

the witnesses, and to take them to their friends at Milan; to call on their friends, and to communicate to them the safe situation in which the witnesses were, in order to ease their minds of the apprehension and alarm under which they laboured. Q. Did Rastelli make any difficulty; did he object to going on this journey? He did not. Q. Did Rastelli say anything about coming back? He said he would be back as soon as he could. I beg to observe, that I knew Rastelli had been an important witness in this House. I also knew that he would be an important witness in the other House of Parliament, should the Bill pass here. I could have no motive for sending him out of the way; and I now repeat, were it not that I had the most firm conviction that he would return, no inducement could have prevailed upon me to send him on that journey. (Cries of "Withdraw!")

The Attorney-General begged to put a few questions to the witness. The LORD CHANCELLOR said the questions should be put through him.

The Attorney-General.—Was Mr. Powell in this House when the Queen's Attorney-General declined a further cross-examination of the witness? I was. Q. Has any communication been made to Mr. Powell by the Queen's Counsel, that they wished further to cross-examine Rastelli? None, and I considered that no further cross-examination was intended, because—[we could not catch the reason, to great was the press and noise below the bar.] Q. Has Mr. Powell had any communication from the Queen's Counsel, implying that they meant to call Rastelli as their witness? None. Q. Had Mr. Powell any intention of withdrawing Rastelli from a further examination? None, and no consideration could have prevailed on me to do any such thing.

Lord LIVERPOOL.—From the time the riot at Dover occurred, and the period of Rastelli's leaving the country, was any courier sent to Italy? None that I know of. I was not present at Dover at that occasion.

Marquis of LOTHIAN.—Was not Rastelli himself maltreated at Dover? I understand all the witnesses were maltreated there.

The witness was ordered to withdraw.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE moved, that the examination of Mr. Powell be printed separately, as not relevant to the issue of the present inquiry, it having been merely gone into for the information of the House on a subject of complaint.

Earl GREY dissuaded from the opinion of the Noble Earl (Lauderdale), and contended that it was for their judicial proceedings.

Lord ERSKINE was extremely anxious to see the character of the House rise in the estimation of the Country, and that they should not willingly justify themselves. The House had been engaged the whole day in the examination of this witness, and he could not consent to have it put upon record that they had been occupied all this while to no purpose whatever. If it was a good objection to printing Mr. Powell's evidence as part of the proceedings, that it did not affect the case one way or other, then a great many of the questions put by the Noble Lord who made the witness go, also to be printed separately, as having no connection on earth with the case before the House.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE held this examination to be of a separate character from the rest of the proceedings, in which every rule of evidence had been violated. Here (said his Lordship, with great energy) four Judges had opened the case, and asked the opinion of Counsel. The usual course, in other cases, was for Counsel to open the case, and ask the opinion of the Judges. He wished it to appear, that one Peer at least had not sanctioned such a precedent, by which every rule of evidence was violated.

Earl GREY would not attempt to rival the Noble Earl in his admirable talent for mimicking the violence of Counsel; and still less was he disposed to mimic his Noble Friend in the extreme forbearance and mildness with which he conducted himself. He apprehended that no Judge had opened the case here, although what they had done would have been done by any Judge in any Court. An objection was stated to have been given to the Defence, and their Lordships had called upon the person complained of, to question him upon this proceeding. This was the character of the proceeding, which, in his opinion, was dictated by a sense of duty to the party, to the Bill, and to the Public.

The Earl of DOUGLASS, so far from thinking that this examination should be expunged or treated with any distinction; thought it was material as any other part of the case. But he thought there was a necessity of bringing this proceeding to an issue, whether the charges were founded or not—guilty or not guilty—and he would be ashamed to interpose any technical difficulty in the way of the examination. He wished to get at the bottom, and therefore to open as wide a door as possible for examination. He considered his Majesty's Government were the prosecutors here, and that the Ministers would have been guilty of a neglect of their duty, if they were not prosecutors here. He did not feel any delicacy in assuming modestly that he considered them the Prosecutors. The House, therefore, ought to be cautious; and where there is so much power on one side, it should open the door for as much justice as possible on the other.

Lord CAHILLON spoke against printing the examination of Mr. Powell separately. The LORD CHANCELLOR was of the same opinion. The Motion was negatived with a Division.

Joseph Planta, Esq. was then called in, and examined by Lord Carnarvon. Q. Are you Under-Secretary in Lord Castle-rough's Office? I am. Q. You remember an application being made to you in the month of September for a passport in the name of Rastelli? I remember Mr. Powell came to my office, and asked for a passport for Rastelli, and desired me to take the official steps for that purpose. Q. What did you do in consideration of that direction? I ordered the passport to be made out, and took the course that was proper. Q. By whom was the passport signed? By Lord Castle-rough. (In explanation, he said there were always passports ready signed in the office for such occasions, and the one in question was one of them.) Q. Did you make any application to Lord Castle-rough, respecting granting the passport? I did not. Q. Did you then, on your own account, grant the passport in consequence of Mr. Powell's application? I did. Q. Is it usual in your office for persons in your situation to grant such passports, without directions from Lord Castle-rough? It is the constant practice. Q. Have you received directions from Lord Castle-rough, or any other person's directions, to grant passports to witnesses that have been examined at the bar of this House? I have received no communication from Lord Castle-rough, or any other person, to that effect. Q. At the time the passport was granted to Rastelli, did you know that he had been examined as a witness at the bar of this House? I merely knew it from the Newspapers. I had no other information. Q. Do you know the precise day on which the passport was granted? It was on the 14th of September. Q. Do you know whether the Courier Rastelli was charged with despatches from the Foreign-office, or only with despatches given to him by Mr. Powell? From the Foreign-office I think certainly not; but only with the papers given to him by Mr. Powell. Q. Do you know that a passport has been granted to any person, besides Rastelli, connected with this prosecution? I know that passports have been granted to other Couriers, but for what object I do not know.

By the Marquis of LIVERPOOL.—In what situation did you consider Mr. Powell when he applied to you for a passport for Rastelli? As an agent for the prosecution, certainly.

By the Earl of DUBLIN.—At the time Mr. Powell applied to you for a passport for Rastelli, did he ask you for a passport for any other person to return to Italy with Rastelli? I think certainly not.

By Earl DARNLEY.—Had Mr. Powell made application to you at any other time for passports for any other witnesses on the part of the prosecution? Certainly not. Q. Were you at that time acquainted with the orders of the House, that witnesses should not be sent out of the Country? I was not.

Mr. Brougham here requested leave to ask the witness a few questions.

Q. I wish to know, whether Mr. Powell said any thing else to you respecting Rastelli's going back to Italy? As far as I recollect, he mentioned something about Rastelli's being a person proper to be sent to Italy to quiet the apprehensions of the families belonging to the persons remaining in this Country. He made some statement of this sort, but I did not attend to it, as it did not concern my duty. Q. Did he say any thing else about Rastelli? I recollect nothing else. Q. Was any body present at that time? I really cannot recollect whether there was any body else in my room. There are generally several persons in my room, and it is very likely there was somebody else there when Mr. Powell was present. Q. You say there have been other passports granted to Couriers; do you mean as Couriers connected with this Bill? Yes. Q. Was there any passport granted after the 18th of September? I really do not know. I don't keep the dates of the passports, and therefore I cannot recollect. Q. As Mr. Planta recollects the date of this passport to have been the 14th of September, does he recollect the dates of the other passports given to the Couriers, who, he has said, have left this Country since? In consequence of hearing that this was spoken of yesterday, I looked to the book, and ascertained it was the 14th; previously I had no knowledge of the date. Q. Has he any objection to look to the dates of the other passports given to the Couriers?

The LORD CHANCELLOR ordered that he should look to the dates, for the satisfaction of the House.

The Counsel then withdrew.

Lord CAHILLON said he had now a Motion to submit, to which he did not expect any objection would be made. It was, "That Counsel should be called in and informed, that the witness Rastelli, having been sent abroad upon public service by Mr. Powell, could not attend the House; and that they should be asked whether, in the absence of that witness, they were prepared to proceed in the examination of witnesses?"

The LORD CHANCELLOR was decidedly of opinion that the latter part of the question should not be put. If her Majesty's Counsel thought proper, after having been called in and informed that Rastelli was absent, to make any application to the House, stating that they could not proceed under such circumstances, it would then be the duty of the House to hear the Counsel for the Bill; after which their Lordships would decide upon the application. If the House acted otherwise, they would establish a very dangerous precedent. It would, therefore, be the best course to call in Counsel and leave it to them, without being called in to interpose, to say whether or not they considered it

necessary to proceed, or injurious to their cause to advance further till Rastelli should be produced? The Noble Lord concluded with moving an Amendment to this effect.

Lord LIVERPOOL suggested the omission of the words "Upon public service."

Lord HOLLAND said, the course proposed was an extremely liberal one; but it struck him as also an extremely unnecessary one, for the Counsel had already ascertained the fact which the House was so anxious to inform them of.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL suggested the introduction of words expressing the fact that Rastelli was detained by illness.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN said, that fact had merely appeared upon the evidence of Mr. Powell, and it would be rather too much to admit that the House was satisfied with that evidence. (Hear, hear!)

The discussion ended by the calling in of the Counsel; and Mr. Brougham begged that their Lordships would allow him and his Learned Friends a few minutes to consult upon this important question. (Hear, hear!)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said the House would grant any time which should be thought necessary. At five minutes past two o'clock the Counsel returned, and the House resumed.

Mr. Brougham.—My Lords, under the extraordinary circumstances in which her Majesty's Counsel find themselves placed, and the difficulties with which they are surrounded, I find it impossible to communicate any thing to your Lordships as our decision in conducting the Defence of her Majesty, except that we shall pursue a little further the course of examination with which we commenced.

Philippe Rotti was then called in and sworn. Examined by Dr. Lushington. Q. In what part of Italy do you usually reside? At the Bruna. Q. How long have you resided there? In my own Parish, for thirty-five years; in the place where I worked, fourteen years. Q. Is the Bruna the name of a Parish? It is. Q. Have you lived at the Bruna in the house of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales? It is fourteen years since I have been there. Q. Do you remember the Princess of Wales residing in that house? Yes, I do, a night and a day. Q. What is your trade? I am a carpenter. Q. Do you know Giuseppe Rastelli? I do. Q. Was he in the Queen's service? Yes, he was a groom. Q. Do you know Louis Demont as being in the service of her Royal Highness? I do. Q. Do you remember in the course of the last year Rastelli coming to the Bruna? Yes. Q. Who accompanied him? He came with the son of the Head-Master. Q. Was Demont with Rastelli? Yes. I came up an hour after in a carriage with other persons. Q. Was Rastelli and Demont together in the house? Yes. Q. What did you see Rastelli do on that occasion? I saw him perform little drawings there. Q. Did Rastelli, upon leaving, offer you any money? He asked me if I had received presents, from those persons who had come, and I said, No, and he afterwards made me a present. Q. Of what amount? Two Napoleons of 40 francs. Q. Did he say any thing respecting Demont, when he gave you the money. (Question objected to by the Attorney-General, and abandoned.)

Q. Did he offer you any money to come here as a witness? He offered me on another day, on that day he offered me not; he told me if I had something to say against her Royal Highness, I should have a great present. Q. When did he say this? I said that I had nothing to say against her Majesty; I had nothing to say but speak well of her. Q. State as nearly as possible the exact words that Rastelli used when he told you that you should have a great present if you deposed any thing against her Royal Highness? Come, if you like, you may make yourself a man. I asked what he meant? He answered, you have always lived in this house, you may have something to depose against her Royal Highness. I said I had nothing to depose against that Lady, who had always done a great deal of good. Q. Was Madame Demont present on that occasion? She was not. Q. Did Rastelli at the time mention her name to you?

Objected to by the Attorney-General.

Lord ERSKINE said, that Rastelli was an agent, and all that he had said ought to be traced.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that as Rastelli was absent, it would be but fair to allow the question, as the Counsel for the Defence could not now call Rastelli to cross-examine him again.

Question allowed and repeated. No.

(The witness was proceeding, when the Solicitor-General again objected.)

Witness continued.—No; because it was a few days after that he had this conversation with me. The Solicitor-General still objected, and said, that the Counsel ought not to put questions which they could not put if Rastelli was not here.

Mr. Denman contended for the right of going into the evidence upon the proved agency of Rastelli.

The Attorney-General said, the question could not be put. It was asserted that Rastelli was an Agent. This he denied, as Rastelli had only been employed as courier to bring witnesses before the Commission.

Lord LIVERPOOL thought that Rastelli's absence ought not to deprive the Counsel of their right to put any questions which they would have put had he been present.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought, if a Witness was out of the country, the latter was on the other

side, and that it would be too hard to expect the defendant to require a postponement, in consequence of the act of the other party. He thought the question might be put.

Question put thus— Q. At the time of the second conversation, was the name of Demont mentioned when he offered you money? Objected to by the Attorney-General. Q. Changed thus—Q. When did this conversation take place? On a morning that he called upon me, and when we went together to the inn. Q. Did he make any offer or promise of money if you would become a witness against her Royal Highness, and in what words? He told me— "If you have any thing to depose against her Royal Highness, now is the time; you will have a great present, and become a great man." We went to the inn, and drank there. Q. Did he at that time mention the name of Demont? He did. Q. Did he mention the name of Demont with reference to any offer of money that he made? Objected to by the Solicitor-General. Q. Did he name the name of Demont? I asked him whether Demont was in the service of her Royal Highness, he said she was, and that she had made a good day's work.

Mr. Brougham said, the interpreter, Spinetta, omitted the words, "and she (Demont) had received a great sum."

Mr. Cobden, the interpreter for the Queen, said, that those words were omitted.

Mr. Brougham.—My Lords, there are several gentlemen at the bar, besides myself, who can testify that the words were omitted.

He told me Demont was still in the service of her Royal Highness, but I found she was here. He said if I would depose something against her Royal Highness I should be paid a present; I said, I have been in her Royal Highness's service night and day, and I never saw anything that was at all improper in that Lady. He replied, then you know nothing, for it is a deceitful boy; that is, a bad house, and bad women were in it. I told him it was a real falsehood, for I had been in the house by day and night, and had seen nothing of this; and then we separated.

Q. Did Rastelli, on that occasion, say any thing further respecting Demont? No.

At this period of the examination Mr. Planta returned, and was asked what was the date of the first passport for a Courier to the north of Italy, and he said that he had searched the books and discovered that it was the 28th of September.

Rotti's examination continued.

Q. Was it on this occasion that Rastelli used the expression of making a good day's work? Yes, it was on that occasion that Rastelli said he was going about making recruits.

Q. Say what more Rastelli said about making a good day's work? I cannot express it; I must only say, he told me that on the day she (Demont) came to make the drawing, she made a good day's work. Q. Do you know a person named Ruganti? Yes, he is a companion of Rastelli. Q. What is he? He sells salt, tobacco, brandy, and other liquor. Q. Where does he live? He lives two gun-shots from Milan.

Objected to by the Solicitor-General.

Dr. Lushington said that he trusted he should convince the House that the question ought to be put, for in page 409 in the evidence Rastelli was asked, "How came you to the Milan Commission?" He answered, "I was sought after." Q. Who sought after you? A person of the name of Ruganti. Q. How long after this did you go before the Commissioners? In a few days.

Dr. Lushington having read the above evidence, he said; that it was clear the evidence of Rastelli distinctly proved the agency of Ruganti in this prosecution. It was necessary to prove the agency from the witnesses, and not from the agents themselves. There was no visible prosecutor—no prosecutor in any shape or form; but he believed, with all deference to their Lordships, that the prosecutor was best described as "a joint stock company." (Very general laughing.) If this evidence was refused, what were the consequences to her Majesty. The whole of Italy, and even Europe, might have been secured for witnesses by subornation of perjury, and all the evidence brought against her might have been so procured; and unless the evidence be offered were admitted, he wished to know what justice her Majesty could have, how could he expose the vile crimes which had been committed by the agents of the Milan Commission?

The Attorney-General had again to complain of the Counsel on the other side taking an opportunity of attacking persons who were not now before their Lordships, the Gentlemen who formed the Milan Commission.

Mr. Denman.—My Lords, this Roganti was the agent of the Milan Commission. (No, from the Solicitor-General.) I say it appears in evidence that he was in the employment of the Commission; he was agent to Vimercati.

Solicitor-General.—My Lords, there is no evidence of that fact.

Mr. Denman.—I ask the Attorney-General if he will inform me if Roganti is in Cotton Garden, or in any other part of the Country; it may be that I shall think fit to call him. I conceive there can be no objection to answering my question.

The Solicitor-General.—I must decline answering the question put by the Learned Counsel.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, "If you do me the honour, Mr. Denman, to address me, I must say that I do not know. Whether any other Noble Lord is acquainted with the fact I cannot tell.

Lord ERSKINE.—The House according to a journal, at Four o'clock, to Monday.

CORN STORES, CARRICK-ON-SUIR.

TO BE LET, AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN. A very good STORE at the River Side, at the end of a Quay, lately occupied by Mr. Patrick Doyle, on the Quay in Carrickbeg. Both Stores are very commodious for Accommodation and Storage. Apply to RICHARD POWELL, Esq. Carrick-on-Suir, October 18, 1820.

HOTEL, KILKENNY.

TO BE LET. THE ESTABLISHMENT of the late Mr. DEVEREUX, Patrick Street, on the former or upon an enlarged scale, being a commodious NEW HOUSE, with superior STABLING, the Situation being decidedly the best in Kilkenny. The Tenant must take the FURNITURE, CARRIAGES, HORSES, and HARNESS, at a fair Valuation, for the payment of which, good Security will be taken at One, Two, and Three Months. Mr. WILKINSON, Solicitor, and JAMES NEWTON, Esq. in payment of the Debt due to that Firm, and who together and upon what Terms the Assessee should adjust in an amicable manner certain Accounts depending between the late Firm and other Members of the Family of the late Mr. WILKINSON, NEWTON, and JAMES NEWTON, in relation to compound Debts, submit Differences to Arbitration, and common Suits in Equity, and upon other very important Business relating to the Bankrupt's Estate. Waterford, Oct. 18, 1820.

EXCISE OFFICE, YOUGHAL, OCT. 18, 1820.

OFFICES for receiving the ASSESSED TAXES of this District shall be held at the following Places—of which all Persons concerned are required to take Notice. Any Persons not then paying in their Taxes will be proceeded against as the Law directs:

- Castlemary, the 16th October.
Cloyne, the 17th and 18th do.
Midleton, the 19th and 20th do.
Castleton, the 21st do.
Tullaro, the 23rd do.
Cappoquin, the 26th and 27th do.
Dunurcum, the 31st Oct. & 1st Nov.
Kilnashoman, the 2d November.
Clashmore, the 3d do.
Youghal, the 6th to the 11th do.
WM. STEWART, Esq. Collector.

O'NEILL & KEHOE

- OFFER FOR SALE.
100 Chests TEA,
65 Hhds. Muscovado } SUGAR,
5 Ditto Refined }
24 Boxes SUGAR CANDY,
40 Kegs NEW MUSTARD,
20 Casks Refined } SALTPETRE.
20 Bags Rough }
THEY DAILY EXPECT THE ARRIVAL OF
103 Chests TEA,
15 Hhds. Muscovado } SUGAR,
9 Ditto Refined }
12 Baskets CHEESE;

Which, with their present Stock of SPICES, WICK YARN, Spanish and East India INDIGO, PITCH-TAR, ROSIN, &c. &c. will be disposed of on the most reasonable Terms. Waterford, Oct. 17, 1820.

LEASE of the LANDS of FAITHLEGG, in the County of WATERFORD, lately in the possession of CHARLES BOLTON, Esq. and his wife, TRACY. Security will be required for the Rent. Apply to MESSRS. EVE and MORTIMER, Solicitors, Waterford.

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 ROCKSHIRE, in the PARISH of WATERFORD, now in the possession of Mr. RICHARD MANNING. Proposals will be received by MICHAEL DUNN, Waterford; or by BENJAMIN BALE, Esq. No. 7, Fleet-Street South, Dublin; by Letter, post-paid. (The insertion on Saturdays only.) September 6, 1819.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF WATERFORD.

THE ASSIZE OF BREAD, BY ORDER OF THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL SAMUEL KING, ESQ. MAYOR OF SAID CITY.

THE Middle Price of Wheat and Flour (as taken by Act of Parliament to form the Assize) has last week been 9s. 6d. per Quarter, besides an Allowance of Eight Shillings per Quarter, by Act of Parliament, on White and Refined, for the Benefit of the Baker, and Ten Shillings on Household.

Table with 3 columns: WHITE, REFINED, HOUSEHOLD. Rows for Penn Loaf, Four-Penny, Two-Penny, Six-penny.

ALL other Suits of Lessors are to weigh in proper time, and to add the two initial Letters of the Baker or Maker's Name, and the White Bread must be marked with a 'W', the Refined with an 'R', and the Household with an 'H'—and the Weight must likewise be impressed upon each Loaf, whereas in the Assize. And the several Bakers and Dealers in Wheat, Meal, and Flour, are required to make the 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, and the Penalties will be levied according to Law. G. D. SAMUEL KING, Mayor.

In the Matter of SEVILLE NEWPORT, a Bankrupt.

THE COMMISSIONERS in this Matter have appointed to meet at the ROYAL EXCHANGE, DUBLIN, on WEDNESDAY, the 25th day of October instant, at Two o'clock in the Afternoon, for the purpose of receiving the PROCEEDINGS from the CREDITORS of said Bankrupt, previous to a DIVIDEND being ordered. Dated this 11th day of October, 1820. By Order of the Commissioners, R. DAHL, Agent to the Commission.

In the Matter of SEVILLE 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 ASSIZES, at the CITY COURT-HOUSE, on SATURDAY, the 25th day of October instant, at 12 o'clock at Noon, in order to determine whether and upon what Terms the ASSIZES should receive the Votes of the late WILLIAM, SAMUEL, and JAMES NEWTON, in payment of the Debt due to that Firm, and who together and upon what Terms the ASSIZES should adjust in an amicable manner certain Accounts depending between the late Firm and other Members of the Family of the late Mr. WILKINSON, NEWTON, and JAMES NEWTON, in relation to compound Debts, submit Differences to Arbitration, and common Suits in Equity, and upon other very important Business relating to the Bankrupt's Estate. Waterford, Oct. 10, 1820.

TO BE LET.

FROM THE 25th OF MARCH NEXT, FOR THIRTY-ONE YEARS AND ONE LIFE. PART of the LANDS of POWERS-KNOCK, containing 1800, 00, 7r. Plantation Measure. These Lands are divided into Two separate Farms—one Division containing 800, 00, 7r. Plantation Measure, and the other 1000, 00, 7r. Plantation Measure. The Lands will be shown by Mr. W. KELLY, of Whitehall, and Proposals (in Writing) will be received by THOMAS CHRISTMAS, Esq. at Waterford, September 20th, 1820.

TO BE LET.

For such Term as may be agreed upon. THE very desirable FARM of ANSFELD, situated in the County of KILKENNY, on the River Barrow, nearly opposite the Town of NEW ROSA, commanding a beautiful and extensive Prospect, and containing about 25 Acres of Choice Meadows and Pasture, with a good Water-course, and several Hundred feet of good FISH-TREES on the Farm, which it is expected the Tenant would purchase at a Valuation. Application to be made to BENJAMIN BALE, Esq. New Ross, or to SAMUEL DUNN, Esq. New Ross.

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

HOUSE OF LORDS—MONDAY, OCTOBER 16. At twenty-five minutes past ten o'clock Council were called in.

Earl GREY wished to suggest whether it would not be proper now, as he understood Sir John Beresford was in attendance to speak to the character of one of the witnesses, Wm. Carrington, to call that Gentleman, and let the matter, so far as Carrington's character was involved, be now determined upon.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL observed, that he had a disinclination, unless by the express consent of Counsel, to call a witness out of course; but if there was any convenience in adopting the suggestion at this moment, he should not object to it.

Sir John Beresford was then called in and examined.

By Earl GREY.—Yes, your Lordship, an Admiral in her Majesty's service? I am, your Lordship, a Rear-Admiral. Did you command his Majesty's Ship Poitiers during the late war, when a person named Wm. Carrington was serving on board? I remember him.

In what capacity was he serving? As a quarter-master. Was he rated on board in any other rank? Not while I commanded the Ship.

Did he leave the ship while you commanded her? He did. Under what circumstances? I have to state, that Sir Wm. Gell repeatedly applied to me to procure Wm. Carrington's discharge, and I recommended him to that purpose to Mr. Jones, then the acting Captain, and he was eventually discharged at my request, by being rated as my clerk in order to obtain that discharge.

Was he rated as a midshipman? I believe he was rated as such merely for the purpose of getting his discharge. Then, in point of fact, he was rated as midshipman when he was discharged? I believe he was, but for the purpose only that I have already said.

Did you, Sir John, give him a certificate of good conduct? I think I did; but whether at the time, or after he was discharged, I cannot say.

What was his behaviour while on board? Never a man behaved better. With respect to the irregularity of the proceeding in obtaining his discharge in this way, added Sir John, I am the only person answerable for it. Certainly, not (Captain Jones).

By the EARL.—Are you to understand, Sir John, that he never acted as a midshipman while on board? Never. Never did duty as such upon any occasion? Certainly, never.

Did he complain he did not like the sea and wished to be discharged? While the discharge was in progress, he certainly said he did not like the sea, and that he had been ordered to stand on the ship's books. The books will show what he did on that point. I think it was in June, or July, 1814. I was on shore at that time.

Are you certain that you never gave Carrington reason to expect promotion to the rank of midshipman, while he was on board the Poitiers, and during his quarter-master's No such expectation was held out to him while I was in the ship.

Did Carrington ever state to you any difficulty that he found in point of expense in getting an extraordinary certificate himself as a midshipman. No. If he had, I should have maintained him, as did others in the service, till they could pay me again.

Mr. BROUGHAM begged to remark, that the witness Carrington had stated, at page 581, that he was a midshipman, but at page 591, it would be seen how he explained what he had stated: His examination would be found in that book.

Were you rated a midshipman on board the Poitiers? I was long? I do not rightly know how long, I suppose during the time I was there.

He was then asked—Do you mean that you entered as a volunteer to learn your duty, or did you go upon the quarter-deck of that ship as a volunteer? Sir John Beresford said, I was not a very young man; I did not go on the quarter-deck for some time, but I understood I was to be a midshipman.

Were you positively sure that during the time you joined the Poitiers you were rated a midshipman? I am not certain whether I was rated at the time or not; I was rated at the time I left.

From this it will be seen that Carrington had explained his former statement.

Examination resumed by the Earl of LIVERPOOL.—Could Wm. Carrington have understood that he was rated previous to the time of his discharge. The answer was inaffirmative.

Did Sir J. Beresford act to Wm. Carrington, that the witness could consider Carrington understood he was to be a midshipman. The answer was inaffirmative.

Mr. BROUGHAM begged, before this question was answered, to say, he apprehended the answer to it would not be received as evidence. Before this could be received in evidence, he wished to know in what part of his testimony Carrington had stated that he understood he was to be a midshipman.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said, he would point out in what part he had said so.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought the question ought to be put—Did William Carrington ever act as a midshipman on board the Poitiers? Sir J. Beresford begged to say, that, in justice to Wm. Carrington, he should like to answer the question put to him by the Earl of Liverpool.

Mr. BROUGHAM again remarked on what Carrington was supposed to have said as to his understanding that he was to be a midshipman.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the Learned Counsel must not take upon himself to explain the evidence given. He must take the answers such as the witness had given them. The witness appeared to have given different accounts of this business, as a very honest man might often do. They must endeavour to ascertain what was, precisely, the truth. The question which ought to be put, it appeared to him, was this—Did William Carrington ever act as midshipman on board the Poitiers?

Mr. BROUGHAM hoped when the witness gave his answer, if he wished to add to it anything that he might recollect, that their Lordships would not prevent such addition from being made. He understood the witness to have said, that he should like to answer the question put by the Earl of Liverpool.

The witness was then asked whether Carrington had ever been given to understand that he would be made a midshipman, and by whom such expectation had been held out?

He was never led to expect that he would be made a midshipman by me. I do not suppose that what I am about to state ought to be taken down as evidence, but I have reason—

on him to state who had been sent out of the country. By the answers given to these questions, their Lordships, knowing who had been sent away, might be enabled to judge for themselves, whether any of the parties were qualified to perform that task which it was stated had been assigned to Rastelli. In what other way could they get at the truth?

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, there might be many cases in which, from the sacredness of the principle now contended for, difficulties might arise; but if facts could not be obtained without doing that which the law of England would not authorise, the evil must be submitted to. Such questions must not be put in any particular case, on account of the evil consequences to which such a departure from the established practice must lead.

Lord HOLLAND wished to know who was the principal in this case, whether that House were or not; and if it were, whether they, as the principal as well as the prosecutor, had not a right to examine their own agent?

The LORD CHANCELLOR, after the question which had been put to him, thought it right to say, that whatever the popular impression produced by his conduct might be, he would give no answer to a question which the Noble Lord must feel that he ought not to have put.

Lord DARNEY understood, that a vast number of witnesses had been brought to this country who had not been examined at their Lordships' bar. Some of these, for obvious reasons, it might not have been improper to send back. Such being the case, he was surprised that some of these had not been conveyed to Italy, where they could have answered every purpose that was to be answered by sending Rastelli. It was said that an account of the expense incurred was unnecessary when he had called for it.

[Here the Noble Lord was interrupted by cries of "Question," "Order," and "Laughter."] If anything that he had said were improper, it would be right to call him to order; but he did not think it quite decorous in a Noble and Learned Lord, then in his eye, to join in that species of coarse mirth at his expense, that certain individuals had taken the liberty to indulge in, on the present occasion.

Lord REDDESDALE did not think the remark just made was particularly called for by anything in his conduct; but he might appeal to the House, if all those who sat with the Noble Lord who had just spoken had not freely indulged in very coarse mirth, at his (Lord Reddesdale's) expense.

Lord DARNEY begged the Noble Lord's pardon, and did not know but on the principle of retaliation he might be perfectly justified. To return to the point on which he had been interrupted: he had merrily for accounts of the expenses incurred in these proceedings a fortnight ago; but if it had not been thought proper to grant them at that time, he was of opinion that they ought to have been produced.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL was of opinion, that whatever might be the value of the accounts alluded to hereafter, they had nothing to do with the present question. What had been said with respect to the witnesses seemed to require some explanation from him. It was perfectly true that more witnesses had been brought to this country than had been examined at their Lordships' bar, and it was true that he had said he was of opinion that those persons who had not been examined might be sent away, but that those who had given their testimony ought not to be suffered to depart. It was true that he had expressed such an opinion, but when he said it appeared to him that those who had not been examined might be sent away, this opinion was delivered subject to that of the Law Officers of the Crown, who best knew what their case required, and who might have important reasons for not allowing those to go away, whom he had felt disposed to send back. They might know that this would be improper, and that which he had stated was certainly subject to the decision which might be come to by the professional advisers of the Crown.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN thought, whatever the case might be, there could be no objection to questioning the witness at the bar in the way which had been proposed. It could not affect the interests of an unknown client improperly, to suffer the question which had been put to be answered. It was not proposed to ask what had been done with this or that witness—or what this or that witness had been brought over to prove, but whether witnesses had not been sent away, who could have done that which it had been assumed could only be done by Rastelli. The answer to this would only put the House technically in possession of that which was well known to the Public already, namely, that witnesses had been sent away unexamined.

The Earl of CARRISBROOK could not but feel surprise, considering the very extraordinary step that had been taken, in contradiction to the express order of the House, that the witnesses, who had been examined, should be detained. It was strange that it should be thought that Rastelli alone could convey that information to the friends of the witnesses in Cotton-garden, which it had been judged expedient to send; that he alone could execute this task in the few hours that he was to reside in Milan. But how would the case stand if he showed not that one, but that fifty or sixty witnesses had been sent back? These persons could not only have conveyed letters or information to the relations of the witnesses here, but their own personal appearance (probably well clothed and fed) would have proved that there was not that danger in coming to England to further the ends of justice which had been apprehended.

It was now said, that they must not examine an agent with a view of diving into the secrets of his principal. This was not contended for, but the question on which they wanted information was in point of fact this—whether some of the persons who had not been brought forward ought not to have been sent back, rather than Rastelli, who had been examined. Was this to seek for the disclosure of secrets? He supposed every one of them must have obtained passports from the Foreign Office, and he could therefore see no objection to putting the question which had been asked.

Lord ACKLAND observed, that agents and attorneys were liable to be examined, but in certain cases they were cautioned, that they were not to answer, where their answers would disclose what had been confided to them by their clients, as matters of secrecy. In civil cases, a much greater latitude was allowed in this respect, than in criminal cases. He thought that the questions suggested might be put, and that Mr. Powell, if it should be necessary, might appeal to the House, whether he ought to answer any particular questions.

The LORD CHANCELLOR remarked, the privilege which had been mentioned was not to be regarded as the privilege of the agent, but as the privilege of the principal.

Lord ELENBOROUGH could not allow, that that principle which was held to be so sacred in other cases, was exactly applicable to the present proceedings. The principal in this case he considered to be the State. The Attorney-General had no case to make out. He had to discover the truth and nothing else; and if at any period of the proceedings the Counsel for the Bill should be satisfied that a case could not be made out, it was their duty to state this to the House. The State being the principal, that House, a part of the State, it appeared to him, had a right to examine their own agent.

The witness was again called to the bar, and several of the preceding questions and answers having been read, the examination was resumed. To the best of your knowledge and belief, had any other witnesses left this country? I have heard that two others were gone.

At the time you resolved to send Rastelli to Milan, had you enquired whether it was probable that any other witnesses would soon depart from this country? At that time, I had made no inquiries on the subject. You have stated, that by letters received from Milan since Rastelli was sent thither, you learn that he is ill. From whom did those letters come? From Colonel Brown.

Have you got them? Not about me at present. Have you had any communication from Rastelli himself since he set out on his journey? None; nor have I made any to him.

By the Marquis of Lansdown—Did you instruct Rastelli to go to any place or places but Milan? He has already answered that I did not.

By Lord Morley—Did you mention Rastelli at the Foreign Office when you applied for passports? I mentioned at the Foreign Office that Rastelli was going to Milan as a courier.

Antecedently to that application were you personally known to Mr. Planta and Lord Clanwilliam? I was.

Did you consider the witnesses to be under your control? I did not.

Did you make application to Rastelli, or did he apply to you? I applied to him, not Rastelli to me. Solely to quiet the apprehensions of the friends of the witnesses in Cotton-garden? Solely to quiet the friends of the witnesses, and to take back certain papers to Milan to be legalised.

By Lord Erskine—At the sole object of sending Rastelli was to quiet the minds of the relations of the witnesses in Cotton-garden, how came you to send certain papers back by him to be legalised, the legalising of which might have caused some delay, if he were to bring them? I sent the papers to Milan to be legalised, that further proofs might be obtained from them, and I expected that these papers would be legalised in sufficient time for Rastelli to return on or before the 3d October.

Did you intend that they should be left to be legalised, or did you expect Rastelli to bring them back? I had no expectation of the sort. That was left to the discretion of Colonel Brown.

By the Marquis of Lansdown—Will you state which of the witnesses now in Cotton-garden have families resident at Milan? Resident at Milan, and in the neighbourhood? At Milan? Francanti and Marchetti.

Accounts have been received at Lloyd's, London, stating, that during the late heavy gales from the westward, ten merchant vessels had been totally wrecked on the coast of Norway.

The *Ducchi* cutter had been despatched from Plymouth with orders; the *Lee* and *Hellion* sloops were under orders to proceed to sea, to assist the lowerward-bound ships, detained at sea by the northerly winds.

We have been favoured by the *Southern Reporter* with the following very late intelligence from Lisbon:—

“ Cork, Oct. 17.—The *Lively Anne* arrived in this river last night, in seven days from Oporto, by which we have Papers from thence to the 8th inst. and from Lisbon to the 29th ult. The Juntas of Oporto and Lisbon had formed a coalition for carrying on the Public Affairs till the Cortes assembled, which was to be evinced with all possible despatch, when the Juntas would be dissolved. We will communicate farther particulars as soon as the Papers are translated.”

Committed to the County Gaol, the 7th Inst. by Thomas Perrot and H. Gumberton, Esqrs. John Howard and Anthony Harris, for stealing 5 sheep and three lambs from town fields at Lismore. By Richard English, Esq. Patrick Quilly, for an assault and rape.

Committed to our County Gaol, on Monday last, by Timothy Doyle, Esq. Patrick Ryan, one of the convicts who escaped from the Cork Depot in August last, and who recently effected his escape from the City Gaol of Waterford. He had assumed the name of John Walsh, and is charged with stealing a pair of shoes and a coat, value thirty shillings.—*Leinster Journal*.

WATERFORD MARKETS.
The supply of Butter at the market-house on the last two days has been limited—123 fukins were weighed on Tuesday, and 154 yesterday. The price advanced yesterday from 78s. to which it opened, to 80s. per cwt. for first quality. There has been no alteration in Bacon Pigs, which continue at 28s. to 30s. for best. A few prime scalded yesterday brought 24s. 6d. but the highest general current for these descriptions remains at 24s. The receipts of Grain from Farmers continuing rather thin, the demand for Wheat and Oats having somewhat improved, the price of both has gradually advanced within the last two days. Good Wheat sold freely yesterday at 4s. generally, and 6d. more was paid for a few superior samples. The current rate for Potatoes was steady at 9s. 6d., and some purchasers paid 9s. 8d. Barley remains stationary at 9s. 6d. to 10s. No alteration in Flour, Oatmeal, or other articles.

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 accumulation, is solely 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.

Under the Security offered to the Public does not depend on 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 in 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 empowered, enabled to effect Fire Insurance in every Part of the Kingdom, and to reduce the rates of interest on the Loans of their 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 same country, which it has generally received throughout every part of England into which it has been introduced—a success which the Directors may proudly attribute to the beneficial principle on which the Institution is founded, and to the unassailable character it has so uniformly maintained.

WILLIAM LUMSDEN, Quays, 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 BE LET,
AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN.
A VERY GOOD STORE at the River Side, at the end of OYER-LANE, joining SAUND'S QUAY. Also a large STORE, lately occupied by Mr. PIERCE DOYLE, on the Quay in Carrickbeg. Both Stores are very commodious in Accommodation and Situation.
Apply to RICHARD POWELL, Esq. Carrick-on-Suir, October 18, 1820.

HOTEL, KILKENNY.
TO BE LET.
THE ESTABLISHMENT of the late Mr. DEVEREUX, Patrick Street, upon the corner or upon an enlarged site, being a commodious NEW HOUSE, with superior STABLING, the Situation being decidedly the best in Kilkenny.

TO BE LET.
£500 TO £3000.
PART of said Sum would be laid out in the Purchase of an ANNUITY, or of well-selected ESTATE, in LANDS or HOUSES.
Application to be made to ALGERNON BROWNE, Esq. Barrister at Law, No. 10, Pall Mall, London, or to Mr. Waterford, Oct. 17, 1820.

O'NEILL & KEHOE
OFFER FOR SALE,
100 Chests TEA,
65 Hhds. Muscovado SUGAR,
5 Duns Refined SUGAR,
24 Barrels SUGAR CANDY,
40 Kegs New MUSTARD,
20 Casks Refined SALTPEET,
20 Bags Refined SALTPEET.

THEY DAILY EXPECT THE ARRIVAL OF
103 Chests TEA,
15 Hhds. Muscovado SUGAR,
9 Duns Refined SUGAR,
12 Baskets CHEESE;

Which, with their present Stock of SPICES, WICK, YARN, Spanish and East India INDIGO, PIMENTO, TUR, ROSEN, &c. &c. will be disposed of on the most reasonable Terms.
Waterford, Oct. 17, 1820.

In the Matter of SAMUEL NEWPORT, a Bankrupt.
THE COMMISSIONERS in this Matter have appointed to meet at the ROYAL EXCHANGE, DUBLIN, on WEDNESDAY, the 25th day of October, inst. at 11 o'clock in the Afternoon, for the purpose of receiving the PROOF of DEBTS from the CREDITORS of said bankrupt, persons to a DECLARATION being ordered, on the 11th day of October, 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 ASSISEES, at the CITY COURT-HOUSE, on SATURDAY, the 25th day of October, inst. at 12 o'clock at Noon, in order to determine whether and upon what Terms the ASSISEES should receive the Votes of the late WILLIAM SAWYER, and JAMES NEWPORT, in payment of the Debts due to them from said bankrupt, and upon what Terms the ASSISEES should adjust an equitable manner certain Accounts depending between the late Firm and other Members of the Family of the late Mr. WILLIAM NEWPORT—and to invest the ASSISEES 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.

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 accumulation, is solely 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.

Under the Security offered to the Public does not depend on 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 in 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 empowered, enabled to effect Fire Insurance in every Part of the Kingdom, and to reduce the rates of interest on the Loans of their 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 same country, which it has generally received throughout every part of England into which it has been introduced—a success which the Directors may proudly attribute to the beneficial principle on which the Institution is founded, and to the unassailable character it has so uniformly maintained.

WILLIAM LUMSDEN, Quays, 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 BE LET,
AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN.
A VERY GOOD STORE at the River Side, at the end of OYER-LANE, joining SAUND'S QUAY. Also a large STORE, lately occupied by Mr. PIERCE DOYLE, on the Quay in Carrickbeg. Both Stores are very commodious in Accommodation and Situation.
Apply to RICHARD POWELL, Esq. Carrick-on-Suir, October 18, 1820.

Would it have been possible for Rastelli, by carrying letters to the different places where the families resided, and by his personal appearance there, to have converted those assurances, without incurring a greater delay than the witness has stated would belong to that object? As I have already stated, Rastelli left this country, I believe, on the evening of the 14th, or early on the morning of the 15th. I do not positively know which, not having seen him set off. He could have gone to Milan six days and six nights, and supposing he had taken seven, that would have brought it to the 21st or 22d. The leaving eleven days before the 3d of October, the distance from Milan to Monza, where the family of one of the witnesses resides, is ten miles, and the distance to Como is 25.

The witness examined by Lord Auckland.
Can you state whether the family of Cuchi were in a state of anxiety? I cannot say.
Do you know whether Rastelli took a letter to his family? I do not know.

Witness examined by Lord Ellenborough.
Did you send any letter to Colonel Browne by Rastelli? I did.
Have you a copy of it? Yes. But it contains matters relative to proceedings; and I would submit it as a question for the House, whether, in my situation, I ought to produce it.

Can you produce that part of the letter which refers to—? It is altogether a confidential communication, which I submit I ought not to disclose.
Lord DARNEY moved that the witness should withdraw.
Mr. Powell withdrew accordingly.

Lord DARNEY then begged to remark to their Lordships, that this witness had not been called in support of the Bill, nor by the Council for the Defence, but by the House. In what capacity the House had called him, his Lordship could not say. He had, however, been brought to the Bar by an order of the House, and the Noble Lord would submit, that the Council on both sides should be permitted to put any question to him which they thought necessary, confining themselves to those rules of evidence which prevailed in the Courts below.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—My Lords, your present proceeding is an exemplification of those principles on which this House acts—namely, whether the Council on either side do or do not call for an explanation on this subject, your Lordships may call for it, & have called for it. Confining the questions to the subject matter now before you, with reference to which this discussion has taken place, and not making the witness betray any confidence reposed in him by his client, your Lordships may finally permit any question to be asked at the suggestion of Counsel, the House reserving those questions, if they think them proper. I apprehend, however, no noble Lord ought to put questions which, in an examination in the Courts below, would not be permitted. We must, however, give Counsel credit for putting questions which are material.

Lord GUY moved, that the witness be called back.
Mr. Powell again returned to the bar.
The witness examined by Lord Grey.

I understand you to state, that you have in your possession a copy of the letter which you wrote to Colonel Browne, giving an account of Rastelli's object. Can you produce that copy? Not the whole of the letter, but that part I conceive all communications made by me to Colonel Browne as confidential communications made by me, as an agent for this Bill, and considering I am the agent, or one of the agents, for this Bill, I object to the production of any correspondence relating to that subject.

Or to any part of it? If I object to the production of the whole, I object, of course, to the production of a part.
You have also received a letter from Col Browne in do you object to the production of that? I object, in the character in which I stand, to the production of any letters either to or from Col. Browne.

I understand you to say, that you gave Rastelli a positive injunction to return before the resumption of these proceedings? If he could, I stated to Rastelli, that he was to be back on or before the 3d of October, or as soon as he possibly could.

Did you state to him your reason for wishing for his speedy return? I don't recollect stating any particular reason.
I understood you to say yesterday, that you did not expect Rastelli would be wanted before this business would be proceeded upon in the House of Commons? Of course.

On what account then was it that you gave him such a positive injunction? Because I expected him to return with the papers which I sent, and which I considered I might want to use on the recommencement of the proceedings on the 3d of October.

And not with a view to his being examined further in this House? The necessity of his being called as a witness, in the further proceedings in this House, did not suggest itself to me. The Counsel for the Defence having stated, that they had no further questions to ask any of the witnesses in support of the Bill, I could not conceive this witness would be called for as a witness by them. I am not aware that this House made any order that the witnesses in support of the Bill should be kept in readiness to be again examined; but I understand, that on the future proceedings of the Bill they should be ready to be recalled, if necessary. I can only say, that it did not immediately suggest itself to me, when I was sending Rastelli, or I should not have sent him.

Though other persons might have gone to Milan from this country, I certainly considered Rastelli to be the best person to send back for the purpose I sent him, as he accompanied the witness to this country. I believed him to be well acquainted with the families

of the witnesses, and therefore considered him as the most fit person. I am not positive that any of the families are actually resident in Milan, except Marchetti's; but Rastelli was to go to the neighbourhood of Milan as well. Using ordinary diligence, a courier could go to Milan in six nights and days; and I have known couriers go there in a less period of time. The letter from Col. Browne to me, I think, states the date of Rastelli's arrival at Milan, and I could communicate that to you; but I must decidedly object to disclosing anything contained in the correspondence between Col. Browne and myself. Considering the situation in which I stand as an agent for this Bill, I consider all communication between us as confidential.

By a FERR.—Have any of the persons stated to have been ill treated at Livorno returned to Italy? None, except Rastelli.
Was there not a woman among them? There was. One man received so much injury, that he has never recovered the effects of it since.

Does the woman still remain in England? Yes.
By Lord KENTON.—Did Rastelli bring more than one set of witnesses to this country? I do not recollect; I have no knowledge.
What were the names of the witnesses whom Rastelli brought? Do you mean the witnesses who were brought to Dover? I mean the witnesses brought to this country. I cannot recollect; I did not see them all.

Do you know the names of the witnesses who were brought by Rastelli? I do not know the whole of them.
Can you learn by inquiry? I can.
Can you state the greatest distance any one of the witnesses lived from Milan who was brought to this country? I cannot; I do not recollect the names of all.

Do you conceive that Rastelli communicated with the families of all the witnesses whom he brought here? He was to communicate with them all.
Evidently LIVERPOOL here interposed, and observed, that there could not be the least difficulty in communicating to the House the names of the witnesses, the alarm of whose families his journey to Milan was meant to allay—as well as the date of the letters which were written for the purpose of bringing him back, whatever difficulty the witness might make, in communicating these facts in his character of agent.

Lord KENTON.—Am I to understand that there is any other difficulty in your answering these questions than that which arises from your character as agent?
Lord LAUNDEDALE said, that this course of proceeding, if persisted in, would be fatal to the judicial inquiry in which they were engaged. They had called an agent to their Bar, as a witness, who had been himself instrumental to bringing witnesses to support this Bill; he begged only to ask, what would be their situation, if, from that confidential agent, a contradiction was extracted to the witnesses whom he had himself produced? He thought the whole of his testimony should be removed from their minutes.

Mr. Brougham.—I understand I am to be permitted to suggest some questions to the witness.
The LORD CHANCELLOR.—The Lords are not yet done.
Mr. Powell, who had withdrawn from the Bar, was called back.

By Lord DARNEY.—I wish to ask the witness under whose direction and control the witnesses in support of this Bill are? I scarce know how to answer that question. I understand them to be under the direction and control of Government. Persons are authorised by Government to see after these witnesses.

Do you know this of your own knowledge? I know that there are several persons who remain in the place with them; but under whose immediate direction and control they are I cannot say.
In point of fact, are not persons admitted to see the witnesses by your order? I have given instructions that strangers should be excluded—because I did not think an indiscriminate admission of such persons would be consistent with the safety of the witnesses.

By Lord DERRY.—I understand you to have said, that you did not know under whose direction or control Rastelli was. Under what authority, then, did you take upon yourself to send Rastelli from this country? As a person who assisted in the support of this Bill, I considered that I had a right to send Rastelli abroad as a courier.

Did Mr. Powell send Rastelli out of the country of his own mere notion, or had he any communication with any other agent in the cause? I do not recollect that I made any communication to any other agent in the cause. I know I spoke of it generally as a matter in contemplation.

Lord KENTON now suggested that the witness should be directed to produce the list of the witnesses whom Rastelli had brought to this country.
The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that as the witness could not speak to this subject of his knowledge, such list could not be produced.

By the Earl of WINCHESTER.—Had you any authority to order a witness to leave this country?—If he refused to go, certainly not. I did not consider either, if he pleased to go, that I could legally prevent him.

Mr. Brougham.—With the permission of your Lordships, I wish to ask the witness who is his employer or agent in this cause? (Cries of order, order! and murmurs of disapprobation throughout the Peers.)
Mr. Brougham.—My Lords, I have not put this question for any ill purpose; but that justice may be done to the illustrious Individual whom it is my duty to defend.—The present witness is the first one that has been called to your

Lordships' bar, who could give us that information. Is it not, my Lords, of the utmost importance, that we, who have to defend a specified Individual, may know, if possible, in the other party in this case? If I have certain knowledge of who that party is, I should not be able to produce evidence composed of the acts, speeches, declarations, &c. &c. of that party would put an end to the Bill at once. The unfortunate peculiarities of this case, the prosecutor has no tangible existence; the interesting Unknown is a sort of airy without a local habitation or a name whom I am in consequence unable to identify. If that airy being were known, I might be enabled to convict him out of his own mouth, and I readily admit that professional assistance is to be highly respected, when there is to whom the acts of the professional are traced. But here there is but the party—if

“Steps that might be called, which shape but are not.”
“Distinguishable in number, joint, or limb.”
“West coast of his head.”
“The likeness of a kindly crown had on.”
Am I, my Lords, under these circumstances, to be met at every step with professional assistance, may apply to other cases, but cannot do this?

The LORD CHANCELLOR here called Mr. Brougham to order, as these questions ought not to be put to a person who was not called to the Bar as a witness by one of the parties, supposition that an order of the House would be sufficient to put the witness on the Bar.

Mr. Brougham wished to put one question to Mr. Powell—namely—How many witnesses were here before the 14th of September of this year?
The LORD CHANCELLOR objected to this.

Mr. Brougham.—To the best of your knowledge, how many Witnesses who had support of the Bill had left before the 14th of September of this year?
The LORD CHANCELLOR and Lord Erskine objected to the question, which, after discussion, was put thus—Previous to the return to Milan, how many of the Witnesses were here before the 14th of September of this year?
The LORD CHANCELLOR objected to this.

Mr. Brougham.—To the best of your knowledge, how many Witnesses who had support of the Bill had left before the 14th of September of this year?
The LORD CHANCELLOR and Lord Erskine objected to the question, which, after discussion, was put thus—Previous to the return to Milan, how many of the Witnesses were here before the 14th of September of this year?
The LORD CHANCELLOR objected to this.

Mr. Brougham.—Will you take an oath, that at the time Rastelli was sent to Italy after the Dover riots; I mean, any other person so employed? After the riots? Certainly, I don't say under the Commission, for I consider the Milan Commission to have ceased in June, 1819? I may, but I ceased to act under the Commission in March. I don't consider myself bound under that Commission since.

What relation to any person who has acted in relation to this Bill? Certainly; I have been to Italy since the Dover riots; the names of the persons, &c. sent to the north of Italy since the Dover riots; the names of the persons, &c. sent to the north of Italy since the Dover riots; the names of the persons, &c. sent to the north of Italy since the Dover riots.

Q. Did you send any communications to the friends of the witnesses who were brought over by Rastelli? Letters were sent by the different friends of all the witnesses. Q. Were the couriers desired to call on the witnesses besides Rastelli? They were to go round and deliver the letters to the witnesses. Whenever a courier was on his way, I considered that he would give all on he possessed about the witnesses to the other couriers that you did send letters to the others. I received that the friends of the witnesses were with the letters sent by their friends; the impressions prevailed that they had written those letters. Q. Will you state from whom you received that information the name of any one family to feel this uneasiness? Colonel Browne was general; but I can not say who had heard the report that they were forced to write the letters themselves; it was the wife of Lancauti (who had heard that her husband had personal injury. Q. Did Colonel Lancauti send any communications to the friends of the witnesses? The Solicitor-General objected to this.

The latest proceedings with respect to the Queen's are of the greatest interest and importance, and it will be seen, that we have made no inconsiderable exertions to lay the whole in full detail before our readers. All reports are unfounded to abandon the investigation are unfounded.

The Waterford Chronicle.
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19.
The latest proceedings with respect to the Queen's are of the greatest interest and importance, and it will be seen, that we have made no inconsiderable exertions to lay the whole in full detail before our readers. All reports are unfounded to abandon the investigation are unfounded.

Excise Office, Youghal, Oct. 11, 1820.
OFFICES for receiving the ASSESSED TAXES of this District shall be held at the following Places—of which all Persons concerned are required to take Notice. Any Persons not then paying in their Taxes will be proceeded against as the Law directs:
Castlemartyr, the 16th October.
Cloyne, the 17th and 18th do.
Middletown, the 19th and 20th do.
Castletyons, the 21st do.
Tallow, the 25th do.
Cappanquin, the 26th and 27th do.
Dungarvan, the 31st Oct. & 1st Nov.
Kilmacothomas, the 2d November.
Clashmore, the 3d do.
Youghal, the 6th to the 11th do.
W.M. STEWART, Esq. Coll. clv.

WEST OF ENGLAND INSURANCE COMPANY.
LONDON, ENGLAND, Aug. 12, 1820.
SIR—Allow me to return the Directors of your respective 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 for the life of the late WILLIAM GRANT, effected in April 1819, and the amount Certificate of which only reached me the 9th of this month.
I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
J. G. PORTER.
To S. CROOKSHANK, Esq. Agent to the West of England Fire and Life Insurance Company, Cork.
WATERFORD:
Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PURRIN, Chronicle-Office, Quay.

DRD CHRONICLE.

... us that informa-
... the utmost impo-
... send a specific and
... w, if possible, who
... ? If I had any
... party is, non con-
... to produce a mass of
... speeches, writ-
... of that party, which
... at once. One of
... of this case is, that
... existence—that in-
... of "airy nothing,"
... or a name," with
... nable to grapple.—
... n, I might be able
... mouth, if he have
... professional confidence
... n there is a party
... professional agent may
... but the shape of a
... which shape had none,
... tint, or limb—
... d,
... n had on."

... circumstances, to
... professional rules, which
... t cannot be applied
... re called Mr. Brough-
... estions ought not to
... was not called to the
... e parties, but on the
... the House had been

... put one other ques-
... y—How many wit-
... 14th of Sept. In sup-

... objected to this ques-

... best of your recollect-
... who had come here in
... fore the 24th of Sept.?
... and Lord LAUDERDALE
... which, after some dis-
... vious to Rastelli's re-
... of the Witnesses had
... Italy? I don't know of
... ledge and belief none
... wear that none had re-

... of this question, Mr.
... er.

... you take upon you to
... tell was sent back, no
... a courier, under this
... k from the north of
... ; I mean Krouse, or
... ed? After the Dover
... say under the Milan
... the Milan Commission
... 1819? I left Italy in
... under the Commission
... myself as having act-
... since. Q. The ques-
... who has acted as courier
... Certainly; persons have
... ver riots. Q. Give us
... &c. sent down to the
... ure? Do you mean of
... down to the present
... of Rastelli's departure?

Q. Did he bring wit-
... ally? He did. Q. Have
... backwards and forwards
... the Dover riots? Yes.
... munications to any other
... ds of those witnesses
... Letters from the wit-
... different couriers to the
... s. Q. Were any other
... all on the friends of the
... ? They were desired to
... letters to the families of
... r a courier took letters,
... d give all the informat-
... the witnesses to their
... e the same instructions
... you did to Rastelli? I

... I received information
... nesses were not satisfied
... their friends, and that im-
... they had been forced to
... Will you name the per-
... ved that information? I
... Browne. Q. Will you
... one family that was said
... Colonel Browne's infor-
... I can name one indivi-
... report that the witnesses
... letters stating their safe-
... ncart (we believe); she
... hand had received much
... Colonel Browne suggest
... ver Rastelli?

... AL objected to this ques-

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, it had been re-
peatedly laid down, that the agent had received
a communication in writing. Counsel had no
right to ask a question about it.

Witness stated, that all the communications
from Colonel Browne to him were in writing.

The LORD CHANCELLOR observed, that the
Witness's answer did not form part of the evi-
dence. The examination could not be pursued;
unless Counsel meant to call Mr. Powell as a
Witness in chief.

Mr. BROUGHAM, as we understood, pressed his
right to put the question.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—It is clear you can't
ask the question, unless as to a parcel communi-
cation. The written communication to the agent
is a confidential one.

Examination continued.

Q. Do you not know that Rastelli never knew
one of the Witnesses brought over by him, or any
of their families? How can I know that circum-
stance? Q. Has not Rastelli sworn that he did
not know the Witnesses or their families? What
he has sworn is on the minutes. Q. Have not
you, as the Agent for the Bill, read those minutes?
I don't recollect having read the evidence of
Rastelli. Q. Did you not hear Rastelli swear that
he did not know the witnesses or their families?
that he had never seen any of them since the time
when he got them to court over here? I don't
not now recollect what I heard Rastelli swear.
Q. Have you not sworn that your reason for
sending Rastelli to Italy was, because he did
know the witnesses and their families?

The Attorney-General objected to this ques-
tion.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the regular form
was to read over the answers given by Rastelli
respecting his knowledge of the witnesses.

Mr. Brougham then read Rastelli's answer:—
"Some of the witnesses I know; some I do
not know. I never saw any of them until the
time they came over with me from Italy."

To another question, Rastelli's answer was—
"That he knew some of the names, and others
he did not know. His knowledge of them arose
from their having been together on the journey to
this Country."

Here, said Mr. Brougham, it is plain that Ras-
telli was a stranger to the witnesses and their fa-
milies.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, Counsel was to
read any part of the evidence, but not to make
observations upon it.

Mr. Brougham.—I ask the witness if he had
not heard the whole of Rastelli's evidence before
he sent him (Rastelli) to Italy? I am not sure
that I heard the whole of his evidence, as I was
frequently in and out of the House; but I beg to
state, that my sending Rastelli away was not with
reference merely to the families of those who were
at the occurrence at Dover. The occurrence at
Dover had alarmed the families of all the witnesses
who had come over in support of this Bill.—

Q. Does witness mean to state, that Rastelli was
to go to the families of the witnesses at Milan,
and the neighbourhood; that he was to go round,
not only to the families of the witnesses he himself
had brought over, but also to those of all the other
witnesses who had come over, or who were to come
over, in order to assure them of the safety of their
friends here, or of those who were to come here?
He was directed to call upon the families of those
witnesses who had come over, as far as he could,
and, under the directions of Colonel Browne, to
deliver the letters he carried over. As to the
families of the witnesses to come over, there was
nothing in reference to them, they being in no
danger. Q. Can the witness tell, I do not mean
to say within one or two, but as nearly as he can,
the number of witnesses who had come here from
the North of Italy?

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Do you mean with
Rastelli?

Mr. Brougham.—Yes. I do not mean with-
in one or two, or six or seven, but as nearly as
you can guess? I cannot tell; I do not know the
number of witnesses now here. Q. Will you
swear there were not forty from the North of
Italy?

The Attorney-General objected to this question.

Mr. Brougham observed, that witness had said
Rastelli's mission was not confined to the friends
of the witnesses who had come over with him,
but that he was to go round to call in the neigh-
bourhood of Milan.

The LORD CHANCELLOR desired the witness's
answer on this point to be read. The Short-hand
Writer having read the answer,

Mr. Brougham asked, if Rastelli was in this
country during the whole of the time subsequent
to the occurrence at Dover? He went to Holland
after the occurrence at Dover. Q. Will you
swear that he was not in the interim sent to Milan?
I mean before this journey? I do not know; I
did not see him after. Q. Will Witness state the
instructions he gave to Rastelli? I told him, as
far as I recollect, to collect letters from all