; Informant observed, that his brother had some valuable articles and other property; said James replied, that "there was no one but himself to come in for it—that he was the heir—that his brother had made his will and said in it what he had to say, thank God!—and that the Doctor was deceived in his opinion, for his brother would die." Saith, that before the said powder was brought by Informant to said James Darcey, and about a day before Richard Darcey and his wife were taken ill, three fowls died in the garden (as was suspected) of poison:

WILLIAM MACKESY, of the City of Waterford, Apothecary, sworn. Saith, that Informant attended the late Richard Darcey at the commencement of his illness, also his wife; and in about a week, finding them worse, Dr. Mackesy was called in, their bowels and stomachs, principally the latter, having been violently affected. Saith, that on the 2d September last, Patrick Mollery brought the note to Informant which he now produces, signed Richard Darcey, desiring Informant to send him some poison to banish rats that were injuring the melon pit and garden of the Palace; that Informant accordingly sent by said Mollery two ounces of white arsenic in powder, in several papers, and took his receipt for the same; but at the same time asked Mollery was Richard Darcey well enough to write, or was that his hand-writing? Mullery replied, he was not, and that his brother wrote in his name.

MARY RICKARDS, wife of Thomas Rickards, sworn.—Saith that she is house-keeper to the Lord Bishop of Waterford, at the Palace. Recollects that on Saturday, the 2d September last, Richard Darcey (late Steward and Gardener to the Bishop), who had been ill for some time previously, was much better. Saith she had got his bed made, put him comfortably to bed, gave him some wine-whey, and left some with him, and he seemed so well that he said he expected to go to see Kitty (meaning his wife) on the next day. Informant then left him in care of his brother for the night. Saith that between 8 and 9 o'clock the next morning she sent to know how the said Richard was, and word was brought her that he was a great deal worse than ever he had been. Saith she then hurried towards his room, and met his brother, James Darcey, coming out of the room. Informant told him she was sorry his brother was so ill; he replied, "be damn'd but he is worse than ever—you never saw such a night as he has spent." He then returned to the room with her. She then told Richard she was sorry to find he was not well, and that she had expected to see him a great deal better—to this he replied, that he thought the wine-whey had disagreed with him, but Informant said it could not, and that she had taken some of it herself going to bed. James Darcey then left the room.—Informant then asked Richard where was the wine whey, finding water in the jug in which it was—he replied, that James had thrown the whey in the grate. James then returned with a mug of tea for his brother, but Informant observed that he was not allowed tea, and she brought the tea and the jug with the water out of the room, which water Richard said was bad, and requested Mollery might be desired to bring him some good water, as he said he had got none but what was bad.—Informant then brought the said mug of tea and jug of water to her own room; shortly afterwards James followed her for a drink of water for his brother. Saith she threw the tea out of the mug, which she washed at the pump, and gave it with clear good water out of the pump to him. Saith she then examined the said jug in which the whey had been, and the water then was, and saw some white powder at the bottom of it. Saith that the water had acquired a milky colour, and having drained it off, she took out the powder and put it into a wine glass in her press. Saith it then occurred to her that the said James Darcey was not doing right, and when she next saw Dr. Mackesy, she told him so, and that she wished a nurse-tender to be procured to attend Richard Darcey. Saith that on the same day she went to the room of the Deceased to give him some medicine ordered for him, which was accordingly given out of a bottle, and when the bottle should be finished the Doctor ordered it to be repeated.—Saith there then remained about two table-spoons full of the medicine in the bottle. The Doctor and she then went to see Mrs. Darcey, and on her returning to the room of the said Richard, she perceived the window where the said medicine had been left all wet, and the said bottle with a white mixture in it, and the quantity greatly increased. Saith that the prior appearance of the medicine was brown. She then took up the bottle, and asked James what it meant—there was white powder in the bottom of the bottle, which was not there before? to which he replied, that it was in it before. Saith he then attempted to take the bottle from her, but she brought it quickly out of the room. Saith she then brought the bottle to her own room, and emptied it into a tumbler, which she put into her press. Saith she then well washed the bottle, as the medicine which had been first in it was to be repeated—that she put the powder which had been in the jug (which she had put out of it into the wine glass) into the tumbler also, as they appeared to her to be precisely the same. On the following day she gave the same to Dr. Mackesy, and what she so gave him contained nothing but what she had found in the jug and the bottle as before mentioned, nor had any person but herself access to the press where the same was locked up, and the key in her possession. Saith she observed the said James Darcey to be much agitated on the day she so found the bottle with the powder, and he complained of a pain in his head.

The Hon. and Right Rev. RICHARD BOURKE, Lord Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, sworn.—Saith, that the late Richard Darcey lived in Informant's service about eight or nine years, as Steward and Gardener. That, after an absence of some time, Informant returned to the Palace on Monday, the 4th of September last, and finding that the said Richard Darcey was ill, confined to his bed, went immediately to see him. On going into his room, James Darcey (his brother) and a nurse-tender were both there. Informant asked the said Richard Darcey how he was? he replied that he was very ill; Informant expressed his sorrow at seeing him so ill, and left the room. He then went to the house-keeper's room, and found the house-keeper much agitated, and after having spoken to her, she declared that she was apprehensive that Richard Darcey and his wife had had foul play shewn them. That on Informant's requiring her to be more explicit, she detailed to him what she has since stated in evidence to this Inquest, adding, that she believed the brother (meaning James Darcey) to be a very bad man. Saith that the wife of the said Richard Darcey died, he thinks, in about an hour after he had returned to the Palace. Informant insisted upon the said James's quitting the Palace, and on his saying he had no money, Informant told him he would give him any money his brother desired. Saith he brought him to the said Richard Darcey's room, and repeated this—when the said Richd. Darcey requested Informant to give said James £10, which he accordingly did, but had not at that time mentioned his suspicions of his brother. Saith that, knowing the said Richard Darcey had some property to dispose of, Informant some time afterwards asked him if he had made a will, which he replied he had done—that he had directed the will to Informant, and asked if his brother had given it to him. Informant answered he had not. Informant availed himself of the next opportunity of asking about the will in the brother's presence, when the said Richard asked his brother why he had not given it to the Bishop immediately on his coming home, and sent him for it, but he did not then bring it, nor did Informant get the will from him until he (the said James) was going away, when Informant demanded it, and the said James unlocked his chest, out of which he took it, and gave it to Informant, and which he now produces; whereby testator bequeathed about half his property to his wife, and the remainder to his said brother—and in case of the wife's death, the entire to the brother; and saith that the said James Darcey told Informant that the said will was in his hand-writing; the said Richard Darcey had saved about £200 out of his wages. Saith that the said Richard Darcey afterwards asked Informant if he had got the will? Informant replied that he had, and desired to know what he should do with it? that the said Richard Darcey replied, "Burn it; annihilate it; it is not correct; see how I have signed my name." Saith that Informant had not at this time communicated to him his suspicions of his brother's conduct, having considered it might disturb and agitate him; but some days previous to his death, having been informed by the Doctor that he thought him sinking and growing weaker, he deemed it necessary that those suspicions, with the grounds on which they rested, should be mentioned to him, and this was accordingly done by Doctor Mackesy and Informant. Saith that Informant then remarked to the said Richard Darcey, that he had made a will and asked if he wished that his property should go to his brother? to which he answered, "Not a fraction—is it for sending my wife to eternity, and leaving me in the way I am in!" Another will was then prepared by his directions, which he signed and acknowledged in the presence of witnesses.

RICHARD ADAMS, of said City, Gardener, sworn. Saith he has this day viewed and examined the melon pit in the garden of the Lord Bishop of Waterford, and has not been able to discover that it has been in the smallest degree injured by rats, nor that it had been even visited by them; that the said pit could not be injured by those animals unless they burrowed in it, in which case it would be useless to lay pills for them.

THOMAS L. MACKESY, being re-examined, further saith—that, in this Informants opinion, from all the circumstances of the case, the said Richard Darcey had something of a deleterious nature administered to him on the night of the 2d or the morning of the 3d day of September last—and if such opinion be correct, he is further of opinion, that the death of the said Richard Darcey was caused thereby.

BRIDGET WALSH, spinster, sworn.—Saith that about a fortnight before the death of Catherine Darcey, wife of Richard Darcey, the Bishop's house-keeper sent Informant to attend the said Catherine at his Lordship's garden-house, where James Darcey also lived at the time. Informant accordingly attended the said Catherine from thence until her death. During that period, the said Catherine was very ill and weak, seldom taking any thing but tea or water, and at such times as tea was prepared for her, the said James Darcey always brought the tea out of the house to a tub in the garden, for the purpose of cooling it (as he said), by putting the tea-cup in the tub, in which there was water. Saith the said James sometimes gave the tea to the said Catherine after bringing it in.

As the foregoing Inquest excited a great deal of interest in this City, we have given the evidence adduced on the occasion at very considerable length. The investigation was conducted by the Coroner and the Jury with the utmost patience, and the most anxious solicitude to discover the truth. James Darcey, in consequence of a warrant from Michael Evelyn, Esq. Coroner, transmitted to the Head Police office, Dublin, was speedily apprehended by Mr. Farrell, of that office, and lodged in Kilmainham Gaol, to be sent to Waterford at the next Assizes. On this, as on every occasion, the zeal and promptitude of the Dublin Magistrates, and of their meritorious officer whom we have named, manifest the exertion of a spirit in support of the public good which is entitled to the warmest public gratitude, and which has long been productive of the most beneficial consequences.

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

Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No 12,618. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1820. PRICE FIVE PENCE.

AUCTION OF NEW HOPS.

ARCHBOLD & O'BRIEN
WILL SELL BY AUCTION,
AT THEIR STORES, BAILEY'S NEW-STREET,
On SATURDAY, the 14th instant, at One o'Clock,
100 POCKETS OF PRIME NEW HOPS,
Just landed, per the *Lovet*, from Rye.
TERMS AT SALE.
FITZPATRICK, Auctioneer.
Bailey's New-street, Oct. 10, 1820.

In the Matter of SAMUEL NEWPORT, a Bankrupt.

THE CREDITORS of the Bankrupt who have proved their Debts under the Commission in this Matter are particularly requested to meet the ASSIGNEES, at the CITY COURT-HOUSE, on SATURDAY, the 28th day of October instant, at 12 o'Clock at Noon, in order to determine whether and upon what Terms the ASSIGNEES should receive the Notes of the late WILLIAM, SAMUEL, and JOHN NEWPORT, *in payment of the Debts* due to that Firm—and whether and upon what Terms the ASSIGNEES should adjust in an amicable manner certain *Accounts* depending between the late Firm and other Members of the Family of the late Mr. WILLIAM NEWPORT—and to invest the ASSIGNEES with power to *compound Debts*, submit *Differences to Arbitration*, and commence *Suits in Equity*—and upon other very important Business relating to the Bankrupt's Estate.
Waterford, Oct. 10, 1820.

TO BE LET,
FROM THE 29TH OF SEPTEMBER NEXT,
For such Term as may be agreed upon,
Either in the Whole or in Divisions,
ABOUT 40 ACRES of the LANDS of ROCKSHIRK,
IN THE LIBERTIES OF WATERFORD,
Now in the possession of Mr. RICHARD MAGRATH.

Proposals will be received by MICHAEL DUNN, Waterford—or by BENJAMIN BALL, jun. Esq. No. 7, Frederick-Street South, Dublin; if by Letter, post-paid.
September 6, 1819.
(To be inserted on Saturdays only.)

WEST OF ENGLAND
Life and Fire Insurance Company,
ESTABLISHED IN THE CITY OF EXETER,
IN THE YEAR 1807.

CAPITAL—£600,000.

EMPOWERED BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.

THE Directors of this Office respectfully invite public attention to the distinguishing features in the Constitution of this Company.

It is supported by a numerous and opulent body of Proprietors, who have subscribed a Capital, which, with its accumulations, is *wholly invested in Government and real Securities*, in the names of the *Trustees*; and the affairs of the Company are under the management and control of a Board of Directors, of undoubted respectability; thus presenting *a pledge of an honourable fulfilment of its engagements.*

Hence, the Security offered to the Public does not depend upon the mere receipt of Premiums, nor upon anticipated revenue; and the Assured are not exposed to calls to make good the Losses of each other, as is the case in mutual Insurance Schemes.

Besides the substantial protection afforded by a subscribed and invested Capital, (without which Insurance becomes speculation,) the *assured against Fire* participate, every *Five Years*, in one-fourth part of the Profits on the Fire Insurance business of the Institution; with the important advantage of being entitled to the same share of the gain, which may accrue from the Insurance of Lives, and the grant and purchase of Annuities.

The Directors are, moreover, enabled to effect Life Insurances TEN PER CENT. lower than in the London Offices; and the rates so reduced are *lower than those of any other Office in the Kingdom.*

In extending the Company's business to Ireland, and in giving publicity to its advantages, the Directors cannot but anticipate the same liberal support and patronage from the Sister Country, which it has so generally received throughout every part of England into which it has been introduced. The success which the Directors may proudly attribute to the beneficial principle on which the Institution is founded, and to the unsullied character it has so uniformly maintained.

By Order,
WILLIAM LUMSDEN,
Quay, Waterford,
Agent for Waterford and the adjacent Districts.
15th Sept. 1820.

The Agent for Waterford, &c. begs leave to refer to the following articles, which have been extracted from the Cork Papers:—

To the Directors of the West of England Insurance Company, of Exeter.

Cork, August 3, 1820.

GENTLEMEN—We think it but justice to the Company, to make public the extremely handsome manner in which you have acted towards us, by the immediate Payment of THREE THOUSAND POUNDS British, the full amount of our claim for loss sustained by the late Fire at our Concerns on Patrick's-Quay, in this City.

To your Secretary, CHARLES LEWIS, Esq. and your Agent here, SAMUEL CROOKSHANK, Esq. we beg to return our best thanks, for the prompt attention we have experienced from them throughout this business.

Gentlemen,
We are, respectfully,
Your obliged Servants,
BURKES & HONAN.

WEST OF ENGLAND INSURANCE COMPANY.
Loken, Enniskillen, Aug. 19, 1820.

SIR—Allow me to return the Directors of your respectable Company my Thanks for the promptitude with which they have paid me THREE HUNDRED & SEVENTY POUNDS, being the amount of my claim on the Policy on the Life of the late WILLIAM GRANT, effected in April, 1819, and the usual Certificate of which only reached you the 9th of this month.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant.
J. G. PORTER.

SAM. CROOKSHANK, Esq. Agent to the West of England Fire and Life Insurance Company, Cork.

Lessee of WILLIAM HENRY HASSARD, Esq. *v.* the casual Ejector.
Lessee of Same *v.* Same.

TO BE LET, pending these Suits, and immediate possession given, all those, the several untenanted parts of the LANDS of FAITHLEGG, in the County of Waterford, lately in the possession of CORNELIUS BOLTON, Esq. and his under-Tenants. Security will be required for the Rent.

Apply to Messrs. LYTE and MORTIMER, Solicitors, Waterford.

THE Gentlemen Solicitors and Attornies are respectfully informed, that A LAW STATIONER'S-OFFICE has been opened at No. 63, SACKVILLE-STREET, corner of Henry-Street, Dublin.

The Proprietors, encouraged by the patronage of several eminent Solicitors, by whom they have been confidentially employed, beg leave to offer their Services to Gentlemen of the Profession ONLY, in the Drafting and Preparation of Pleadings, Costs, Deeds, &c. and the Conducting and general Management of Law and Equity Business, which they undertake to attend with such assiduity and care, as they trust will be found to render very considerable Advantage and Facility to the Agent, and on a plan similar to that which has secured to the Law Stationers of LONDON that confidence reposed in them by the Profession of the Sister Country.

SCRIVENERY BUSINESS
Neatly and expeditiously executed by the best hands, and carefully compared.

Professional Gentlemen in the Country may on moderate Terms have their Business conducted, and their Dublin Residence registered, at No. 63, Sackville-street, (the Dwelling-house of one of the Proprietors,) where all Commands addressed to KAVANAGH & CO. shall be punctually attended to.
Dublin, Oct. 8, 1820.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF WATERFORD.

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

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Assize) was last week 28s. 0d. per Barrel, besides an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Ranged, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

	WHITE.	RANGED.	HOUSEHOLD
	lb. oz. dr.	lb. oz. dr.	lb. oz. dr.
Penny Loaf,	0 5 6	0 8 5	0 11 2
Two-Penny,	0 11 4	1 2 2	1 6 4
Four-Penny,	1 7 1	2 2 0	2 12 7
Six-penny,	2 2 6	3 4 1	4 3 4

☞ All other Sorts of Loaves are to weigh in proportion—and besides the two initial Letters of the Baker or Maker's Name, the White Bread must be marked with a W, the Ranged with an R, and the Household with an H—and the Weight must likewise be imprinted upon each Loaf, otherwise to be seized. And the several Bakers and Dealers in Wheat, Meal, and Flour, are required to make due Weekly Returns, ON OATH, on every Wednesday, before 12 o'clock, of all Wheat, Meal, and Flour, bought or sold by them, according to the Acts of Parliament for regulating the Assize of Bread, or the Penalties will be levied according to Law.

Oct. 12. SAMUEL KING, *Mayor*

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7.

W. Carrington's evidence continued—Examined by the Peers.

Marquis of BUCKINGHAM.—Witness left the King's service in 1811, and entered into that of Sir W. Gell immediately after. Understands Italian pretty well. Had the conversation with Majocchi in Italian, which witness understood perfectly well. Majocchi said, that the servants of the Princess were determined, if they met Ompteda, to give him a good thrashing, and kill him, if they could; but that Lieutenant Hownam had forbid them to hurt him. This was all that Majocchi said about killing Ompteda.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH.—Witness stated that Ruccanelli was four miles from Rome. The house of the Princess had been a convent; the court-yard was in the middle of it.

Earl of LAUDERDALE.—Witness saw Louis Bergami, who was occupied in giving orders to the servants during the time he had the conversation with Majocchi. Had heard Majocchi mention the subject before. Witness did not recollect a servant of the name of Alesandro; never saw one of that name at Ruccanelli that he knew of.

Marquis of HUNTLEY.—Witness went to Italy in 1814; had served four years on board the *Boreas*, under Sir John Beresford.

Earl of LIVERPOOL.—Witness did not know the names of the servants at Ruccanelli; saw some of them afterwards at the Villa Grande.

Lord CARRINGTON wished to know if the witness could repeat the words used by Majocchi about killing Ompteda, and in Italian? Yes, I can.

Then do so? This is what he said, "*Lui hanno detto a me voudrez che lui lasciar me fari il mio dovere che lui vorebbe bastonare e mazzara come un cane in mezzo a la strada.*"

The House appeared to be generally satisfied with this answer; but the interpreter, the Marchese Spinetti, was asked to put a question to the witness, in Italian. This was done, and the witness translated it immediately.

Mr. John Jacob Sicard, examined by Mr. Brougham.

Entered the service of her Royal Highness about twenty-one years ago. Was appointed to her service by his present Majesty. Was at first in the capacity of cook; but in a short time afterwards was promoted to be *Maitre d'Hotel*. Went abroad with her Royal Highness in August, 1814. Remembers, when at Milan, that her Royal Highness had occasion for a courier. Sir William Gell ordered witness to hire as one, a person who was recommended by the Marquis de Gizelieghri. That person was Bergami. Had no communication whatever with her Majesty about hiring him. Recollects, when at Naples, that the sleeping room of Bergami was changed, on account of want of sufficient accommodation for the whole of the suite. A small cabinet was allotted to him. Witness made that arrangement himself, without any direction from her Royal Highness. Had no previous communication with her on the subject. His reason was, that there was a glass door in the cabinet, which opened into the garden; and he thought it right, for safety, that some male servant should sleep in it. During all the time that he has lived in the service of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, her manner towards her servants was uncommonly kind, almost to a fault. This manner was not peculiar to any of the servants, but common to them all. Witness has walked many times with her Royal Highness by her command; in the pleasure grounds of Blackheath very often. Her Royal Highness would talk very condescendingly to him, and on steps, or rising ground, would take the assistance of his arm. Sometimes, in the way of conversation, she would do him the honour to put her hand on his arm, saying, "Is it not so?" or "do you comprehend?" or, "do you understand what I mean?"—[The witness shewed by his gestures what he meant.] Has walked with her Royal Highness, on such occasions, half an hour, or a little more. Does not recollect ever walking with her Royal Highness in the garden at Naples in that manner. Recollects a masked ball given by her Royal Highness to the Court at Naples. On that occasion, Hieronymus and witness were dressed as Turks. Recollects her Royal Highness appearing on that occasion in two dresses; one was a kind of peasant's dress, and the other was a Turkish dress. Is no longer in her Majesty's service; is on pension as long as her Majesty chooses that he should receive it.—Quitted her service within the last three or four months.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.

The amount of my pension from the Princess of Wales is £400 a-year, which I had at her Majesty's pleasure entirely.

Did you leave her Royal Highness at Naples? No, she left me—*(A laugh.)* I went from thence to Genoa by sea, and from thence I came to England. I did not go to her Royal Highness again until I went to bring her information of the death of the late King. I remember stopping at the country-house previous to our arrival at Naples. I cannot tell whether on that night William Austin slept in the room of her Royal Highness. I had not made arrangements for the apartments of the suite there. The apartment allotted to Bergami at Naples had no direct communication with her Royal Highness's apartment. There were two small cabinets near the room occupied by Bergami. There was a public passage which led from Bergami's room to the bed room of her Royal Highness, and a smaller passage beyond the public passage, and running parallel with it. There was a door into that passage from Bergami's bed-room. Cannot say if there was another door leading from that passage to the Princess's room; cannot tell, unless he had the plan.

[A plan was here shewn to the witness by the Solicitor-General, on which he pointed out the different apartments, saying, that it was all right, but a door was wanting in a particular part. The Solicitor-General then withdrew the plan, saying he had shewn it to the witness merely that he might understand the question he asked him.]

Mr. Brougham observed, that as long as the Solicitor-General's plan agreed with the witness's recollection, he had been allowed to examine it and to speak to its correctness, but no sooner had he pointed out an error, saying "Here a door is wanting," than his Learned Friend hastily withdrew it.

Cross-examination resumed.—There was a communication along that passage, through the doors described, with the bed-room of her Royal Highness. No one slept there that he knew of. The door of Dr. Holland's room, and of the rooms where William Austin and Hieronymus slept, opened into the public passage. Heard that when Bergami was ill, a servant slept there, but does not know it of his own knowledge. Witness arrived at Naples in the morning; her Royal Highness arrived in the evening. It was bad weather. All the upper servants breakfasted in the steward's room at Naples; Hieronymus, myself, Dumont, Lady Elizabeth Forbes's servant, and Bergami. Will swear that Bergami mostly breakfasted at that table at Naples; but he was fond of meat in the morning, and he sometimes went to the coffee-room, for he did not like tea. At the ball at [illegible], thinks the second dress her Royal Highness had on was a Turkish dress—the first was that of a peasant. Several persons called upon the Princess at Naples, after her Royal Highness's arrival there. Cannot tell whether, on the first or second day after her arrival at Naples, persons who called were kept waiting by her Royal Highness. Did not wait at the drawing room. Does not recollect going in quest of her Royal Highness, because persons were waiting for her appearance. It might be so; things of the kind have happened in this country more than once; but had no recollection whether it took place or not at Naples. Bergami, at Naples, attended as a page in waiting, and shared that duty with Hieronymus.—He was a courier on the road, as was Hieronymus also.

You say when her Royal Highness took your arm in walking, it was principally in going up steps, or any eminence, or to call your attention to her conversation?—Yes. She was familiar with you in conversation?—Yes. You do not mean to insinuate that there was any thing further?—No; God forbid—*(A laugh.)* Witness's allowance from the Princess was not a pension, but a continuance of his salary of £300 a year. Her Royal Highness added £100 a year more to it three or four years ago, on account of his acting for Mr. Cooper. Has been on the Continent for witnesses for her Majesty; had a letter from her Majesty to take to Carlsruhe. Did not bring any witnesses to this country. Had never known Bergami before he saw him at Milan. Went out to the Continent to convey the intelligence of the death of the King to her Royal Highness, and waited for her at Leghorn.

Re-examined by Mr. Brougham.

Do you recollect in the passage mentioned as leading from the Princess's room whether there was a water-closet? Yes, there was a small place (not exactly a water-closet) which was used for that purpose.

To whom did you carry the letter to Carlsruhe? To Mr. Leman; it was a letter to the Great Chamberlain, sealed by her Majesty.

Examined by the Lords.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH.—When Bergami was taken into her R. Highness's service, witness did not make inquiry as to his character. He was introduced by a Marquis, whose recommendation was thought sufficient. His behavior was superior to that of most Couriers? He was not quite so chatty as Italians generally are; and I believe he behaved very properly. Cannot say that his behaviour was particularly gentlemanly. He never shewed himself that way. He never refused to do anything he was told to do—*(A laugh.)*

Examined by Lords DONOUGHMORE and CATHCART. Witness stated, that none of Bergami's family were in the service of the Queen when he went to Naples. Witness hired Bergami as *valet de chambre* and courier, and left him in that capacity. The apartments of the Queen, while at Naples, were near those of witness. A large passage or corridor separated them.

To a question from Lord GRANTHAM, witness stated, that William Austin had usually slept in the room of the Queen previous to her going to Naples. Soon after their arrival there her Majesty said he was too old, and must have a separate apartment.

Earl of DARLINGTON.—Did you ever see any improper familiarity on the part of the Queen towards Bergami? Never, never, I am positive I never did. Witness further stated, that he was the bearer of the despatch to her Majesty announcing the death of our late Sovereign. He was sent by her Majesty's legal advisers; no despatch, announcing the event, was sent by Ministers. While the Queen resided at Naples, she never breakfasted alone with Bergami; will not say positively that it never did happen, but believes it never did.

To questions from the Lords KINGSTON, ENNISKILLEN, and LAUDERDALE, witness stated, that he recollected the Princess going to the Opera at Naples on the second night of her arrival, but did not know at what time she returned. Never saw Bergami until he was recommended to him by the Marquis Gizelieghri. Did not know whether he was a married man at the time or not. Witness had leave of her Majesty to return to England, but was ordered to hold himself in readiness to join her.

The Earl of HARROWBY asked a number of unimportant questions respecting the position of the rooms at Naples.

The Marquis of BUCKINGHAM and Lord CALTHORPE next examined the witness, who stated, that a person, to go from the Queen's room, while at Naples, to that of Bergami, must pass the doors of the rooms of Dr. Holland, and other persons. That Bergami's manners were far superior to those of the same class of servants.

Mr. Brougham wished the Lord Chancellor to ask witness if there were any doors in the public passage leading from the room of the Princess to that of Bergami? Yes, there were two.

Have you not observed, in the course of twenty-one years' service, that the Princess was particularly fond of young children? Yes.

The witness was ordered to withdraw, and it being a quarter past four o'clock, the House adjourned.

By the Earl of ENNISKILLEN.—What was the hour of the night at which the Queen returned from the Opera?—It was very late, and she was very tired; I believe it was about one o'clock. (*Hear, hear!*)

You describe that the Queen was dressed, on one occasion, in a robe resembling a Grecian female; I wish to know whether that robe could be put over any other dress she had on that night, without undressing?—Not only it could, but it must be so; and I recollect the dress her Majesty had underneath; it was perfectly plain, it came up to the neck, was very short, and had no train.

By the Earl of LAUDERDALE.—Did you attend the Princess at Villa Grande and Ruccanelli?—I was a few days at Ruccanelli, and afterwards came to Villa Grande, where I resided two months, July and August, 1817.

Do you remember whether Louis Bergami was there?—He certainly was, some part of the time.

Do you remember whether any other persons of the Bergami family were at Ruccanelli or Villa Grande?—The Countess of Oldi, who, I understood, was sister to Bergami.

Do you remember any other?—Not at this moment.

Was there another sister, named Faustina?—Not that I ever heard of. I never saw her, knowing her either to be Faustina or sister to Bergami.

Did Louis Bergami dine at table with the Princess, at Villa Grande? Sometimes.

Did you see Bergami's mother?—Never, to my knowledge.

Then you do not recollect to have seen in the Princess's service any other relations of his family but Louis and the Countess Oldi?—I recollect no others.

By the Earl of ROSEBERRY.—You have said, Sir William Gell, that you observed that her Royal Highness wore a short dress under that of a Grecian female; was that the dress of her former character? It must have been so, for she had not time to change it.

I refer to the dress which you described as coming up high in the neck, and without a train, which the Princess wore under the Grecian robe; and I wish to know whether that was the dress she wore in her first character? It must have been so, because I was waiting at the door, and saw the robe of a Grecian female put on over the short dress, and I saw her Royal Highness come down in that dress, and she had not time to have changed her dress.

By a PEER.—When Bergami dined at the table of the Princess, at what part of the table did he sit?—Generally on the left hand of her Royal Highness.

Next to her Royal Highness? Sometimes, and sometimes not.

Did Sir William Gell sit on the right hand of her Royal Highness? Generally, when there was no company—it was a square table, and Bergami sat round the corner.

When other company was present, did Bergami continue to sit in the same place? Just as it happened, according to the rank of the company.

By Viscount FALMOUTH.—Sir William Gell has stated that Luigi Bergami has dined at the table of her Royal Highness when Sir William Gell was present; how often did that happen? Several times.

I wish also to ask Sir William Gell what situation Luigi Bergami held on her Royal Highness's establishment at that time? I believe that of equerry.

Where did he sit when he so formed part of the company? At the lower end of the table.

By the LORD CHANCELLOR, at the instance of the SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—When the Princess appeared in the Turkish dress, did she not wear trowsers? I happen to know what the trowsers were, and I beg to explain them. (*Explain, explain.*)—They are very much like the common petticoat, sewed slightly between the legs at the bottom; such as are very often worn in the Levant.

At the instance of Mr. WILLIAMS.—When you saw the Princess and Bergami walking on the terrace, could they not be seen by persons in the surrounding houses, as well as in the house to which it belonged? Yes, from every house in the neighbourhood.

By Lord BROWNLOW.—When the Princess went up stairs to change her dress, had she any attendant to assist her, and who was it? To say the truth, she had a great number of attendants: the door was opened and shut by every body who went in and out of the room.

Was she attended by Demont? I do not remember. I dare say she was.

Do you believe that Bergami was there?

Mr. BROUGHAM was unwilling to interpose, but he wished the question to be put, not as a matter of belief, but of actual knowledge.

Do you know whether Bergami was there? I do not.

By Lord FALMOUTH.—You said that on one occasion you saw Bergami and the Queen walking together on the terrace. I wish to know whether they were arm in arm?

Mr. BROUGHAM said, that the witness had already stated that they were not walking arm in arm, but behind each other, as far distant as the witness and Mr. Parke.

Lord FALMOUTH would not press the question if it had been already answered.

By the Earl of LAUDERDALE.—Do you recollect Bergami being ill at Ruccanelli? I do not.

You were not at Ruccanelli all the time the Princess was there? I was not.

The witness was then ordered to withdraw, and as it was four o'clock, the House adjourned.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7.

The Lord Chancellor entered the House at seven minutes before ten o'clock. The usual forms were gone through.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN requested that the Interpreters should be called on to prove the translation of the correspondence between Guiseppi Mariettі and his father.

The Marchese Spinetto and Beneditto Cohen appeared at the bar, were sworn, and delivered in translations of the correspondence.

The Counsel were then called in.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL suggested that perhaps Lady Charlotte Lindsay was in attendance to give the explanation required of her Ladyship yesterday. If so, it would be a considerable relief to her Ladyship to receive that explanation at once.

Mr. BROUGHAM said, that Lady Charlotte Lindsay was not in attendance, or he would have been happy to have availed himself of his Lordship's kindness.

William Carrington was then sworn and examined by Dr. Lushington.

In what situation of life are you?—I am Sir Wm. Gell's valet.

How long have you been in that situation?—Nine years.

What situation were you in before?—This is my first situation as a servant.

In what situation were you before?—I was in the navy, as a Midshipman.

Did you attend Sir Wm. Gell in the latter end of the year 1814, at Naples?—I did.

Did you live in the house of the Princess of Wales? I did.

Do you remember Bergami coming into the service of the Princess?—I do.

In what capacity?—As a courier.

Did his coming into the service of the Princess as courier excite any jealousy?—I never heard of any.

Was there any jealousy observable among the servants after his (Bergami's) coming into the service as courier? I never saw any.

Do you remember the first night that the Princess arrived at Naples? Yes.

Do you recollect where Bergami slept that night? I do. In a small room over the Steward Sicard's room.

Did Bergami sleep in the same room the second night? He did not.

Do you know the reason why his room was changed? It was because the room was so low that he could not stand upright in it. (Bergami is between 6 and 7 feet high.)

Do you remember the room to which he removed? I do.

How near was it to the room in which her Royal Highness slept? About 60 feet distant.

Were there any other rooms between the chamber of Bergami and that of her Royal Highness? There were three rooms and a passage between.

Can you tell who occupied those three rooms?—Mr. Austin occupied the first, Hieronymus the second, and Dr. Holland the third.

Do I understand you rightly that those three rooms intervened between the chambers of Bergami and her Royal Highness? Yes, all of them.

Did any of those three rooms open into the passage? Yes.

Do you remember being at a masked ball given by the Princess at Naples? I do.

Do you recollect the servants appearing at that ball in any particular dress? No, I do not.

Did you yourself wait on that occasion? I did.

Did you travel in the suite of her Royal Highness on her going to Naples? I did.

Do you remember W. Austin on the journey? I do.

Can you say where Austin usually slept before your arrival at Naples? In a room by himself when there was room; when there was not, he slept in the room of her R. Highness.

Do you know Majocchi? I do.

Did you ever see him at Ruccanelli? I did.

Did you ever hear him mention the name of one Baron Ompteda? Yes.

What did you hear him say? ——

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL objected to any evidence of conversation which took place between Majocchi and Ompteda, because Majocchi's evidence had not proved that there had been any such conversation. Before he could allow the question, he called on the other side to shew that there was evidence of any such conversation in the testimony of Majocchi.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said, that before his Learned Friend could be allowed to examine the witness with respect to a collateral issue with a view to contradicting the evidence of Majocchi, he ought to point out the evidence so to be contradicted.

Dr LUSHINGTON trusted that he should be able perfectly to satisfy their Lordships that the question ought to be put. It was contended that any inquiry as to Majocchi's intercourse was a collateral question with respect to the issue of the main proceeding, and that no evidence could be offered of conversation between the witness and Majocchi respecting what might have taken place between Majocchi and Ompteda. Was it possible to contend that any fact respecting the conduct of Ompteda, who had been acting as a spy upon her R. Highness—who had been engaged in corrupting her servants—who had suborned witnesses—who had picked the locks and robbed the most secret depositories in which her Majesty kept her papers—was it possible, he asked, to contend, that in an inquiry affecting the character and life of her Majesty, and which no less affected the Crown and the Country, that the facts respecting such conduct as he had described was not material to the inquiry before their Lordships?

Lord REDESDALE ordered the Counsel to withdraw. Counsel could have no right to make such statements as had been just advanced, without furnishing any evidence of their truth.

Earl GREY, if he understood the Attorney General's argument rightly, he conceived that the Counsel for the Queen was answering that objection in the most direct manner, and in that event the Learned Counsel had not exceeded his limits in reply.

Lord REDESDALE contended, that there ought to be an assurance that evidence would be adduced.

The LORD CHANCELLOR hoped for their Lordships' confidence in the sincerity of the opinion which he was about to give. But he must say, that it was the first time he had ever heard it proposed to prove by a third party what had passed in a conversation between a former witness and another person, that former witness not having shewn that there was any such conversation at all.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE referred their Lordships to several pages in the minutes, in which Majocchi had been examined with respect to his intercourse with Baron Ompteda.

Lord ERSKINE suggested that the Counsel at the bar should refer to the pages of the evidence.

After a few words from the Earl of Lauderdale and Lord Erskine, Counsel were again ordered to be called in.

Dr. LUSHINGTON advanced to the bar, and said, that when their Lordships were pleased to stop the argument, he was about to add, that he never could have conceived that the declaration of Majocchi made to the witness was evidence of what the Baron Ompteda had said or done. But to shew that the conduct of Ompteda was not collateral, but a direct point in issue, he was about to state what in a subsequent stage of the proceeding they might find it necessary to prove, that such plots did exist, which would explain the conduct of her Royal Highness, which had laid her open to imputations, from being always accompanied by one person, but they would shew the necessity of her having one about her *upon whose fidelity she could depend*. He contended that this was evidence, because Majocchi had denied the existence of that plot altogether, and therefore that part of his evidence was open to contradiction from their side. He was asked, "Did you see a person named Ompteda?" and answered, "I do not recollect the name." Was it not therefore material to shew that the Baron had been the subject of his repeated conversations? It was of the highest importance to the credit of Majocchi that that testimony should be listened to. He was also asked, "Had any thing happened in the Princess's family particular?" "I do not remember." "Any locksmith employed or examined?" "I do not remember."—"Did he recollect any thing about false keys?" "That I do not remember."—"Was there any mention in the family of such circumstances?" "That I do not remember." "Was there any thing about a quarrel?" "There was something about a quarrel, but he did not remember what it was"—and then followed a long series of *Non mi ricordos*. He apprehended that it was open to him to shew the contradiction in that witness's testimony without any contravention of the rules of evidence. The existence of the plot tended to explain and justify the conduct of her Majesty. The witness denied all knowledge of that plot. He contended that the testimony now offered did away with that part of the evidence, and left the case *rectus in curia*. He did not contend that he should establish any facts declared by Majocchi. All that he wished was to remove the impression of his former perjury. It might be said indeed that he was labouring in a work of supererogation in attempting to detract from that credit which had long ceased to exist.

Mr. BROUGHAM followed on the same side, and pointed out to their Lordships' attention some parts of Majocchi's evidence not referred to by Dr Lushington, shewing more clearly the relevancy of the inquiry in which his Learned Friend had been interrupted. He thought it strange, that whenever any question was put about this Baron Ompteda, his Majesty's Counsel should invariably oppose it with all their might, *per fas aut nefas*.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied. He animadverted in warm terms on the style of argument invariably pursued by the Learned Gentlemen on the opposite side. They had no right to say that the credit of Majocchi was completely destroyed; that still remained to be shewn by the course of the case. In the Courts below such a course of examination could never be permitted, for it was a well-known established principle, that a question must be previously put to the witness whose evidence an attempt was made to destroy, before another witness could be examined as to any conversation, and for the best of reasons, that an opportunity might be afforded of explaining all the circumstances of that conversation. All he could say was, that no evidence at all had been given relative to Baron Ompteda in the case for the Bill, and therefore the Learned Counsel had no right to examine on that subject. Slanders and calumnies innumerable certainly had been heaped upon the memory of the Baron.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said that it was not established upon any principle of law, that a witness, in defence, could be questioned upon a conversation which had not been treated of in the former part of the case.

Lord ERSKINE said he considered it a privilege of the Counsel for the Defence, not only to refer to what the witness Majocchi had said, but to accompany it with such comments as appeared to them necessary to the Defence. The House were to look at what Majocchi had said; and the Learned Counsel proposed to shew from the conversation between Majocchi and the witness, that his evidence was false. The House were bound to hear it.

Mr. BROUGHAM wished simply to state his proposition. It was past all doubt that nothing that Majocchi had said could be evidence of what Ompteda had done; but Majocchi having said, in answer to five or six questions—"I do not remember," and in answer to two questions—"I do not know," he wished to ask this witness whether Majocchi not only remembered what he had denied, but whether he must not have remembered the circumstance in all its details—that, in fact, it was of such a nature that it could not be forgotten. Nay, that he had told such things as made it perfectly clear that he had an accurate knowledge of every thing connected with the circumstance. He (Mr. Brougham) contended, that Majocchi having sworn that he was ignorant of certain things, the proof must be permitted to be given of the contrary, for he was the very person who had told those things to the witness.—The Attorney-General had admitted that if any question had been asked Majocchi, as to the conversation about Baron Ompteda, there would arise a right to examine other witnesses to that subject. How, then, could the permission be refused, when the evidence of the present witness would go to prove that he was cognizant of facts, the knowledge of which he had denied. To prove his right to examine to this point, he was not only supported by the authority of what had taken place before their Lordships in the case of the Duchess of Kingston, but by the case of Eliza Canning, at the Old Bailey, in which it was ruled, that a Counsel was not to be limited to any particularity in his endeavour to prove the falsehood of an evidence. It would be desirable to put it to the Judges whether, a witness having sworn to his ignorance of certain facts, Counsel should not be allowed to prove that he was acquainted with them. Suppose that he asked a witness whether he knew that A. B. picked locks, and was turned out of the house for it? and that that witness said he knew nothing of it—would he not be allowed to prove that the witness was present when the locks were picked? He (Mr. Brougham) could prove, that Majocchi was present when that fact took place. There could be no hesitation then as to his knowledge of that which he said he was ignorant of. It would be a powerful contradiction to him (Majocchi), that he had told to some one, who had previously known nothing of them, facts of which he had sworn his ignorance. If the question had been put to Majocchi which, *ex consensis*, on all hands would have entitled Counsel to examine upon the conversation, how could the privilege be denied when it was considered that the reason that questions had not been asked was, that they did not know whom it might be necessary to call and what it might be necessary to contradict.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, the argument of the Learned Counsel was merely a repetition of what had been said before; and argued against the right to ask the question in the present state of the case in nearly the same terms he had used before. The Learned Gentleman continued, in a tone of great warmth, to argue against the question. If Majocchi had been examined as to the conversation with Carrington, then it would have been permitted to the Learned Counsel on the opposite side to examine their own witness on the subject. But that conversation could not be sought for until Majocchi had either acknowledged or denied it. And they must have the denial of Majocchi before they attempted to impeach him on that point.

Lord ERSKINE wished their Lordships to be guided as much as possible by the rules of evidence admitted in common law. But if, in a trial like this, where a list of witnesses was refused to the Counsel for her Majesty, they learnt some important facts with which they were unacquainted at the time of the cross-examination, was the truth, then, still to lay undiscovered?—Certainly not. Majocchi might be called to confront the witness. He had seen this practice adopted more than once in the Courts below. He, as a Peer of that House, would contend that the evidence was admissible.

The LORD CHANCELLOR was always glad to hear the Counsel on both sides argue a disputed point, before their Lordships gave their decision. He had himself little experience in the rules of evidence. But he conceived they could not admit the evidence of any witness to a particular circumstance to contradict a general assertion of another witness, unless that witness should be examined as to that particular fact. He, therefore, would recommend, that the subject of discussion should be put in the form of two questions to the Judges; and that they should state their opinion how far it was the practice of the Courts below.

Earl GREY, much as he respected the opinions of the Learned Judges, would not admit them as bound. He thought the best course would be, that Majocchi should be called in, and the question put to him, which, if it had been put in cross-examination, would, as admitted by the Counsel for the prosecution, have entitled the Counsel for the Queen to pursue the course of examination they were doing, when interrupted.

After some further observations—

The LORD CHANCELLOR wished to know from the Counsel on both sides if they had any objection to Majocchi's being called in.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he felt considerable difficulty. Majocchi had been three times cross-examined, and the Learned Counsel had declined any further cross-examination of him. If this course was to be adopted, it might be applied to every witness.

The LORD CHANCELLOR interrupted the Learned Gentleman, and said, he did not wish him to argue the point, but merely state whether he agreed to Majocchi being called or not.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, he could not consent to Majocchi being called.

The question was then put to the Judges, who withdrew to consult upon it.

Mr. BROUGHAM suggested, that as Lady Charlotte Lindsay was in attendance, it would save the time of the House if she was now called in.

Lady Charlotte Lindsay was then called to the bar of the House, and stated, in reply to questions from the Lord Chancellor and the Earl of Lauderdale, that she had searched for the Letter, but had not found it, and believed it was not in existence. She had no distinct recollection of the general terms of it, further than a wish that she should resign her situation, and stating some pecuniary arrangements consequent on it. Could not recollect whether her brother assigned any reason for his advice; but she had some indistinct idea, that the reports already mentioned might have been stated in the letter. The reports alluded to were those which, in answer to a question from a Noble Lord, she mentioned yesterday—reports of an unpleasant nature, which induced her to wish to leave her situation.

Lord ERSKINE.—Does your Ladyship mean those reports which were inconsistent with your own observations? Question objected to.

John Whitcombe was then sworn, and examined by Mr. Tyndall.

He stated that he was valet to the Hon. Keppel Craven; that he had been in his service six or seven years; went with the Princess to Naples; did not recollect the room Bergami slept in the first night. This witness perfectly recollected where Bergami's second bed room was—it was at the end of the passage looking into the garden, and her Royal Highness's was at the other end of the passage; William Austin slept in the room next her Royal Highness, Hieronymus in the next room to him, and Doctor Holland in the adjoining room. These three rooms lay on the same side of the passage. There was a door from the room of Hieronymus that opened into the passage. The door of Dr. Holland's room opened into another passage towards the dining room. Dr. Holland's room was at the corner of the two passages. Bergami's room did not open into that passage. Demont slept in a room over that of Doctor Holland. Has been in that room frequently, late as well as early. Demont generally invited him to go there. Another female servant of the house was sometimes present, but has been alone with Demont in the room very frequently. On some occasions when thus alone with her, the door was locked and bolted.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL here interfered. He said, that the object of this course of examination must be evident to their Lordships, and surely no argument was necessary to shew that it was illegitimate.

Mr. DENMAN.—My Lords, we will not pursue it.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—You have pushed it as far as you possibly could.—(*A laugh.*)

Examination resumed.—Recollects the masked ball given at Naples. Part of the servants were dressed in character; Sicard, Bergami, and Hieronimus, after the Turkish fashion. Saw Bergami, in the latter part of the evening, in his plain clothes. He was walking about the rooms, and at times assisting in handing about refreshments. Was at Naples all the time the Princess was there. Bergami conducted himself towards the Princess in the same way as the rest of the servants—as they all did.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.—From a long series of questions about the position of the rooms, unnecessary to be repeated, it appeared that besides the passage common to the rooms of the Princess, Dr. Holland, Hieronimous, Wm. Austin, and Bergami, there was another parallel passage, by which Bergami could go to the room of the Princess, without passing the room doors of Dr. Holland, &c.

The witness being ordered to withdraw.

Lord ERSKINE rose, and requested the attention of their Lordships to that part of De Mont's evidence which related to her sleeping alone at Naples. She had sworn that she had slept alone "every night"—"The whole night"—"Alone"—"All alone;" and that she did not recollect where Mr. Keppel Craven's servant slept on any one night, while at Naples. His Lordship wished that the witness Whitcombe should be recalled, and asked whether he passed any night, or part of a night, in the room of De Mont when she was there and in bed?

The Solicitor-General submitted to their Lordships, that the question was one which ought not to be put. It was attempting to do that circuitously and by a side wind, which could not have been done directly. The object of it was to fix the guilt of a certain connection on De Mont; and it, as he submitted to be quite clear, De Mont could not have been asked to criminate herself, it was incompetent by questions to another witness to come at the same result.

Lord ERSKINE vindicated his right to put the question. A witness might be asked a question which he was not bound to answer, but nothing could prevent Counsel from putting it. His Lordship when at the Bar had once tendered a Bill of Exceptions on this very point, and though the Bill had not been argued, as the cause it referred to was of no importance, it had ever since been regarded as a settled rule of practice, that Counsel might put questions to a witness, tending to criminate that witness, leaving it in the option of the witness to answer them or not. When De Mont was asked whether she had slept alone, no objection was taken to the relevancy of the inquiry; and his Lordship could not see how it was now irrelevant to ascertain wheher the answer she gave to that question was true or false.

The LORD CHANCELLOR observed, that when he first entered into practice at the Bar, the rule was, that when a question was put to a witness, the answer to which might criminate that witness, the Judge put the witness on his guard; but more recently the practice had been altered, and it was now usual to allow a criminatory question to be put, leaving it to the witness to determine for himself whether he should answer it or not. At the same time, it was equally a settled rule of practice, that if a witness was asked a question, tending to fix on him the guilt of some offence, and if he answered by a denial, it was not afterwards competent to prove by other witnesses that he was guilty. By appealing to the witness's own testimony, the right to resort to any other testimony was for ever and completely abandoned. The only difficulty, therefore, which remained in the present case, was, to determine whether the questions put to De Mont, as to her sleeping alone, necessarily involved the imputation of an impure connection? If they did, then, in his Lordship's opinion, the question proposed by his Noble and Learned Friend (Lord Erskine) could not be put.

Lord LIVERPOOL said, that it was possible to reconcile the evidence of De Mont and that of Mr. Craven's servant. She had sworn that *no one had slept with her*. Now that was quite possible, for *a person might have had criminal intercourse with her without having slept with her*. [A laugh, which continued for some time.]

Some observations were made by Lords Redesdale, Erskine, and Lauderdale, but it was impossible to hear them in consequence of the mirth excited by Lord Liverpool's last words.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said it was evident that a question had been put to De Mont, for the purpose of ascertaining whether she had lived an immoral life. No witness could be called to contradict the denial she had given. He hoped the Counsel for the Defence would not permit an answer to be given to any disputed question until the sense of the House was taken upon it.

The examination was then resumed.

In the Queen's house at Naples, slept in the room next to the Hon. Keppel Craven's, the whole of the three nights; that is, after he went to bed. Went to bed at twelve o'clock. Never went to any other bed from his own during the night? After these three nights he went to lodgings? Never slept in the Queen's house afterwards. When first he entered into the service of Mr. Keppel Craven, it was at Brandenburgh-house, about six years ago. Spoke a little French at the time, as much as to make himself understood. Was at Pesaro fifteen months ago. Bergami and Austin came to the lodgings of Mr. Craven. Witness shewed Bergami into the room himself. Bergami spoke to witness when he was coming up stairs, and pressed his hand. After having gone from the house in which he first was, witness frequently has been in De Mont's bed-room. Did not see any body there but Annette, that he recollected. Witness was ordered to withdraw.

The Judges having returned,

The Lord Chief Justice rose and stated, that the opinion of him and his Learned Brothers upon the question submitted to them was in the negative. If the power of examining evidence of the nature alluded to was allowed, the person whose testimony it was meant to affect would be deprived of the most important opportunity of saving himself. In the Courts below, it would be permitted to the Counsel rather to call back an evidence, and so far break in upon the ordinary rules, than to violate so important a principle.

After a few words from Lord Holland, the Lord Chancellor, and Lord Liverpool,

Majocchi was called in.

There was a general buz in the House when this celebrated character appeared, and the strangers below the Bar pressed forward to see him.

Examined by Mr. Brougham.

Do you recollect, at the Ruccanelli, having seen William Carrington, the servant of Sir William Gell? *Questo non mi ricordo!*—(*Laughter above and below the Bar.*)

Do you recollect having seen Sir William Gell's English servant near Rome any where? "QUESTO NON MI RICORDO!" [In a low sigh—General laughter in the House.]

Do you remember having seen Sir Wm. Gell's servant any where? I have seen him, I think, at Rome, but not at Ruccanelli.

Did you ever tell him that Baron Ompteda had employed any one to get the keys of the Princess at Como, in order to get others made? QUESTO NON.

Did you ever tell that servant anything to that effect? I never have spoken of this.

Did you ever tell him that a person who had been employed for the aforesaid purpose by Ompteda, had confessed to the Police such employment, and been discharged in consequence? I never had any such conversation.

Did you ever tell him that if the Princess had not ordered her servants to take no notice of the conduct of Ompteda, you yourself would have killed him like a dog? I never said any such thing. These things are quite new to me.

Did you ever speak to him of the villainy and ingratitude of Ompteda, after having so long eaten and drank in the Princess's house, and complain of his having brought suspicion on the servants? Never.

Did you ever talk of Ompteda to the English servant of Sir William Gell, by name? Never.

Did you ever hold any conversation with Sir William Gell's servant respecting the conduct of Ompteda? No, I never spoke to him about it.

William Carrington called in, and his examination resumed by Dr. Lushington.

What did Majocchi say to you respecting Ompteda? He told me that Baron Ompteda, while on a visit to the Princess of Wales, had employed the postilion and chambermaid to procure the keys of her Royal Highness's room.

Did Majocchi tell you that Ompteda employed persons to get the keys? Yes, to procure the keys of the Princess's room at Como, to get false ones made.

Did he tell you that a person in the Princess's family had been so employed, and discharged in consequence? He did.

Did Majocchi say, if Ompteda had so applied to him, he would have killed him like a dog? Yes, he did.

Did he say Ompteda had made the servants suspected? He did.

Did he frequently mention the name of Ompteda? He did.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.

I had this conversation with Majocchi in the coach-yard of the Villa Ruccanelli. No other person was present. I came there accidentally, not having anything particular to do. It was in July, 1817, about an hour before our setting out for Rome. I was at Ruccanelli part of two days and one night. I was at Rome two months.—Majocchi went to Rome the same day. When I had the conversation with Majocchi, he was preparing the carriage. Several of the Princess's people were about, but I do not know their names. The subject was the talk of the house at the time. Majocchi began the conversation by saying, "Have you heard of the affair of Ompteda?" I said I had heard something about it.—He then went over it. He had before mentioned it in the servants' hall, when eight or ten of the livery servants were present, but I do not know the names of any except Francisco. I am not very positive that this was in 1817, but I believe it was. When the Princess was at the Villa Grande, Sir Wm. Gell did not sleep there, but at the Hotel de l'Europe, about a mile and a half or two miles distant. Sir Wm. dined with the Princess almost every day, and returned in the evening.

Re-examined by Dr. Lushington.

After I left Naples I saw the Princess of Wales twice at Rome. I did not hear of Ompteda the first time. Had no conversation with the servants, and never dined with them.

(*Left under examination by the Peers.*)

The Waterford Chronicle.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12.

There is no foreign intelligence to interfere with other subjects of interest.

On Saturday, we shall attend to the Report of the proceedings of the Lismore Agricultural Society, to Charitable Acknowledgments, &c.

MILITIA OF IRELAND.—The Irish Government has issued an Order, dated the 7th of October, to the following purport—Referring to the 39th Section of the Act of the 49th Geo. 3d, Chapter 120, his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant does not consider it expedient, that the Militia of Ireland should be called out, trained, and exercised, for the period thereby prescribed in the course of the current year. It will, consequently, be unnecessary, that the general meetings and other proceedings, directed by the same clause, should be brought into operation within the present month.

ORPHAN INSTITUTION, JOHN'S HILL.—We beg leave to call the particular attention of the Public to this Charity, which, we have reason to think, is conducted in the best possible manner, and has been productive of the most solid benefits. We have only time at present to express our hope, that the Meeting, which is to take place this day (see Advertisement), will be numerously attended, and the list of Benefactors and Subscribers considerably augmented.

LISMORE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

The October Meeting of this Society was held at Lismore on Thursday, the 5th instant, when a Show of Cattle and a Ploughing Match took place. The ground which was selected for the ploughing was admirably adapted for the purpose. At 12 o'clock, lots having been previously drawn, twenty-one Ploughs started, remarkably well-appointed in every respect, and each Ploughman finished the half rood of ground assigned to him in a reasonable time, and in a very superior manner.

Captain CROKER, R. N. ARTHUR KEILY, Esq. and JOHN HUDSON, Esq. having been appointed Judges, after a careful inspection, made the following adjudication of the Premiums:—

FIRST CLASS.

To *Michael Bryan*, Ploughman to STEPHEN MOORE, Esq. of Sapperton, the *First Premium*.

To *Denis Allen*, Ploughman to WILLIAM MOORE, Esq. of Moore-hill, the *Second Premium*.

To *Daniel Connor*, Ploughman to WILLIAM MOORE, Esq. the *Third Premium*.

SECOND CLASS.	£	s.	d.
To *Patrick Egan*, of Agglish, Tenant to HENRY A. BUSHE, Esq. the *First Premium*—an *Ayrshire Iron Plough*, value	6	0	0
To *John Keeffe*, of Clashneganiffe, Tenant to his Grace the DUKE of DEVONSHIRE, the *Second Premium*—a *Double Harrow*, value	3	0	0
To *John Allen*, of Parkdota, Tenant to WILLIAM MOORE, Esq. the *Third Premium*—a *Pair of Winker Bridles*, value	1	10	0
To *John Mulcahy*, of Curryheen, Tenant to his Grace the DUKE of DEVONSHIRE, the *Fourth Premium*, in value	1	0	9
To *Maurice Collins*, of Curryheen, Tenant to the same, for bringing into the Field the most approved Plough and Harness, in value	3	0	0

The Judges for Cattle were—the Very Rev. Dean SCOTT, the Rev. Mr. DICKSON, THOMAS M'GWIRE and WM. SMITH, Esqrs. who, after an attentive examination, awarded the following Premiums, viz.—

To *Stephen Moore, Esq.* of Sapperton, for the best Holderness Bull, having served 20 Cows gratis during the season, a *Silver Cup*, value	5	13	9
To *John Power, Esq.* of Mount Rivers, for the best Heifer, under 3 years old, in value	3	8	3
To the *Duke of Devonshire's Steward*, for the best Sow, in value	2	0	0
To *Patrick Leahy*, of Fountain, Working Farmer, for a well-bred Heifer, in value	1	0	0

The Judges for Green Crops awarded the following Premiums in the Barony of Coshmore and Coshbride:—

To *Michael Finn*, of Ballymartin, Tenant to his Grace the DUKE of DEVONSHIRE, for the best and largest quantity of drilled Potatoes, in value	5	0	0
To *William Long*, of Parkdota, Tenant to WILLIAM MOORE, Esq. the second best, in value	3	0	0
To *William Doran*, of Curryheen, Tenant to J. BAGGE, Esq. the third best, in value	2	0	0

And in the Barony of Kinnataloon:—

To *John Galahue*, of Carrigeen, Tenant to HENRY PRARD, Esq. for the best and largest quantity of drilled Potatoes, in value	5	0	0
To *John Keeffe*, of Clashneganiffe, Tenant to his Grace the DUKE of DEVONSHIRE, the second best, in value	3	0	0
To *William Patterson*, of Knocknegapple, Tenant to the same, for the largest and best crop of Red Clover, in value	3	0	0
To *William Connell*, of Carrigmore, Tenant to RICHARD POWER, Esq. for the largest and best crop of Vetches, in value	3	0	0
To *Anthony O'Neill*, of Booladorough, Tenant to His Grace the DUKE of DEVONSHIRE, for the largest and best Crop of Turnips	3	0	0

The Meeting was attended by all the Gentlemen of Property in the Western part of the County, who, after the business of the day, dined together at the Devonshire Arms, Lismore.

HENRY WITHAM, *Secretary*.

WATERFORD MARKETS.—Light supplies and no alteration. Butter (1st), 78s. Prime Wheat, 23s. to 23s. 6d. Best Potato Oats, 9s. to 9s. 3d. Shipping Barley, 9s. to 9s. 6d. Malting do. 9s. 6d. to 10s. Bacon Pigs, 28s. to 29s.; over heavy do. 25s. to 26s.

BIRTH.—A few days since, in Ross, the Lady of Henry Loftus Tottenham, Esq. of a daughter.

MARRIED.—On the 30th ult. at Clonfad, the seat of her father, Martin Browne, Esq. in the County of Roscommon, Mrs. Dillon, widow of the late Capt. Jas. P. Dillon, of the 101st Regiment, to Robert Francis Sargent, Esq. son of Thomas Sargent, of this City, Esq.

DIED. On Tuesday evening, after a tedious illness, borne with truly Christian resignation to the Divine Will, Mrs. Max, wife of Simon Max, Esq.

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE, OCT. 11.

ARRIVED,

6th—Eleanor, Ellis, London, ballast; Dash, Webster, Portsmouth, do. for Ross; Fame, Maxwell, Dublin, ballast, for Cardiff; Peace, Browning, Liverpool, coals; Industry, White, Swansea, do.

7th—Avon, Wallis, Ilfracombe, ballast; Kitty, Gibbons, Liverpool, rock-salt and hides; William, Boadle, Whitehaven, coals; Lady Montgomery, Hamilton, Dublin, ballast; Union, Lethaby, Liverpool, coals; Friends, Brown, do. do.

8th—Neptune, Forder, Portsmouth, ballast; Alfred, Maine, Swansea, coals.

9th—Gratitude, Jenkins, do. culm; Ocean, Chalacombe, Newport, coals; Speculation, Gains, Southampton, ballast; Providence, Bolt, Falmouth, ditto; Linnet, Waddle, Rye, hops; Harford, Walters, Swansea, coals; Regent, Bond, Newhaven, ballast; Hebe, Carder, Swansea, culm; Success, Devereux, Liverpool, m. goods; Expedition, Stacey, Bristol, m. goods; Rose, Thomas, Llanelly, coals, for Ross; Traveller, Carr, Jamaica, rum, sugar, hides, coffee, &c. for Whitehaven; Providence, Brokenshaw, Swansea, coals, for Ross.

10th—Pursuit, Harris, Milford, ballast; William, Carter, Weymouth, do.

11th—Elizabeth, Atwool, Weymouth, ballast, for Ross; Thetis, Vernon, Liverpool, coals; Aurora, Griffiths, Liverpool, do.

SAILED,

6th—None.

7th—Jane, Austin, Shoreham, butter; Industry, Adams, from Lyme, Chester, ballast.

8th—Prudent, Buchanan, Portsmouth, Southampton, and Chichester, butter and bacon; Marygold, Kean, from Campbeltown, Dublin, herrings.

9th—London, Foss, London, butter and bacon; Blessing, Wallis, London, butter.

10th—Prosperous, Mitchell, Southampton, Portsmouth, and Cowes, butter, bacon, &c.; Amity, Privett, London, wheat.

11th—Wind N. E. at 8 morning.

TO BE SOLD BY PUBLIC AUCTION,

ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1820,

AND FOLLOWING DAYS,

THE VALUABLE LIBRARY of JAMES ROCHE, Esq. (late Banker, Cork,) consisting of NEW and OLD BOOKS, generally in unexceptionable condition, in the ancient and modern Languages, and various Classes of Literature; in which are included numerous Articles of great Rarity and Value. Also a fine collection of PAINTINGS in OIL, by ancient and modern Masters.

W. WEST, Auctioneer.

OF WHOM CATALOGUES MAY BE HAD.

Also of Longman and Co. Arch, R. H. Evans, R. Triphook, Clarke, &c. *London*; A. Constable, *Edinburgh*; Hodges and M'Arthur, and Milikin, *Dublin*; Watson and Mahony, *Limerick*; and Bull, *Waterford*.

Catalogues, Ten Pence—to be allowed to Purchasers.

Lessee of WILLIAM HENRY HASSARD, Esq. *a.* the casual Ejector.	TO BE LET, pending these Suits, and immediate possession given, all those, the several untenanted parts of the
Lessee of Same *a.* Same.	

LANDS of FAITHLEGG, in the County of Waterford, lately in the possession of CORNELIUS BOLTON, Esq. and his under Tenants. Security will be required for the Rent.

Apply to Messrs. IVIE and MORTIMER, Solicitors, Waterford.

THE Gentlemen Solicitors and Attornies are respectfully informed, that A LAW STATIONER'S-OFFICE has been opened at No. 63, SACKVILLE-STREET, corner of Henry-Street, Dublin.

The Proprietors, encouraged by the patronage of several eminent Solicitors, by whom they have been confidentially employed, beg leave to offer their Services to Gentlemen of the Profession ONLY, in the Drafting and Preparation of Pleadings, Costs, Deeds, &c. and the Conducting and general Management of Law and Equity Business, which they undertake to attend with such assiduity and care, as they trust will be found to render very considerable Advantage and Facility to the Agent, and on a plan similar to that which has secured to the Law Stationers of LONDON that confidence reposed in them by the Profession of the Sister Country.

SCRIVENERY BUSINESS

Neatly and expeditiously executed by the best hands, and carefully compared.

Professional Gentlemen in the Country may on moderate Terms have their Business conducted, and their Dublin Residence registered, at No. 63, Sackville-street, (the Dwelling house of one of the Proprietors,) where all Communications addressed to KAVANAGH & CO. shall be punctually attended to.

Dublin, Oct. 8, 1820.

WATERFORD PROTESTANT ORPHAN ASSOCIATION.

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING *of the* GOVERNORS *of the* WATERFORD PROTESTANT ORPHAN ASSOCIATION *will be held on Thursday, 12th instant, at Two o'Clock precisely, at the New Town Hall, to receive the Report of the Committee for the past year.*

The ORPHAN CHILDREN *will be present at the Meeting.*

N. B. Many Ladies being, by the amount of their Subscription, Governesses of this Association, they are respectfully informed, that Accommodation will be provided for them at the Meeting. The Committee also solicit the attendance of such Ladies and Gentlemen as may wish to be informed of the Object of this Association, or to become its supporters.

By order of the Committee,

HENRY BOLTON, Treasurer.

Oct. 10, 1820.

AUCTION OF NEW HOPS.

ARCHBOLD & O'BRIEN

WILL SELL BY AUCTION,

AT THEIR STORES, BAILEY'S NEW-STREET,

On SATURDAY, the 14th instant, at One o'Clock,

100 POCKETS OF PRIME NEW HOPS,

Just landed, per the *Linnet*, from Rye.

TERMS AT SALE.

FITZPATRICK, Auctioneer.

Bailey's New-street, Oct. 10, 1820.

In the Matter of SAMUEL NEWPORT, *a Bankrupt.*

THE CREDITORS of the Bankrupt who have proved their Debts under the Commission in this Matter are particularly requested to meet the ASSIGNEES, at the CITY COURT-HOUSE, on SATURDAY, the 28th day of October instant, at 12 o'Clock at Noon, in order to determine whether and upon what Terms the ASSIGNEES should receive the Notes of the late WILLIAM, SAMUEL, and JOHN NEWPORT, *in payment of the Debts* due to that Firm—and whether and upon what Terms the ASSIGNEES should adjust in an amicable manner certain *Accounts* depending between the late Firm and other Members of the Family of the late Mr. WILLIAM NEWPORT—and to invest the ASSIGNEES with power to *compound Debts*, submit *Differences to Arbitration*, and commence *Suits in Equity*—and upon other very important Business relating to the Bankrupt's Estate.

Waterford, Oct. 10, 1820.

ESTABLISHED BY-CHARTER.

ROYAL-EXCHANGE ASSURANCE

OF LONDON,

ESTABLISHED BY ROYAL CHARTER IN THE REIGN OF KING GEORGE THE FIRST,

For Assuring BUILDINGS, GOODS, MERCHANDIZE, *and* SHIPS, *from* FIRE;—*also for the Assurance of* LIVES.

THIS Corporation, established now almost a Century insures all kinds of Manufactories, Buildings and Stock, from Loss or Damage by Fire.

Assurances on Lives effected with the greatest facility and privacy, to the age of seventy-five years. No Medical Certificate or needless reference required, when the Life to be assured appears at this Office. No extra charge now made for Militia or Volunteer Service, serving within the limits of the United Kingdom. Persons assured with this Corporation do not depend on an uncertain fund or contribution, nor are they subject to any covenants or calls, to make good losses that may happen to themselves or others, the Capital Stock of this Corporation being an unquestionable Security to the Assured in case of Loss.

Insurances effected on single Lives to the extent of £10,000.

Persons whose Annual Premium on Fire Insurances fall due on the 29th September are informed, that if the Premium is not paid on or before the 14th October, their Policy will be void, as the usual 15 days allowed for payment beyond the date of each Policy will then expire.

SAMUEL CROSTHWAIT, } *Agents.*
SANDHAM ELLY, }

Mansion house, Oct. 2, 1820.

IMPORTANT TO INSURERS.

THE FIRST INSTANCE

OF THE

RETURN OF PREMIUMS IN IRELAND

TO INSURERS.

THE NORWICH UNION

HAS NOW REALISED ITS SYSTEM IN THIS COUNTRY.

THE following Persons are a few of those who have been Insured 7 years with this Society, are entitled to their return of Premiums.

Messrs. J. and R. HATTON,	*Cork.*
Rev. R. KIRCHOFFER,	*do.*
P. COLEMAN,	*do.*
JOSEPH BENNETT,	*do.*
THOMAS FARIAN,	*do.*
JAMES YOUNG,	*do.*
E. SPENCER,	*do.*
M. OSBORNE,	*do. &c. &c.*

This is the First Instance in Ireland, of an Insurance Office, not only paying all its Losses, with Honour and Liberality, *but actually returning to the Insurers a part of the* PREMIUM!

It is presumed that there can be now no doubt of the *Decided Advantage* to the Public, in effecting their Insurance at the NORWICH UNION.

IRISH DISTRICT.

CHIEF OFFICE, 2, CAPEL-STREET, DUBLIN.

D. C. ROOSE, *Secretary.*

☞ *Important to Persons about to effect LIFE INSURANCE.*

A BONUS OF TWENTY PER CENT. has been added to all Policies effected previous to June, 1815.

ANOTHER BONUS will be added to all Policies effected previous to June, 1822; therefore Insurance now made will participate in this advantage.

The RATES of the LIFE OFFICE are nearly FIVE PER CENT. LOWER than the Insurance Companies.

The *Norwich Union* is become the *only* Office at which Insurances, affording *all* the benefits of the Equitable Plan can be now effected.

Tables of Rates, and Information, may be had at the Office.

MAURICE FARRELL, Agent, Waterford.