MAGIC POWER OF MINISTERS.

Lord LIVERPOOL suggested, that the windows on the South side should be thrown open. On this side there are no windows.

The LORD CHANCELLOR proposed, that *that* should be deemed the *South* side from which the wind blew.

The Speech was *a figure* we thought for the men,
When 'twas said to be turn'd as the Ministers chose,
But now are their powers much greater than then,
For the *walls* too, it seems, at their will they dispose.

How courteous, how courtly their words are obey'd,
When any one chuses to open his mouth—
Tho' windows can't be, where no windows are made,
Yet those in the *East*, if *they* please, may be *South*!

Such Ministers potent, we all must allow,
Whose call the *wind* hears, and as quickly obeys it,
Who name it at pleasure, how'er it may blow—
Tho' they find it a *job*, as I fancy, to *raise it!*

* * OSRICK—'Tis very hot.

HAMLET—No, believe me, 'tis very cold, the wind is Northerly.

OSRICK—It is indifferent cold, my Lord, indeed.

HAMLET—Methinks it is very sultry.

OSRICK—Exceedingly, my Lord, it is very sultry, as 'twere I cannot tell how.

* * * * *

HAMLET—They fool me to the top of my bent."

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.*

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

It appears to us, that the difference of opinion in the House of Lords, as to the guilt or innocence of the Queen, is a reason why, in point of law, the Bill should not be read a second time; for such difference necessarily implies reasonable doubt, and what is the consequence in all criminal cases (and surely this may be called one) where doubts exist, but an acquittal of the accused?—The Lord Chancellor says *(and he is not given to doubt)* that an adulterous intercourse is clearly proved; but how does his Lordship demonstrate the proposition, not by direct evidence of the act being committed, which if committed, the accused has a right to insist on capable of proof, but by probabilities, and surmises, inferences, and deductions, which may or may not lead to a just conclusion. We shall be glad to know where to find his Lordship's authority for this doctrine. Lord Ellenborough in his speech made a very important remark (and he was one of the Secret Committee), he said, that from the contents of the Green Bag he expected the case to be proved by irresistible evidence. From this it is clear that the case first submitted to the House of Lords was grossly exaggerated. Keeping this circumstance in view, let us calmly consider how the charges against the Queen have been compiled—the time they embrace (long since past); the plan adopted to select and collect the evidence; and last, not least, the great object in view with "all those means and appliances to boot," we beg of the dispassionate reader to consider the whole evidence, and we will then ask him whether gross improprieties (many, we admit, are incontestibly proved) may not by trifling exaggeration become indecencies, and may not indecencies by reasonable inference be easily turned into criminal acts? This sort of reasoning will not do. By the law of England, no punishment is to be inflicted by force of men's conceits: the rules of evidence are wisely made, in compassion to human infirmity: by their liberality the guilty often escape punishment, because the innocent shall never suffer: this is the sum and substance of all text writers on the subject, and we here take this opportunity of observing, that the arguments for the Queen (brilliant and able as they were) would have been much enforced by reference to authorities; for that mode of reasoning would have been an unerring guide for the judgment of the House of Lords. We first took notice of the case of Evans v. Evans, and are told the witnesses have satisfactorily answered the quotations, by saying, that the case has nothing to do with the present one, because Evans v. Evans was a suit instituted in the Ecclesiastical Court, in which the wife was the complainant: *verba scripta manent.* We quoted the case for the purpose of producing rules which are invariable, and applicable to all cases dependent on presumptive and circumstantial evidence.—Lord Grey, in his great and brilliant speech (great only because it was consistent with truth), quoted this case with prodigious effect. The Lord Chancellor in his reply will shew, if he can, its inapplicability: we rather think, *mutatis mutandis*, that his Lordship could have frittered away that which he now thinks substantial to the very shadow of a shade.

We want no alteration of the Laws of England: once degrade for grossness of conduct, and the same arguments may justify the House of Lords in dethroning, for what may be called expediency. We finish our remarks on this distressing subject, which, for the honour and dignity of the Crown and well being of the State, we hope means will be adopted to bury, if possible, in oblivion, with the assurance that every Member of the House of Lords will "be just and fear not," though he may not speak with tears in his eyes *(for that was the fashion with the Heathen Orators)*. We are confident that the Peers of this Realm will take into their consideration, before they legislate, the whole of this sad eventful history, and will, in the judgment they come to, "let all the ends they aim at be—their Country's, their God's, and Truth's."

The present Lord Chancellor, in giving sentence in a cause which, like many others, had been almost an age in Chancery, by way of accounting for the difficulty which he so frequently felt in coming to a decided opinion on any question, related a conversation he had once had on this subject. A Gentleman having observed, that he was astonished how any man should have any difficulty in deciding a cause one way or other, as all causes must be either black or white. "If all causes," said his Lordship, "were either black or white, there would be little difficulty; but I have found the most of the causes which have passed through my hands, neither black nor white, but *grey*." It has been remarked as singular, that the only question on which that Noble Lord is known to have entertained no doubt whatever, is that of the guilt of the Queen. "The circumstances of this case," said his Lordship, "must be such as that a reasonable and plain man, addressing himself dispassionately to the consideration of the case, cannot doubt of the guilt imputed." We have heard Lords Grey, Erskine, Holland, Lansdown, Grosvenor, Harewood, &c. &c. in a word, all the distinguished political opponents of his Lordship, and all the more honourable and independent of his own adherents, express themselves either convinced of the Queen's innocence, or at least satisfied that no proof had been afforded of her guilt. Strange that the first question on which his Lordship should have no doubt whatever, the first purely black question, should be one in which his opinion is not only at variance with that of all who are most distinguished for talents and virtue among the Peers, but that of almost all the *reasonable and plain* men of the Country.—That Lord Liverpool and the rest of his Colleagues should be equally strangers to doubt was to be expected. Neither will the Public be much surprised to hear, that the Duke of Newcastle posted up to Town to pass sentence against the Queen without hearing her defence. *Reasonable and plain* men, though they may not see evidence of the Queen's guilt, can be at no loss to understand the cause of these things.

We are at a loss to understand upon what principle many Noble Lords, who profess so high a reverence for the Crown, should be so anxious to degrade the individual who wears it. These Noble Lords profess to have no doubt of the Queen's guilt—no doubt that she has degraded herself, but still they are determined that she shall remain the wife of the King. Reverence for the Crown may thus, it appears, be associated with the most marked contempt for the King personally. We will bow to the Crown, but we will heap insult after insult on the wearer. We will tell that wearer, that his wife is a degraded woman, but that he is a still more degraded man—that though she is an unfit associate for any of the mothers and daughters of England, she is still good enough for his wife. All the insinuations which have been thrown out against the conduct of the King are thus at once converted into calumnies; and the Bill, without the Divorce, may be appropriately entitled a Bill to deprive the Queen of her rights, and to degrade and dishonour the King.

But when we consider who the originators of the present Bill are, we ought not to wonder that they should so readily consent to degrade the King. These Gentlemen are ready to degrade the Queen, to degrade the King, and to degrade themselves, for the sake of their places. Let us hear the character given of them by one of the most marked of the supporters of the Bill. In that House Lord Donoughmore declared on the 21st of April, 1812:—"The Ministers have drawn, as it were, a magic circle round the Throne—into which none are permitted to enter, on whom the confidence of the illustrious person has been accustomed to repose. Within its range, *the artificers of mischief* have not ceased to work with too successful industry. What phantoms have they not conjured up to warp the judgment, to excite the feelings, and appal the firmness of the Royal mind! But though the evil genius *should assume a mitred*—nay, more than noble form, the sainted aspect which political bigotry delights to wear, or the lineaments of *that softer sex which first beguiled man to his destruction*—though to the allurements of Calypso's Court were joined the magic and the charms of that matured enchantress—should the spirit of darkness take the human shape, *and issuing forth from the inmost recesses of the gaming-house or brothel, presume to place itself near the royal ear;* what though the potent spell should not have worked in vain, and that the boasted recantation of all encumbering prepossessions and inconvenient prejudices had already marked the triumph of its course—though from the royal side they should have torn the chosen friend of his youth, and faithful Counsellor of his maturer years, the boast of his own gallant profession, the pride, the hope, and the refuge of my distracted country, and a high and conspicuous ornament of yours—tho' they should have banished from the Royal Councils, talents, integrity, honour and high mindedness like his, *and should have selected for the illustrious person an associate and an adviser from Change-alley and from the Stews*—though they should have thus filled up to its full measure the disgusting catalogue of their enormities, we must still cling to the foundering vessel, and call to our aid those characteristic British energies by which the ancestors of those whom I have now the honour to address have so often and so nobly saved the sinking State. Parliament must lay the spirit of evil which is abroad—beware how you neglect the performance of your part of that important duty; public indignation justly provoked, and the maddening sense of unheeded grievances and *triumphant profligacy*, are fearful reformers." Thus far the Noble Lord, in 1812. The Ministers of 1812, who, according to his Lordship, surrounded Royalty with associates *from Change-alley and the Stews*, continue to be the Ministers of 1820; and it is not now in the history of the world, that the tempter should betray his victim—that those who labour to withdraw any one from the path of duty should be the first to reproach him with it, and to proclaim his fall to the world, and the readiest to assist in effecting his ruin.

Contrast this selfish course with the open, manly, and generous conduct of Lord Erskine, who, while he raises a voice which has so often been heard in the cause of humanity, in behalf of an innocent and persecuted Queen, endeavours at the same time to rescue her husband from those who are about to sacrifice him. While these hollow friends to Majesty are giving their sanction to all the calumnies which have been circulated against the King, and poisoning the arrows which are to be discharged against him, Lord Erskine generously comes forward and eulogises his Majesty, "whose heart," he said, "was known to him, and who, he was convinced, would be the last man on earth to countenance injustice or oppression, when his judgment was allowed to exercise itself. He would do any thing to promote the happiness of that illustrious Individual, except to desert his duty."

* This article was written prior to the Second Reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties.

LIST OF THE LORDS,

As they voted on the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, in the order in which they were read in the House:

CONTENTS FOR THE BILL.

LORDS.	St. Asaph	Pomfret
Pendhoe	St. David's	Macclesfield
Harris	Worcester	Aylesford
Ross (Glasgow)	London	Coventry
Meldram (Aboyne)		Rochford
Hill	VISCOUNTS.	Abingdon
Combermere	Exmouth	Shaftsbury
Hopetoun	Lake	Cardigan
Gambier	Sidmouth	Balcarras
Manners	Melville	Winchilsea
Aiken (Castilla)	Curzon	Stamford
Lauderdale	Sydney	Bridgewater
Sheffield	Falmouth	Home
Redesdale	Hereford	Huntingdon
St. Helens	EARLS.	MARQUISES.
Northwick	Limerick	Conyngham
Bolton	Ross	Thomond
Bayning	Donoughmore	Headfort
Carrington	Belmore	Anglesey
De Dunstanville	Mayo	Northampton
Ross	Longford	Camden
Saltersford (Courtown)	Mountcashel	Exeter
Stewart of Garlies (Galloway)	St. Germains	Cornwallis
Stuart (Moray)	Brownlow	Buckingham
Douglas (Morton)	Whitworth	Lothian
Grenville	Yarborough	Queensberry
Suffield	Cathcart	Winchester
Montagu	Mulgrave	DUKES.
Gordon (Huntly)	Lonsdale	Wellington
Somers	Oxford	Northumberland
Rodney	Manvers	Newcastle
Middleton	Nelson	Rutland
Napier	Powis	Beaufort
Colville	Liverpool	Lord Privy Seal
Gray	Digby	(Westmorland)
Saltoun	Mount Edgcumbe	Lord President
Forbes	Strange (Athol)	(Harrowby)
	Abergavenny	Archbishop of Cusm
BISHOPS.	Aldersey	Chancellor (Eldon)
Cork	Bathurst	Archbishop of
Landaff	Chatham	Canterbury
Peterborough	Harcourt	Clarence
Gloucester	Warwick	York
Chester	Portsmouth	
Ely	Graham (Montrose)	

NON-CONTENTS AGAINST THE BILL.

LORDS.	Saye-and-Sele	De-la-Warr
Brendalbane	Dacre	Dehester
Erskine	Zouch	Darlington
Arden	Clinton	Egremont
Ellenborough	Audley	Fitzwilliam
Alvanley	De Clifford	Stanhope
Lofton (Ely)	Belhaven	Cowper
Fitzgibbon (Clare)		Dartmouth
Calthorpe	VISCOUNTS.	Oxford
Dawsey (Downe)	Granville	Rosseberry
Yarborough	Anson	Jersey
Dundas	Duncan	Albemarle
Selsea	Hood	Plymouth
Mendip (Clifden)	Leinster (Duke of)	Essex
Auckland	Torrington	Tunnet
Gage	Bolingbroke	Denbigh
Fisherwick (Donegal)	EARLS.	Suffolk
Amherst	Blessington	Pembroke
Kenyon	Caledon	Derby
Sherborne	Enniskillen	MARQUISES.
Berwick	Farnham	Bath
Ashburton	Gosford	Stafford
Bagot	Carrick	Lansdowa
Walsingham	Morley	
Dynevor	Minto	DUKES.
Foley	Harewood	Portland
Hawke	Grey	Brandon (Hamilton)
Sondridge (Argyll)	Romney	Devonshire
Durie	Roslyn	Bedford
Holland	Carnarvon	Grafton
Grantham	Mansfield	Richmond
King	Portescue	Somerset
Clifton (Darnley)	Grosvenor	Archbishop of York
Howard, of Effingham	Hillsborough (Downshire)	Gloucester.

The second title affixed to several Peers is that by which they are generally known.

Of the majority of 28 in favour of the Bill—

Two Princes of the Blood, holding high offices at pleasure	2
Cabinet Ministers, avowed Prosecutors in this accusation	9
Persons holding offices dependant on the Prosecutors	13
Archbishop of Canterbury, who prejudged the case by erasing her Majesty's name from the Liturgy	1
Three Peers who attended the Prosecution, and were absent for the Defence; the Duke of Newcastle, and Two other Lords	3
	28

FROM THE LONDON GAZETTE OF NOV. 4.

ADMIRALTY-OFFICE, NOV. 4, 1820.

Copy of a Letter from Lieutenant William Edward Parry, commanding his Majesty's ship Hecla (lately employed with the Griper Gun Brig on a Voyage of Discovery in the Arctic Seas), to John Wilson Croker, Esq. dated his Majesty's ship Hecla, West Coast of Davis's Strait, lat. 70 deg. 41 min. N. long. 69 deg. 17 min. W. Sept. 5, 1820.

SIR—I avail myself of an undexpected opportunity by the Lee, of Hull, whaler, to acquaint you, for the information of my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, that his Majesty's ships under my orders succeeded in discovering a passage through Lancaster's Sound into the Polar Sea, and penetrated, during the summer of 1819, as far as the longitude of 112½ deg. west of Greenwich, between the parallels of 74 deg. and 75 deg. north latitude.

In this space twelve islands have been discovered, and named the Islands of New Georgia, in honour of his Majesty. The expedition wintered in a harbour on the south side of the largest of these islands (called Melville Island), in latitude 74 deg. 47 min. N. and longitude 110 deg. 47 min. W. and proceeded to the westward immediately on the breaking up of the ice at the commencement of the present season, the ships being in perfect condition, the officers and men in excellent health, and with every prospect of the final accomplishment of our enterprize.

At the south-west end of Melville Island, however, the quantity and magnitude of the ice was found to increase so much, that for sixteen days (being above one-third of the whole navigable season in that part of the Polar Sea), it was found impossible to penetrate to the westward beyond the Meridian of 113 deg. 47 min. W.; in order, therefore, that no time might be lost, I determined to try what could be done in a more southern latitude, and for that purpose, ran back along the edge of the ice, which had hitherto formed a continuous barrier to the south of us, in order to look out for any opening which might favour the plan I had in view; in this endeavour I was also disappointed—and the season being so far advanced as to make it a matter of question whether, with the remaining resources, the object of the enterprize could now be preserved in, with any hope of success, I consulted the principal officers of the expedition, who were unanimously of opinion, that nothing more could be done, and that it was, on that account, advisable to return to England.

In this opinion it was impossible for me, under existing circumstances, not to concur, and I trust that the detailed account of our proceedings, which I shall shortly have the honour to lay before their Lordships, will prove highly satisfactory, and that, though our exertions have not been crowned with complete success, they will not be found discreditable to the naval honour of our country.

I beg you will be pleased to acquaint their Lordships, that having proposed to survey the west coast of Davis's Straits, previous to my return, and being desirous of losing as little as possible of the remaining part of the present season, which is favourable for the navigation of these seas, I have not considered it right to detain the expedition for the purpose of transmitting by the Lee a more full account of this voyage; I shall only, therefore, add, that having accomplished the object now in view, I hope to reach England by the first week in November.

I have the honour to be, &c.

W. E. PARRY, Lieut. and Com.

ADMIRALTY-OFFICE, NOV. 4, 1820.

Lieutenant Parry, accompanied by Captain Sabine, of the Royal Artillery, attached to the expedition, arrived at this office this morning.

Lieutenant Parry states, that the officers and men of both vessels passed the winter without any considerable inconvenience, notwithstanding the intense cold (the thermometer having been so low as 55 degrees below zero); and that only one man was lost, who died of a chronic disease of the heart.

BIRTH-DAY OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH.

We have much pleasure in stating, that it has been resolved, by some distinguished friends of taste and literature in Ireland, to hold a Meeting at Ballymahon, on the 29th November, to celebrate the anniversary of our great national Poet, Oliver Goldsmith; and also for the purpose of devising the most practicable means of getting rid of a well-merited reproach, under which our country lies in the literary world, by the erection of a pillar to the memory of our Poet, on that fascinating spot in Lissoy, which presented to his eye the most agreeable horizon in nature. Unlike Swift, Congreve, and other ingrates, who either denied their country, or left no traces in their writings by which it could be ascertained, Goldsmith identified himself and his divine poetry with the localities of his natal spot—his inimitable delineations of which have elicited such universal feelings of admiration and delight. His memory, therefore, is well entitled to some public testimonial of regard from a country which desires so much honour from his birth; and we feel no doubt of the success of this laudable and spirited undertaking. We have been given to understand, that it will not be necessary for any individual to subscribe more than a small sum, payable, in separate portions, on the next and two succeeding birth-days of the Poet; for it is reasonably expected that the subscription will be as general in Ireland as the feeling which has suggested it, in a Country so remarkably distinguished for the literary taste and capabilities of its People. The Scotch have set us an example, very lately, by erecting a splendid pillar, near Dumfries, to the memory of Burns. The Bard of Avon has long been the idol of taste in England, where, in every village that can boast of having produced an eminent literary character, the spot of his nativity is pointed out with conscious exultation; but in Ireland—warm-hearted, romantic Ireland—with shame be it spoken, the only memorial of her Goldsmith—buried in a foreign land—of him whose heart, untravelled, still fondly turned to her—is his own old hawthorn tree in Lissoy, now nearly cut away by literary pilgrims, whose devotion to Goldsmith and his "Deserted Village" shames the apathy of a country which has left both without a mark of public honour for almost half a century.—*Belfast News Letter.*

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

Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No 12,631. TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1820. PRICE FIVE PENCE.

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

HOUSE OF LORDS—TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7.

HER MAJESTY'S PROTEST.

[After the reading of the *Protest*, as given in the *Chronicle* of Saturday, the following proceedings took place]

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—I apprehend, that, according to the ordinary course of proceedings, after the second reading of a Bill of this nature, the person who is the object of the Bill has a right to be personally heard. It is, therefore, for your Lordships to consider, whether this Protest is to be received as the Address of the Individual; as such, I conceive that it may be received, but that as a Protest it cannot.

Lord DACRE.—My Lords, I am aware of the difficulty pointed out by the Learned and Noble Lord on the Woolsack; but as it is admitted that her Majesty may be heard personally, your Lordships, I am sure, would not wish to press on a person of her exalted rank and situation the necessity of addressing your Lordships, but that, in some form, the Protest of her Majesty will be admitted.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL thought, as this might be the most convenient mode of her Majesty expressing her sentiments, there could be no objections to receiving it; and, to prevent its being drawn into a precedent, some entry on the Journals, stating it to be a special case, might be made.

The LORD CHANCELLOR deemed it his duty to state to the House, that the only way in which he conceived the Protest could be admitted was, not as a Protest, but as a representation from her Majesty, instead of a personal Address.

Lord LAUDERDALE begged to know from their Lordships, whether, considering the context, that Address would have been received in the House as part of a speech without interruption? It was impossible that their Lordships could for a moment think of permitting such a violent attack upon their character. He found that it was said in that Paper, that Noble Lords came from the Secret Committee with minds biassed by a mass of slanders. How could her Majesty, or her Majesty's Advisers, know, that all the evidence which had been brought before the Secret Committee had not been laid before the House? This was one of the most direct calumnies ever vented against the House. He, for one, had sat upon the Committee, and he declared before God, that his opinion of the Queen's guilt had arisen from her own defence. Was it possible that their Lordships would permit themselves to be thus slandered? With all due respect towards the Illustrious Personage who was under such circumstances in that House, and with every feeling of delicacy towards her as a female, he could not help making some observations upon the Protest she had thought proper to present—so powerful was his sense of duty. He begged and implored their Lordships to recollect their own dignity; and, while they were permitting any statement to go upon their journals, to take care that it should not convey any stigma upon their own character. *(Hear, hear!)*

The Duke of NEWCASTLE rose. He had, he said, heard some observations, intimating, that, by an *ex post facto* law, some of their Lordships, who had been unavoidably absent, were to be deprived of their most valuable privilege, that of voting. Now he was determined to maintain all his privileges, and he should do his duty conscientiously, without fear of consequences.

Lord SOMERS and Lord SHEFFIELD spoke in explanation of their absence during part of the proceedings, and in justification of the votes they had given.

Lord CARNARVON said the case was of such a nature, that the absence of any Noble Lord for a single hour might have been of great importance. Much, however, in such circumstances as those under which the Queen laboured, must be left to the discretion of their Lordships. He was aware that the language of the Paper was, strictly speaking, objectionable, but great allowance should be made for the painful situation in which her Majesty was placed; and he trusted that the greatest latitude would be given. He should certainly have been much better pleased if her Majesty had said, their Lordships had come to a consideration of her case under circumstances which rendered it impossible that their minds should not be biassed. *(Hear, hear!)* He, at the same time, must declare, that if he had been on the Committee, he should not entertain a thought of voting, convinced, as he was, that such was human infirmity, he could not but be an inadequate judge. *(Hear!)* Had he been Counsel for her Majesty, he would not have advised her to submit any more appeals to the House; and he could not help expressing his surprise at the fact that some Noble Lords thought themselves at liberty to come to a decision about the guilt or innocence of their Queen, and at the same time to trample under their feet the most vital principles of justice! *(Hear, hear!)* He condemned the conduct of the Noble Duke (Newcastle), who said that an *ex post facto* law had been made to prevent him from voting. Unaccustomed to the forms of law, the Noble Duke had, in the anxious discharge of his duty, trenched upon the most obvious principles of justice. Why, asked his Lordship, had the Noble Earl opposite moved, at the commencement of this proceeding, that the House should be called over? Why was it that no Peer was allowed to vote by proxy?—Was it not because no Peer was entitled to vote who did not personally attend the investigation of the case? When the Noble Duke claimed the right of voting without hearing the defence, he was, in fact, claiming to vote by proxy; it was to all intents and purposes the same thing. He remembered well the words of the Noble Earl opposite (Lord Liverpool); when he moved the call of the House, he had said, most emphatically, that he trusted no Noble Lord would *presume* to give a vote on the case who did not hear the whole of the evidence. *(Hear!)* The Noble Lord on the Woolsack, too, had assented to the principle, though he had somewhat qualified its application; he had said, that if he were to be two or three days absent during the proceedings, he should not consider himself justified in voting on the Bill.—*(Hear, hear!)* But did either of these Noble Lords ever contemplate that any Noble Peer who should be absent, not days, but weeks, who should not hear one word of the defence, should come down and say, that he was not only ready to vote for the Bill, but for the severest Penalties which it contained. *(Loud cheers.)* He thought that, considering everything, this was a case in which the House could not relax too much, from any strict rules of practice, in favour of the accused party. He saw nothing so informal in the Protest, as should prevent its being received. The contents of it, as far as respected matter of fact, were strictly true; they were such as all their Lordships, as the whole Country, must feel the force of; he wished to God they could be soon forgotten; for, while remembered, the judicial character of their Lordships would never again occupy that high situation which it had heretofore maintained.

The LORD CHANCELLOR explained, that he had no disinclination to receiving the Protest in some form or other; he wished that her Majesty should have the full benefit of it; his only doubt was as to the proper mode of the thing. He thought that as an Address from her Majesty, containing what she had further to say in her behalf, it might be accepted; but that to prevent its forming a prejudicial precedent, it would be proper to enter the reception of it on the Journals in these words:—"Notwithstanding the exceptions which the House might take to the contents of the Protest, yet, under the circumstances of the case, they consent to receive it as her Majesty's representation of what her Majesty has further to state in the present stage of the proceeding."

Lord DACRE saw no objection to such an entry being made on the Journals.

Lord DONOUGHMORE had the same feeling on the subject with the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack. He did not entertain those objections to the contents of the Protest which some Noble Lords did. He had been one of the Members of the Secret Committee, but he did not feel called upon to stand on his defence on that account. He went upon it with his eyes open, and when upon it he did not object to doing what he conceived to be his bounden duty. Her Majesty might make what statement she pleased on the subject: he felt under no obligation to answer it. Whatever a party under accusation might conceive of use to her Defence, ought to be received in the most respectful manner. After all, there was nothing new in the Protest; not a single ground of objection which had not been repeated in the House again and again. It asserts her Majesty's innocence—so her Majesty did from the beginning. It objects to the Members of the Secret Committee voting on the Bill—so her Majesty had done from the beginning.—It objects to her Prosecutors sitting in judgment upon her—such had been the gravamen of her Defence from the very first. The only new ground of objection was that some of their Lordships had absented themselves during the Defence, and that of course was an objection which must have arisen since the commencement of the proceedings.

Lord LAUDERDALE suggested, that in the entry proposed by the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack, after the words "exceptions which the House might," the word "justly" should be inserted. He thought this necessary to carry down to posterity a proper assertion of the dignity and privileges of the House.

Earl GREY thought that the mischiefs threatened by this proceeding, were now beyond all hope of remedy. If compelled to attend he would; but he did not feel disposed to take any further part in the present proceedings, except by giving a silent vote. He had no objection to the amendment proposed by his Noble Friend on the cross bench (Lauderdale), but he agreed to it only on the ground that the House might be supposed *justly* to take exceptions to the regularity of the Protest; for, as to the objections contained in that Paper, he thought them most just and well founded. *(Hear, hear!)* He considered the objection particularly strong which respected those Noble Lords who had thought it consistent with their honour and duty, and had reconciled it to their consciences, after hearing the evidence for the Prosecution, and not one syllable of the Defence—*(hear, hear!)*—to give their votes on a question of this momentous nature. He had no right to find fault with these Noble Lords. They must answer to God and to their consciences for the vote they had given. All he would say was, that it did seem to him a little extraordinary, that after the House had declared it to be impossible for any Peer to vote by proxy, so many Peers, acting contrary to that principle, should appear, as it were, their own proxies. *(Hear!)*

Lord ROSSDALE defended the Members of the Secret Committee, who were entitled to vote on this question without any imputation on their character. Their Lordships' duty now was to decide this question on the evidence produced at the Bar, and which was entered in the Minutes.

The Resolution of the Lord Chancellor, as amended by Lord Lauderdale, that the Protest of her Majesty be received, was then put and carried without a division.

On the Order of the Day being read for the House resolving itself into a Committee,

The Earl of DARNLEY said, he would not long detain their Lordships, but content himself for the present with protesting against this, as he had done against every stage of the proceeding. With the feelings he entertained on the subject, and which were now stronger than ever, he could not help congratulating their Lordships on the division of yesterday, although it would have the effect of extending the proceedings in this House. He had attended the House every day and every hour during the trial; and, from the whole of the evidence, he felt now, as he did at the commencement, that the measure was wholly unnecessary. From the unusual manner in which the votes had been taken yesterday, the Public had the opportunity of appreciating and analyzing that division. Their Lordships, in looking at the list, could not help observing, that a large portion of the majority consisted of her Majesty's Accusers themselves! another considerable portion were Peers who had recently received favours from the Crown!—*(Hear, hear!)* *The ten junior Barons said Content to the Bill, and eighteen senior Barons said Non-Content.* He (Lord Darnley) had understood, both from the Noble Lord on the Woolsack and the Noble Earl opposite (Liverpool), that their Lordships should attend these proceedings *de die in diem*, unless prevented by sickness; and that if any Peer was absent during an important part of the trial, he should not be entitled to vote; and yet a Noble Lord had voted against the Queen who had not heard her defence. The Noble Earl concluded by declaring, that he would take this opportunity, and every opportunity, of giving every opposition to the Bill.

After a few words from Lord Sheffield, which were quite inaudible below the Bar, the House resolved itself into a Committee.

On the Earl of Shaftesbury (the Chairman) putting the question, whether the discussion on the preamble should be postponed?

The Earl of LIVERPOOL alluded to what had been stated on a former day, respecting the alteration of the Preamble, which it was admitted might be changed; but the question now was, whether the preamble had been proved or not? He would now read the Preamble, and state such alterations as he deemed necessary. The first was the name of the individual who was so conspicuous in these proceedings, which he wished to be altered to "Bartolomeo Bergami," instead of "Bartholomo Pergami." He would also move, that the words of the Preamble, charging the Queen with having "obtained for him orders of Knighthood, and titles of honour," should be struck out—not that he had any doubt of the fact, but as it had not been proved in evidence. He would now come to a most material part of the Preamble, which stated, that "while her Royal Highness had the said Bartolomeo Bergami in her service, she, unmindful of her exalted birth and station, and regardless of her own honour, conducted herself towards Bergami, in the various places and countries where her Royal Highness visited, with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom."—He would move, that the word "the" should be struck out, and that it should stand, "in various places and countries." These were the only alterations he deemed necessary, and he would afterwards have occasion to state, that the Preamble had been fully proved.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY inquired if any other Noble Lord had any alterations to suggest in the Preamble?

Lord ERSKINE said, their Lordships were, in his opinion, going to strike out the only part of the Preamble that was true. He (Lord Erskine) did not believe that the degrading intercourse with which the Queen was charged had been proved.

A conversation then ensued on the alterations, in which Lords Grenville, Ellenborough, Lauderdale, Liverpool and Grosvenor spoke.

Earl GROSVENOR wished to know how the Noble Earl opposite had made himself so well acquainted with the name of Bergami?

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, he had learnt it from the diploma of Lieutenant Hownam, which was signed by the individual. His Lordship then stated, that the part of the Preamble which alluded to indecent familiarities had been proved by De Mont. *(A laugh, and cries of Hear, hear!)* What would their Lordships think of their wives going to a masquerade with their butlers and servants. *(A laugh.)* This fact had not been denied, and should be credited. His Lordship then spoke of the other proofs of indecent familiarities, and stated, that it could not be denied that there had been incontestible evidence to that effect.

A long conversation took place upon the subject, in which Lord Carnarvon, Lord Donoughmore, Lord Lauderdale, Lord Darlington and Lord Ellenborough participated.

Lord CARNARVON begged to know from the Noble Earl (Liverpool), whether he, from his political experience, could state at what age it was too late for a woman to play an Automaton.—*(A laugh.)*

Lord ELLENBOROUGH moved, that the words "adulterous intercourse" should be omitted, as it would be injustice to the King to let it stand on the Journals that her Majesty had been degraded for adulterous intercourse, and still that she was not divorced. He had no idea that the Bill would pass into a law.

Lord HARROWBY supported the words.

Lord LIVERPOOL said that, in the present stage of the Bill, the question was not one of expediency—it was, whether the allegations had been proved? He, therefore, called upon those Noble Lords who had voted from the principle of expediency merely, to vote according to their views of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant.

Lord ERSKINE observed, that the Noble Earl had omitted some things which were true, and certainly he might consent to the omission of those which were false. He considered the Protest of her Majesty confirmatory evidence of her innocence; but if their Lordships were determined to think her otherwise, how could they deny she had been guilty of an adulterous intercourse, and refuse to divorce her? *(Hear, hear!)*

Lord GAGE suggested the words "suspicious intercourse," in the place of those to which objection had been made.

The original words were carried.

Lord CARNARVON proposed to introduce a clause to the following effect: "That, subsequent to her Majesty's return, she had refused £50,000 a year of the public money, which had been proferred to her as a homage by both Houses of Parliament."

Lord LAUDERDALE said that nothing to that effect had been proved, and could not properly be entertained.

Lord CARNARVON withdrew the Clause, but gave notice that he would move it when the Report should be brought up.

The Preamble then was carried, and the House proceeded to discuss the Clauses.

THE DIVORCE CLAUSE.

The Clause having been read,

The Archbishop of YORK rose. He knew, he said, of no religious expedience that could justify any thing of this sort—Marriage was not a civil contract, but a sacred ordinance of religion, and he looked to the word of God as his guide in forming an opinion upon this case. He could not therefore vote for the Divorce. And yet, if the House were to pass the Bill without the Divorce, the monstrous spectacle would be exhibited of a King having for his wife a degraded woman! There was no possibility of avoiding this extremity, without throwing out the Bill altogether.—*(Loud cries of Hear, hear, hear!)* He felt no hesitation in yesterday giving his vote against the Bill; but he must declare, if called upon to give his opinion in his judicial situation, that he must be under the painful necessity of saying Guilty to the charges. It had been said, that regard for public morals, and the interests of religion, required that the Bill should pass. Much more would the public morals, and the interests of religion, have been served, if the Bill had never been spoken of. *(Hear, hear, hear!)* Those nauseous publications would not have got into private society. It would be gratifying to all good men to hear that the measure was formally abandoned: but it would be gratifying to the enemies of order to hear that it was persevered in. He concluded by praying to, God that he might not have to deprecate the continuance of the Bill for the rest of his life.

The Bishop of CHESTER said, he believed the Queen to be guilty, but he had voted for the second reading of the Bill, upon the understanding that the Divorce Clause was to be laid aside. He should vote against that Clause, as he judged as he would wish to be judged.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that if the question was whether divorces *ex vinculo matrimonio* were consistent with the word of God? he felt bound to answer, that they were. He must tell their Lordships, that they were directly and expressly declared to be lawful by our SAVIOUR himself. They were certainly not authorised by the Canons and Institutions of the Established Church, nor by the Common Law of the land. But why so? Marriage lies at the foundation of all society, and forms one of the first principles of social order. It had been the object of all States to protect it by every means in their power from dissolution. Divorces had, notwithstanding, occurred both before & since the Reformation. They were, notwithstanding, consonant both with the Morals and with the

answered, "I pointed out to her Royal Highness several things relative to her affairs, which it was desirable should be settled in England, such as the sale of some goods, the payment of some bills that were due, &c." It therefore, said the Noble Marquis, was not true, that Sicard was sent away without a wish on his part; on the contrary, he suggested it to her Royal Highness, and pointed out sufficient reasons why he should go to England. So much for Sicard's leaving the Princess at Naples. A Noble and Learned Lord (Manners) had, in reference to other parts of her Royal Highness's suite leaving her at Naples, said that Mr. Craven had left her Royal Highness in consequence of his having cautioned the Princess against walking with Bergami; but, from the evidence of Mr. Craven, this was not the case. He acknowledged giving the Princess such a caution, and said, that if he had seen her Royal Highness walking with any other person instead of Bergami, he would have stated to her that he thought she was exposing herself, and that an improper inference would be drawn from it by the spies which he believed to be watching the conduct of her Royal Highness. It was true that the greatest part of the Princess's suite did leave her at Naples; but their Lordships had no right to draw an unfavourable inference from the circumstance. It was not unnatural that her English attendants should not wish to remain in foreign countries, absent from their friends and connexions, for more than a limited time. The Noble Marquis said he would notice that part of the case which had been much adverted to, the charge at Carlsruhe—a case in which a party had been brought to this country to give evidence against the Queen, and where the same power failed of getting a witness for her. He would confess, that his impression was rather favourable to Barbara Kress; but, in the present unsifted state of the case, their Lordships did not know but that Barbara Kress might herself have been deceived, and made to believe that she saw her Royal Highness in company with Bergami, when, in fact, it was his sister, the Countess of Oldi. A Noble Lord had said, Kress came voluntarily forward with her testimony; but if their Lordships looked at the evidence, they would find, that Von Grimm who had given up his apartments to the Princess, for what purpose he knew not, and who, the moment her Royal Highness quitted them, ran from room to room, immediately called up Kress, and asked her if she had seen nothing improper in the Princess of Wales's conduct? The fact was, that Barbara Kress was brought to this Country by power, and by power only, and the same power failed in bringing over a witness for the Queen. This being the case, was it possible that the testimony of Kress could be admitted? He had heard many Noble Lords declare, with great appearance of candour, that they would dismiss from their minds different parts of the evidence, in consideration of the doubtfulness of the veracity of those who gave it; but he would tell those Noble Lords, that they were bound not to dismiss from their consideration one tittle of the evidence, in justice to the Queen.—(Hear!) The case of Senegaglia, and other cases exhibiting the same character of falsehood, should be kept in the closest remembrance. It should also be remembered, that the Counsel for the Defence were prohibited from going into general proofs of the existence of a conspiracy; and if, in keeping within the rules prescribed to them, they had elicited the fact, that somehow or other, through all the parts in which her Majesty resided, there existed a conviction that those who were ready to give evidence against her would get into the most sure road to fortune—if their Lordships should presume from what had come before them that this was the case, and that a machinery and agency existed, from the German Minister down to the German waiting-maid, (a character as respectable as a German Minister engaged in such a cause)—if they were convinced that such an opinion was created by the examination of the testimony of Sacchi and Cuchi, who seemed to speak so purely from the love of truth—were they not bound to look upon that of Paturzo and Gargullo, which had been subject to such doubt, as likely to be influenced by similar views, and to infer the general probability? (Hear, hear!) There was another circumstance well worthy of consideration; their Lordships were desired to compare the evidence of Majocchi and De Mont with that of Flynn and Hownam; and they were told that there were characters in the evidence of all of them, which placed them on the same footing as to credibility.—He begged their Lordships not to confound the evidence of persons who forgot what had existed, with the evidence of those who remembered what had not existed at all.—(Hear!) Such a comparison struck him as most absurd, particularly when he looked to the memory of Majocchi, who recollected having seen Doctor Holland attending upon Bergami in her Royal Highness's presence, and to that of Doctor Holland, who had not and could not have recollected anything of the kind. Distinctions of this kind were to result from the natural principles of evidence.—The Noble Lord then spoke with reference to the absence of the Countess of Oldi and Mariette upon the part of the defence, witnesses whom it would have been inexpedient to call, as the time and place which their testimony could have embraced had not been sufficiently specified, and, of course, their depositions could not lead to a distinct conclusion. He was surprised at a wish expressed by some Noble Lords, that Bergami himself should be called to the Bar. (Loud cries of Hear, hear!) He felt no hesitation whatever in declaring, that whether Bergami admitted or denied all the facts charged in the preamble, it would not weigh a feather in his mind, or in the mind of any other honourable man. (Hear, hear!) Not many years had elapsed since, in a case of divorce, it was proposed to call one of the parties to prove his connexion with the woman who lay under the imputation. On that occasion, a learned & able Judge declared, that if he were himself called to give evidence with respect to a female, to whom he was under such circumstances, he would consider himself absolved from the obligation to state the fact against her. (Hear, hear, hear!) Captain Hook, it was said, had been called upon a speculation of this nature. He was sworn, but he was not believed. [Hear, hear!] The Noble Lord then proceeded to make some observations upon the non-production of efficient witnesses by the Crown. He had conceived that, at the commencement of this inquiry, the cause would have been conducted as the cause of Truth v. the Princess of Wales, and he imagined that there would have been no party, except merely the Defendant. To this supposition he had been led by the Noble Lords opposite, who had said, that tho', for the sake of form, they had taken the character of prosecutors, not a tittle of evidence which, in the course of the investigation, should appear favourable to her R. H. should be suppressed. H. (the Marquis of Lansdown) called on their Lordships to look at the manner in which this purpose, so expressed, had been carried into effect. The evidence of Doctor Holland, who stood in so peculiar a situation with respect to her Majesty—a Gentleman in independent circumstances, and incapable of being influenced, who might have been supposed to be unexceptionable; all circumstances combined to render him the most unexceptionable witness; and yet he was not only not called, but it appeared that he had at no period before the investigation been asked a single question by those who professed such an anxiety to discover the whole truth. (Hear, hear!) Maurice Credi, who had lived with her Royal Highness at the very time when this criminal intercourse was said to have commenced, had not been called. The woman who made the beds at the very time when, if the intercourse had existed there, she must have had means of detecting it in her hands, had not been called.—She was in this country, and must have it in her power, if the adultery had taken place, to establish the fact. Yet that important person was withheld, and now, he believed, remained in Cotton-garden. When he considered that the defence had a party to protect, and that there was to exist on the other side no party but the mere desire to elucidate the truth, he must say, the House was hardly dealt with in not having before them evidence of this description, which must inevitably lead to truth. [Hear, hear!] As to the circumstances which were enumerated in support of the great charge, as corroborants of the evidence of a criminal intercourse, he would say, that the peculiar situation of her Royal Highness should be considered with much attention. It was only by being placed in certain states of relationship that the virtues were called into action; and out of them it was more than probable they would never have a being. It would, then, have considerable weight with their Lordships, that the person charged with not having acted up to the dignity of her station was under her own solitary control, unsupported by any of those authorities which regulate the conduct of society. [Hear!] Into such an inquiry as this the House should not go, for the purpose of pronouncing a judgment at all, much less with the view of passing a Bill of Pains and Penalties. [Hear, hear!] He thought that the House were bound to look at the consequences of the measure in all its possible bearings—that in the present stage of it, they not only might, but must, if they did their duty as men, as patriots, and as legislators, consider as well its expediency as its justice. The Noble Earl opposite (Lord Liverpool) had stated that there was no difference between this and any ordinary Divorce Bill. Such language he thought came rather strangely from the Noble Earl, who had directed their Lordships through the whole course of the proceedings, and who, at the very introduction of it, had proposed a Committee to search after precedents—not of Divorce Bills—but of Bills of Pains and Penalties. (Hear, hear!) The Report of that Committee had carefully excluded all mention of Divorce Bills, as being quite inapplicable to the case in hand; and it was rather too much now, when their Lordships came to feel all the weight of a Bill of Pains and Penalties pressing on the head of this Illustrious Individual, to turn round and say, Oh, it is nothing more than an ordinary Divorce!—The very thing which it had been universally agreed, in the outset, that it was not! If ever an intelligible difference existed, it was between an ordinary Divorce Bill and the present one of Pains and Penalties. The difference was as great and as obvious as between a Bill for the relief of the subject, and a Bill for inflicting punishment. Bills of Divorce were invariably intended for the relief of the subject; and when penalties were at any time introduced, they were merely accessary to the main object, which was certainly not the infliction of punishment. In Bills of Pains and Penalties, on the contrary, the main object was punishment; and if anything affording relief crept in, it was merely accessary. The whole scope of them was not to do favour to any one, but to inflict punishment not provided for by the laws—If, after this explanation, their Lordships could really think to stand justified to their consciences for any hardship which might attend this proceeding, by saying that it was only a Bill of Divorce, he would only say, that never had justice been more partially measured out. If this Bill had any distinction from other Bills, it was in its being more violent in its operation than any other. At all times Bills of Pains and Penalties had been unpopular measures, not with that rabble who were described as entertaining an opinion on this proceeding, and who could be little aware of the nature and effect of it in a constitutional point of view, but with all those thinking classes of the community which formed the most valuable part of its moral force. Nor was this surprising, since it was a mode of proceeding which every author who had written on it had held out to the abhorrence and execration of their readers. A Blackstone had shrunk from the consideration of it, from a fear that to treat of Bills of Pains and Penalties might imply that they formed part of the Constitution; a Paley had openly stigmatised them as a departure from all law; and could their Lordships be surprised that a community so instructed and informed should entertain the deep-rooted aversion to them which they did? Could they be surprised that this aversion was in the present instance peculiarly strong, when the effect of the Bill now pending was to depose, to degrade, and to punish the Queen of the Country? With this knowledge of what public opinion is, and looking at the particular bearing of the measure, their Lordships were bound, as legislators, to consider on (as in any other case of a law) the effect it was likely to have on the People. It could not be sufficiently impressed on their Lordships, that they were passing a law, and not a sentence—that they were not administering any existing law of the land, but were, on a supposed foundation of expediency and public utility, passing a new law, which like other laws must find its own way in public opinion. With reference then to the effect which the measure would have on public opinion, nothing could in his opinion justify this most violent application of a violent measure, founded on nothing but a bare presumption—a presumption arising out of a possibility—that possibility arising out of the fact of her Majesty having five years ago reposed under an awning, to protect her from the intolerable heat of the sun, where an individual of the name of Bergami happened to be reposing at the same time; from which possibility of adultery being committed, the grand conclusion had been inferred, that great scandal and dishonour had been thrown on the Country! Scandal and dishonour! In the eyes of whom? In the eyes of none but Gargiulo and Paturzo. They were representatives of Europe on that occasion. [A laugh.] It was in their eyes that the character of our Country was dishonoured; and it was from their pure and honest regard for the vindication of our national honour, that the Milan Commission of inquiry, and the present Bill of Pains and Penalties, had proceeded. If their Lordships looked for any other evidence of the existence of this scandal and dishonour, they would look in vain. If they were led to affirm the preamble of the Bill, it must be from very different authority than anything which had been proved at their bar. There yet remained one circumstance more, which required their Lordships' most serious consideration. Public opinion could not appreciate all the mischiefs of this measure, regarding it as a precedent for the future. Some Noble Lord, who had spoken in support of the Bill, had quoted cases of Bills for altering the Succession. Would those who did so admit that a case of presumption was sufficient to alter the succession to the Crown? Would they shew what there was in the case for this Bill, which was not equally applicable to a case affecting the Succession? The object of this Bill was said to be, to save the Country from the great evil with which it was threatened by the operation of her Majesty's example on the morals of the Country. He alluded to nobody—he looked only to the general hypothesis that Kings and Queens of various characters must succeed to the Throne of these realms—and were their Lordships to be told that when any number of individuals chose to see in the conduct of any individual, either in possession of the regal dignity, or in the immediate line of succession to it, what in their minds was unbecoming example—were they to be told that this was to be made a ground for deposing and depriving them? [Hear, hear!] Was that the sort of precedent with which the supporters of this Bill wished to enrich the constitutional history of the Country? If it was not, on what ground could their Lordships advance further in this proceeding? Once lay this down as consitutional practice, and let three or four more such precedents arrive, and we should come at once to Elective Monarchy! Their Lordships might be startled at the term, but the fact was undoubted. It was the whole principle of Elective Monarchy to look at the effect of the personal character of the individual entrusted with the reins of power. Hereditary monarchy rested on a notion that the Constitution had provided guards which made the personal character of the Monarch a matter of indifference. [Hear, hear!]—Once remove the line—once establish the right of inquiry into the moral fitness of the Sovereign, and there would never be wanting persons to undertake such inquiries, and by them to endanger and convulse the Country. The Noble Marquis now made an eloquent appeal to those of their Lordships who might be disposed to vote for the second reading of the Bill, in the hope that it might afterwards be mitigated; and maintained, that to rely on any such hope would only lead to irreparable inconsistency. Up to this moment the House stood clear of imputation; a few hours would decide whether they would send down their names to posterity with the infamy of having, on a bare presumption, passed an Act to degrade and to punish a Sovereign of their Country. [*His Lordship sat down amidst loud cheers.*]

Lord MANNERS explained such part of his speech as had been alluded to by the Noble Marquis.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL admitted that there was not proof that Sicard had been sent away in order to facilitate the adulterous intercourse; as it appeared, from his evidence, that he left on business for her Royal Highness; and it was also true that he was ordered to hold himself in readiness to return, but that he never was sent for.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND could not consent to give a silent vote on so painful and important a subject. But, after attending to the whole of the evidence, to the speeches of Counsel, and to the arguments of Noble Lords, he felt in his conscience convinced that a long course of indecent familiarities and of adulterous intercourse had taken place between the Princess of Wales and her servant Bergami. With this impression, he could not consent that her Majesty should remain Queen Consort of England, and at the head of the females of this chaste and moral Country. He, therefore, felt no hesitation in voting for the Bill as it now stood, and must therefore give his vote for the second reading.

Lord HOWARD would not consent to give a verdict against her Majesty on the evidence of discarded servants. Taking into consideration all the facts of the case, he would vote against the second reading.

The Earl of ENNISKILLEN.—"My Lords, having been one of those who voted with the Noble Earl at the head of the Treasury on the first reading of this Bill, and having attended to the whole of the evidence, and endeavoured to understand it, I conceive it to be such a mass of contradiction and suspicion, that I would not convict any person on it, and, therefore, I give my vote against the second reading."

Lord CALTHORPE was not surprised that, on a question which, from its very nature, admitted of every shade of moral and political consideration, Noble Peers should differ in the particular view they took of it. Entertaining, as he did, a conviction that misconduct of a disgusting and degrading nature had been proved against her Majesty, he still could not give his vote for the present Bill, when he looked to her peculiar situation. Had the case against her Majesty been fully proved, and that her conduct had been as licentious as it was represented, yet, unless it had been proved that she had voluntarily resigned her connubial rights, which was not the case, he, even then, must think that the present was not the proper mode of proceeding! The Noble Lord thought the House of Peers had neglected their duty, as patrons and guardians of public morals, in not remonstrating with the Princess of Wales before she quitted this Country: they should have told her, that she was forfeiting the best protection—the protection of public opinion; that she was quitting a Country where morals were rigid, for one in which they were more lax; and that she was subjecting herself to increased temptation. He would ask their Lordships if this was the time to expose Kingly power, or to pass a Bill that would throw odium on his Majesty as a Husband, as a King, or as the Head of the State? Was this the time to ask the Royal Assent to a measure of such an important nature as the degradation of the Queen Consort of the Throne? Under such circumstances, he could not vote for the Bill, or suffer it to go a single step farther towards its conclusion. He was sorry that the House, at present, had no alternative but that of a virtual acquittal of the Queen, or of passing this Bill, which, in its origin and its nature, was highly objectionable. He wished some mode was found, such as was suggested by a Noble Lord on Saturday last (Ellenborough), of the House expressing its feelings on the conduct of her Majesty, as proved in evidence before their Lordships. He believed, with a Noble Lord who had spoken, that public opinion would come right at last: but he conceived it one of the evils of this measure, that it had enlisted generous and compassionate feelings on the side of licentiousness. The House owed it to itself and to the Country, which had a large claim on it, for having poured forth such a mass of disgusting evidence as had done more to poison public morals than anything that ever had occurred in this country—it was due to that Public, to make every amends in their power, and to record, that they are not the patrons of vice, but of virtue! His Lordship concluded by declaring his determination to vote against the Bill.

The Marquis of STAFFORD, in a short speech, said he would vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Lord DE CLIFFORD considered the whole of the evidence for the prosecution tainted with falsehood. In looking at the question, he could not help adverting to the unfortunate differences which had existed for several years between the Accused and the Illustrious Personage most nearly allied to her; and that enough had been stated to prove that her Majesty could not remain in this Country with advantage and comfort to herself. He could not but feel that this Bill would be rejected in some stage or other—(*loud cries of Hear!*)—and, in his opinion, it would be advisable to get rid of it at the present moment. (*Hear, hear!*) His Lordship concluded with declaring his resolution to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Lord GRANTHAM said that upon this great question he differed from those with whom he generally voted. It had been said at the beginning of these proceedings, that the House should be governed in their decision by unsuspected evidence. (*Hear!*) He had attended to the evidence most minutely, but could not give it that character—(*Hear!*)—and the House was now employed in making a law to meet an offence! He saw many difficulties in the progress of the Bill through this House, and through the other House. No human foresight could reach those difficulties, and he was convinced that the Country would be served best, if the measure was at once put an end to! He was aware that the loss of the Bill would be matter of triumph to some factious characters, who cared no more for the Queen than they did for the Monarchy—(*cries of Hear, hear, hear!*)—but he knew it would be but a temporary triumph, and that the good sense and feeling of the Country would soon set the question upon a right foundation. If the case were a common one, upon which a verdict of *Guilty* or *Not Guilty* were to be pronounced, he would have to consider that there had been a great deal of contradictory evidence; but he would also have to look at the grave and heavy suspicions with which the Accused was overwhelmed. Although he would say *not content*, he could not lay his hand upon his heart and say *not guilty*. (*Hear, hear!*)

Lord BLESSINGTON, after a few observations upon the evidence with reference to the polacca, said, he was determined to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Lord GOSFORD said, that he had heard enough of evidence to place him under the painful necessity of saying guilty to the charges; but to pursue the measure would be, in his opinion, extremely inexpedient. He was not afraid of popular clamour, but he felt convinced, that the feeling of the loyal part of the community was decidedly against the measure. (*Hear!*) He could not see how any man could vote for the Bill without the divorce clause—(*hear, hear!*)—and he could not see how any man could vote for the Bill with that clause. (*A laugh, and cries of hear, hear!*) He would vote against the second reading.

The Duke of ATHOL assured their Lordships he never rose with so heavy a heart. He had attended to the evidence and the arguments, and he must say, that he considered the Queen's guilt proved by her own evidence. It became necessary, for the purpose of keeping immaculate the Fair of Great Britain, that the House should mark its sense of such conduct as had been incontrovertibly proved against the Queen. He hoped the Bill would be read a second time; and he should do all in his power to effect that object.

The Duke of SOMERSET expressed his dissatisfaction at the evidence against the Queen, and reprobated the interference of Foreign Powers, who had not only been employed to obtain evidence against her Majesty, but to withhold evidence in her favour. (*Hear, hear!*) He called upon the House to consider that her Royal Highness was a foreign Princess, and had been educated abroad; and that her manners had been notorious for their freedom. He admitted that her conduct had been extraordinary, imprudent, and hardly to be accounted for; but there was nothing in the evidence which could lead to a conclusion of guilt. The Noble Duke concluded by stating, that he dissented altogether from the Bill. (*Hear, hear, hear!*)

Lord GRENVILLE rose amidst loud cries of *Hear!* He had, he said, hoped, that he should not have been called upon to state his opinion upon this painful subject; but their Lordships having ordered the attendance of all, he felt bound to mention the grounds on which he should give his vote.—The duty he had to perform was of a judicial nature, and he had no wish and no hope to influence the opinions of others. He was bound to say, after a long examination of all the evidence, that the strongest judicial proof of guilt had been established, that an adulterous intercourse had been much too sufficiently proved. (*Hear!*) The Noble Lord took a minute survey of the evidence, and declared, that, upon weighing the whole, he had no doubt whatever on his part, that an adulterous intercourse had subsisted between her Majesty and Bergami. It gave him deep pain to pronounce this opinion, but his conscience dictated no other. And he would say, that if their Lordships should come to the conclusion, that there had not been a sufficient legal presumption of guilt established in this case, they must then determine, that in no future instance would any tribunal in the Country be justified in holding an adulterous intercourse proved, except by ocular testimony—a species of proof impossible to be had in ninety-nine out of an hundred of the most undisputed cases of adultery. The expediency of the measure was undoubtedly to be taken into account, and he knew no stage of the proceeding in which it ought to be more considered than the present. He had given the subject the greatest consideration, and the result was, that he saw no other Parliamentary course of visiting such guilt as that which had been proved except the present Bill of Pains and Penalties. He had heard much of the popular feeling on the subject; but, amid all the mischiefs with which the State was threatened, he saw none greater than what would result from a sudden and abrupt termination of the present proceeding, instead of going through with it to a just and satisfactory conclusion.

The Earl of ROSSLYN rose amid loud calls for the Question. The opinion of his Noble Friend who had just spoken was, undoubtedly, entitled to great weight; to impossible it should not have great weight on the votes of their Lordships. He (the Earl of Rosslyn) could not, for one, however, assent either to the conclusion to which his Lordship had come, or to the arguments by which it was supported. Of the alleged familiarities with the courier Bergami, of which the Queen had been accused, not a single act was proved on evidence worthy of credit. When, he saw agents employed to corrupt witnesses, and rewards held out in proportion to the force of the charges made, must he not look at such evidence with great suspicion? The greatest portion of the charges had been abandoned by the advocates for the prosecution, and yet they clung to evidence which they acknowledged to be suspected. The polacca charge, to which so much importance had been attached, at the utmost only amounted to suspicion, and some very unfair inferences had been drawn from it. The circumstance of Ministers permitting the Princess to live three years abroad, after they had become acquainted with her conduct, appeared as if they connived at it. The Bill was not thought expedient when the scandal was fresh, nor when the Princess lived three years in Italy; its expediency only commenced on her arrival in this country. Their Lordships had been told, that they might alter the preamble in the Committee; but unless their Lordships believed every tittle of the preamble proved, they could not vote for the second reading. The Noble Lord then animadverted in strong terms on the conduct of the prosecutors of the Bill and of the Milan Commission, who, if truth had been the sole object, would have called those respectable witnesses who were best acquainted with the conduct of the Princess. If this Bill was to be carried as a measure of state expediency, it was to put down public opinion. The Public had judged of the evidence, and would judge of the conduct of their Lordships; they would also look at the Prosecutors; they would see that many of their Lordships, who were acting as Jurors, were the Prosecutors. Their Lordships ought to be anxious to maintain unimpeached the character of that House, and not to weaken the public confidence in their decision. If the divorce clause was thrown out, and the degradation of the Queen persevered in, then might she be loaded with the most odious epithets, and yet she, by such a decision, was still declared to be good enough to be the wife of the King. Such a proceeding would be unjust to the King. Notwithstanding the public opinion, and the probability of the House of Commons rejecting the Bill, he must notice the hardship of the Queen, in being subjected to this troublesome trial, under such manifest disadvantages, and which were a strong aggravation of the hardships to which she was subjected; and, where so general and eager a sentiment of affection for her prevailed throughout the Country, was not such a measure calculated to give a wrong bias to public feeling and a dangerous incentive to popular disaffection. (*Hear, hear, hear!*)

[The Noble Lord had scarcely finished speaking when a loud cry was raised of "*Withdraw, withdraw!*" "*Question, question!*" which lasted for several minutes.]

Strangers then withdrew at three o'clock, and the House proceeded to vote on the second reading of the Bill.

STATE OF THE VOTES.

For the second reading of the Bill	123
Against it	95
Majority in favour of the Bill, and against her Majesty, only	—28

Adjourned till ten o'clock to-morrow.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7.

The Lord Chancellor took his seat on the Woolsack a few minutes before ten o'clock, when Prayers were read by the Bishop of Bristol, and the list of Peers called over.

Lord DACRE then rose to present a Protest from her Majesty, & said—My Lords, since I came down to the House this morning, a Protest from her Majesty has been put into my hands. Not having taken any share in the debates on this painful and important question, and entertaining, as I do, strong feelings on the subject, I ought, perhaps, to make some apology for now addressing your Lordships. But my opinions, my Lords, were not influenced by what has passed at the Bar of this House. My objection to Bills of Pains and Penalties, for acts long since committed, was so strong, that no evidence that could be brought forward would, in my opinion, justify resorting to such a measure. Having had this Protest placed in my hands, I will make one or two observations upon it. Whatever opinions I may have had as to the nature of this proceeding, I concur most cordially in the first part of her Majesty's Protest, that her acknowledged prosecutors have voted against her on this trial. I know that precedents may be found for such votes, and it is left to the individuals themselves to decide on the propriety of prosecutors acting as jurors; but the Country will form an opinion upon it which it is not difficult to anticipate. Her Majesty further complains, that some of the parties who have given their voices against her have not attended the trial during her defence. (*Hear, hear!*) I will not say they had no right to vote, if they could reconcile such an act to their consciences. Her Majesty then protests, before GOD, that she is wholly innocent of the crime laid to her charge, and declares that she will abstain from all further appeal to your Lordships, reserving to herself the further vindication of her character in another place. I now, my Lords, will read

THE PROTEST.

"*The Queen has learnt the decision of the Lords upon the Bill now before them. In the face of Parliament, of her Family, and of her Country, she does solemnly protest against it. Those who avowed themselves her Prosecutors have presumed to sit in judgment upon the question between the Queen and themselves. Peers have given their voices against her, who had heard the whole evidence* FOR *the charge, and* ABSENTED *themselves during her* DEFENCE. *Others have come to the discussion from the* SECRET COMMITTEE, *with minds biassed by a mass of slanders, which her enemies have not dared to bring forward in the light.*

"*The Queen does not avail herself of her right to appear before the Committee; for to her the details of the measure must be a matter of indifference; and, unless the course of these unexampled proceedings should bring the Bill before the other branch of the Legislature, she will make no reference whatever to the treatment experienced by her during the last twenty-five years.*

"*She now, most deliberately, and before* GOD, *asserts, that she is wholly innocent of the crime laid to her charge; and she awaits, with unabated confidence, the final result of this unparalleled investigation.*"

The Waterford Chronicle.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11.

The motion for the Second Reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties and of Divorce was carried in the House of Lords by a Majority of 28, the numbers being—Contents, 123—Non-Contents, 95. Lists are given in another part of our Paper; "and if," says the *Globe*, "the composition of these Lists be considered, the Minister will find little cause of triumph. Among his Majority we find eleven Bishops, seven Representative Peers for Ireland, and five for Scotland, all of whom are elective—every one of whom, too, owes his election to the Minister of the day. In this Majority, also, are nine Cabinet Ministers, thirteen persons holding offices dependent on them, besides three Peers who never heard the defence. Were it a case before an ordinary tribunal, many of these would be inadmissible as Jurors, and, if set aside, there would be an actual Majority for the QUEEN, and that Majority composed of independent Peers, comprehending the greater stake of property and influence in the Kingdom. With such a body of the Nobility, backed by public opinion, opposed to the measure, a prudent Minister would not persevere."

A Protest from her MAJESTY was presented on Tuesday by Lord DACRE; after some discussion, it was entered on the Journals according to the following motion:—

"That this House, notwithstanding the justly exceptionable matter in some parts of the Paper now presented, does, nevertheless, under all the circumstances of the case, consent to receive the same as the representation of what her MAJESTY has further to state to the House in the present stage of the proceedings."

A discussion of some length took place on this subject, which terminated as we have just stated. The House then went into the *Divorce Clause*, which was opposed by the Archbishop of YORK, the Bishop of CHESTER, and by several Peers who had voted against the Second Reading of the Bill. The *Clause* was supported by the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, the LORD CHANCELLOR, Lord LIVERPOOL, and several other friends of the Bill.—At four o'clock, the House adjourned, and the debate was to be resumed on Wednesday. These proceedings we have been obliged to postpone, in order that we might not mutilate them by abridgment.

The QUEEN went to her private room in the House of Lords on Tuesday, where she remained some time, and then returned. She was accompanied by Lady ANNE HAMILTON, and was received by the military within the barriers with a royal salute. She was accompanied by a great crowd, who filled the streets with their acclamations. The agitation of London is said to be almost extreme.

Among the evils produced by the proceedings relative to the QUEEN are to be numbered those torrents of abuse which are daily poured forth in the most unsparing language. The supporters of both parties are almost equally culpable in this point of view. They search with ardent and unabating zeal for grounds of vituperation, and leave nothing undone which can injure the character, or exasperate the feelings, of those against whom they set themselves in array. Some specimens of such writings we have occasionally, and on both sides, given to the Public; but we utterly disclaim all participation in the sentiments which they convey. They are the sentiments of others, not ours; and although we regard independence of mind as one of the highest attributes of Man, we yet cannot concur in that virulence by which it is so frequently dishonoured, and even rendered abortive in it's exercise. We agree entirely in the following opinions, expressed by the *Scotsman*, a cotemporary which manifests the most distinguished talents, and has attained the greatest eminence: "Both Houses of Parliament ought to be grateful for the public discussion of any measure pending before them, and for every expression of public opinion; nor is it consistent with their honour, any more than their duty, to be fastidious respecting the manner of the one or the other. Their dignity is best preserved in passing over, in silent contempt, all trifling or temporary ebullitions of feeling; their respectability is best preserved by listening patiently to all complaints, and following a course of wise, liberal, and enlightened measures. It is unquestionably the duty of the People, on the other hand, to treat both with respect. It is also their policy to do so. Let them speak firmly, as in the exercise of a right, but decorously also, as to functionaries to whom they and the laws of their Country have committed great powers, as well as the exercise of high duties."

On Tuesday, three per cent. Consols were at 68¼, 67¾, 68. Omnium was 2¾ discount. No mail due.

FORGED NOTES.—On the 8th inst. Mr. ALCOCK, one of the Sheriffs of this City, and a Magistrate of the County of Waterford, went to Dungarvan, and succeeded in apprehending JOHN RICHARDSON, who had in his possession £30, in thirty-shilling forged Notes, purporting to be of the Bank of Ireland, and numbered 90087. Mr. ALCOCK has committed the accused to the County Gaol, and his activity and zeal entitle him to public gratitude.

We have been favoured with a letter from Milford, stating the wreck of the brig *Charles Henry*, of Cardigan, PHILLIPS, Master. This melancholy event is already known to our readers; but we are not the less grateful for the communication, and shall always feel obliged by information from the same quarter.

LISMORE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

This Society pursues its labours with an energy and zeal highly honourable to its Members, and most advantageous to the Community. We have the most pleasing satisfaction in stating, that the Farmers, instead of being rooted in their obstinacy for old and injurious customs, manifest their willingness to adopt new systems, when they are introduced to them in a proper manner. This is, indeed, highly gratifying, and promises speedily to change the face of the Country.

On Tuesday last, a Ploughing Match took place upon the Lands of Lower Mogeely, in the Barony of Kinnataloon, for the premiums hereunder mentioned, which were presented to the Society by the Cork Institution.

The Judges appointed to award the Premiums were Colonel Marsden, of Brook Lodge, Walter Giles, Esq. of Lisnabrin Lodge, and Capt. Croker, R. N. Lisnabrin House, who made the following adjudication:—

1st—To John Keeffe, of Clashnaganiffe, Tenant to his Grace the Duke of Devonshire, the Kippie Iron Plough.
2d—To William Bryan, of Killclafes, Tenant to the same, the Bat Winged Iron Potato Moulding Plough.
3d—To John Coleman, of Oughbeg, Tenant to the same, Two Pounds, to be expended in a Farming Implement.

The Ploughing was a most interesting and gratifying sight, as well from the great improvement observable in the performance of the work, and in the implements, horses, and tackle, as from the energy and emulation exhibited by the Candidates.

WATERFORD MARKETS.

Butter has continued to advance briskly since the beginning of the week. A few casks were purchased at the market-house yesterday morning at 83s. for first quality—but the general currency speedily got up to 85s. for Waterford Firsts, and 88s. was paid for some superior Carlow. Crane Returns for the last two days—Thursday, 214 firkins—Yesterday, 206.

General Return of Butter brought into Waterford during the month of October.

	Firkins.
Received at the Merchants' Cellars from Country Markets	8925
Weighed at the City Crane	5693
Total	14,618

Pigs are rather inclining upwards, though no material general advance has occurred. The currency for good lots of *Bacon Pigs* may be stated at 30s., and 6d. to 1s. more is said to have been given, in a few instances, for prime lots. *Scalded Pigs* continue at 24s. to 28s. generally, but 29s. and 29s. 6d. was paid yesterday for some of very superior quality. *Pork Offal*, 14s. to 16s.—*Pigs' Heads*, 15s. to 17s.

The receipts of *Grain* from Farmers have not increased materially this week. The depression on *Wheat*, noticed in our last, continued yesterday, and the dulness seemed rather increased after the delivery of the letters by the Dublin Mail; 26s. was not exceeded, except for very superior millers' samples, and 25s. 6d. appeared to be the more general average for prime quality. No further alteration has occurred in *Oats*, the best price of which, both in large parcels and off the cars, remained at 10s. *Barley* has continued tolerably steady at 9s. 6d. to 10s. 3d. No material change in *Flour* since last week, except that the coarse qualities, being rather scarce, sell somewhat more freely—Seconds still dull, at 31s. to 33s. quantities, 34s. single bags—Fine Sharps, 28s. to 29s.—Thirds, 24s. to 27s.—Fourths, 14s. to 19s. *Oatmeal* still goes off heavily at 11s. to 11s. 6d. per cwt. and 12s. by retail. New Scotch *Herrings*, 33s. to 34s. 1½d. per barrel. A large supply of *Coals* has arrived within these few days—Newport, 3s. 10d. to 4s. 2d.; Whitehaven, 3s. 6d. to 3s. 8d.; Liverpool, 3s. 6d. to 3s. 8d.; Swansea, 3s. 3d. to 3s. 6d. per barrel.

LONDON CORN-EXCHANGE, Nov. 6.—The supply of Wheat was rather large this morning from Essex, besides a considerable quantity which remained over from last week's arrivals, the sale of which was exceedingly heavy, and 2s. per quarter cheaper for all descriptions, except prime samples, which obtained last Monday's prices. Fine Barley being scarce, sold 1s. per quarter higher than on this day week, but the inferior qualities were dull sale, and rather cheaper; Beans are 1s. per qr. dearer; the Oat trade was very dull, at a decline of 1s. per quarter. In other articles no alteration.

Wm. Edwards has received from Thos. Jacob, Esq. Four Pounds sterling, a fine on a countryman, for having Corn fraudulently packed—which is applied for the benefit of the Sick Poor Institution.

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE, NOV. 10.

ARRIVED,

8th—Deborah, Lloyd, Swansea, coals; Thomas, Drewry, Whitehaven, coals and herrings; Duke of Wellington, Ley, Newport, coals, woollen cloth, and hares' wool.

9th—King George, Richards, Newport, coals; Prudent, Buchannan, Portsmouth, hoops, whiting, paints, colours, &c.; Daldon, Beer, Swansea, coals; Three Sisters, Richardson, Swansea, ditto; Venus, Lowther, Newport, ditto; Geebe, Griffiths, Glasgow, ditto; Hibernia, Bailey, Bristol, m goods; Arabella, Hydges, Liverpool, coals; Charles, Read, Dublin, ballast; Experiment, Chapman, Newport, coals; Meeter, Banks, Falmouth, ballast; Industry, White, Arundel, ditto.

10th—Venus, Webb, Weymouth, ballast and luggage; Ashling, Duke, Colchester, ballast; Rising Sun, Budd, Falmouth, ditto; London, Foss, London, ditto; Hope, Jones, Swansea, coals; Eunice, Williams, Cardiffe, iron; John Wallis, Rogers, Llanelly, oak bark and leather; Elizabeth, Fisher, Liverpool, coals; Four Brothers, Murphy, Newport, coals.

SAILED,

8th—Dotterell, Sloop of War, Capt. Gore, on a cruise; Princess Royal, Griffiths, from Newport, Cork, coals; New Augustine, Mulowney, from Youghal, Liverpool, oats; Brothers, Connolly, before mentioned.

9th—Pyramus, Laen—and Laurel, Elliott, London, butter, bacon, &c.; George the Fourth, Hallis, Portsmouth, &c. butter, bacon, &c.; Union, Perry, Plymouth, bacon, butter, wheat, &c.; Elizabeth, Atwool—, and Three Sisters, Scanlan, before mentioned; Artilose, Wade—and Ocean, Chalbrook, London, wheat, oats, &c.; St. Patrick, Murray, from Swansea, Youghal, culm; Three Brothers, Fitzgerald, Cork, flag-stones.

10th—Success, Devereux—and Elizabeth, Ellis, London, butter, bacon, &c.; Providence, Brokenshaw, Barnhams, oats, butter, and lard.

TABLE BEER.

BIRNIE, LYNAGH and Co. beg leave to inform their Friends and the Public, that, in addition to their PORTER and STRONG BEER, they have now ready for Delivery, at their Brewery in Stephen-street, TABLE BEER, of such a Quality as they flatter themselves will give general Satisfaction.

TERMS.—Twelve Months' Credit to Gentlemen and Housekeepers—liberal Encouragement will be given to Retailers. Waterford, Nov. 11, 1820.

TREES AND SEEDS.

RICHARD FENNESSY

HAS on Sale, a large and general Assortment of best FRUIT and FOREST TREES, WHITETHORN QUICKS, FLOWERING & EVERGREEN SHRUBS, GREEN-HOUSE PLANTS, &c. &c. He has also received, per the *Peter and Rebecca*, from London, a Supply of new GARDEN and BIRD SEEDS, WINTER VETCHES, and Bulbous FLOWER ROOTS—every article of which he will sell at reduced Prices.

Waterford, Nov. 11, 1820.

WANTS A SITUATION,

AS STEWARD AND GARDENER,

AN ACTIVE YOUNG MAN, who is well acquainted with the Management of a Farm—Draining and Planting—Feeding of Cattle—the care of Hot-house and Green-house Plants, &c. &c. He has not been a Month disengaged; passed Three Years in his last Situation, and Five in a former one—both under Families of respectability, near Dublin. Satisfactory References can be produced. Letters, post-paid, will be carefully attended to.

Nov. 11, 1820.

AUCTION OF FURNITURE.

ON TUESDAY, THE 14TH OF NOV. INSTANT, WILL BE SOLD BY AUCTION,

At the House of the late A. Briggs, Esq.

JOHN-STREET,

A FEW USEFUL ARTICLES of FURNITURE—amongst which are a Capital Dinner Service of Delft Ware—some Glass Ware—a Sideboard—Chairs, Tables, Carpeting—Looking-Glasses, Kitchen Furniture, &c. &c.

Sale to commence at 12 o'Clock.

Waterford, Nov. 9, 1820. PEARSON, *Auctioneer.*

PETER GEALE, SADDLER,

RESPECTFULLY informs his Friends and the Public, that he has laid in an elegant Assortment both of English and Irish GOODS, patent Double and Single SHOT-POUCHES and POWDER-HORNS, London SADDLE TREES, new invented patent SADDLE GIRTHS and SPRING IRONS, &c. He with every Deference solicits the Patronage of the Nobility and Gentry at large, and returns his sincere Thanks for their liberal and kind Encouragement since his commencement in Business. Being determined to furnish every Article in his Line in the neatest and most fashionable manner, he assures them that nothing shall be wanting on his part to give general Satisfaction to those who honour him with their Commands. Having purchased his Stock for ready money, every Article shall be sold on the most reasonable Terms for the same. HARNESS made and repaired on the shortest Notice, and engaged to be of the best quality.

Waterford, Nov. 11, 1820.

FOR SALE,

CONSIDERABLY UNDER FIRST COST,

THE following fashionable Collection of FANCY GOODS, HABERDASHERY, &c.

Millinery,	*Rich Tissue Scarfs,*
Ready-made Dresses,	*Straw Bonnets, &c. &c.*
Black & Coloured Bombasins,	*Feathers and Flowers,*
Figured and Plain Sarsnets,	*Thread Lace and Veils,*
Do. Do. Satins,	*Fans and Parasols,*
White and Coloured Gauzes,	*Hair Caps and Bandeaus,*
Gauze Dresses,	*Corsets, of superior quality,*
Lace Do.	*Children's Do.*
Rich Worked Robes,	*Ribbons, and a great Variety of Articles in the Haberdashery line, Gloves, &c.*
Chintz Do.	
London Prints,	
Plain and Figured Muslins,	*Silk and Cotton Hose, for Ladies and Gentlemen,*
Rockspun Scarfs and Shawls,	*&c. &c. &c.*
Camel-hair Do. Do.	
Merino Do. Do.	

S. M'MAHON

BEGS respectfully to inform the Ladies of Waterford and the Public, that having just returned from London, and intending to decline Business in Waterford, she will continue to dispose of her present STOCK, consisting chiefly of the above splendid and fashionable variety, until about the middle of January next, when she will dispose of the remainder, together with the FURNITURE of her House, by AUCTION, of which due notice shall be given.

N. B. MILLINERY and DRESSES, in the mean time, made up in the most fashionable manner, as usual.

Mall, Waterford, Nov. 4, 1820.