

No. 12,862.

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1822.

PRICE FIVE PENCE.

wiles of London, and the late loan to Government...

DEBIL CORN EXCHANGE. FRIDAY, MAY 3.—We had but a small supply...

WATERFORD MARKETS. New Butter stated yesterday at 8s. to 8s. 6d...

DEATHS. On the 23rd April, at Summerhill, near Kildare...

SHIP NEWS. The brig Mary, Remedy, of and from Dartmouth...

WINDY TAX. Sir Robert Shaw has postponed his motion for a repeal...

SUPPRESSION OF MERCIDITY. A highly respectable Meeting of Citizens took place...

COUNTY OF WATERFORD. It is with great regret that we have to lay the following account...

PORT NEWS—PASSENGER LIST. ARRIVED. 3d—Liberty, Post, Private, ballast, 17s. 6d...

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MERCIDITY ASYLUM. THE Ladies and Gentlemen of Waterford and its Vicinity...

TICKETS OF ADMISSION. Ladies and Gentlemen, 2s. 6d. each. Children and Pauper, 1s. 6d. each.

SUMMER ASSORTMENT. HAS received a very extensive Supply of West of England CLOTHS...

THOMAS & RICH. KEHOE OFFER FOR SALE. 104 Cheate Black and Green TEAS.

LONDON CORN EXCHANGE. WEDNESDAY, MAY 1.—We have had a large arrival of Wheat...

SPORTING INTELLIGENCE. The Mayor's Court on Saturday was well attended...

ALTERATION. Oats are 1s. per quarter lower, the arrivals being abundant.

MEMEL CROWN TIMBER, PLANK, &c. COURTESAY and SONS daily expect, per the firm...

TO BE SOLD BY PUBLIC AUCTION. ON TUESDAY, THE 14th INSTANT.

THE BRIG MARTHA, AS SHE NOW LAYS. Sunk in the Harbour, near Broomhill.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty, entitled...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

NEW MEMEL TIMBER. THE undersigned has this day arrived a Cargo of very superior MEMEL TIMBER...

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WOOLEN AND MANCHESTER WARE HOUSE. JAMES LINEHAN.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.



A CURE FOR A QUINZEY.

A GENTLEMAN QUINZEY had, and sorely he pressed him to part a stranger night and day, it wanted and a week him.

The patient was a man of wit, in dress extremely neat, but moan, alas! was vain to dress him any thing to eat.

A little simple Munkin in the chimney-corner brand, with cunning eye the razor, stop, and lather-a-sure.

He stopped the razor carefully, began to scrape his hair, but Jack continued fast his hand, and dragged him to the door.

He stopped the razor carefully, began to scrape his hair, but Jack continued fast his hand, and dragged him to the door.

He stopped the razor carefully, began to scrape his hair, but Jack continued fast his hand, and dragged him to the door.

He stopped the razor carefully, began to scrape his hair, but Jack continued fast his hand, and dragged him to the door.

He stopped the razor carefully, began to scrape his hair, but Jack continued fast his hand, and dragged him to the door.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

THE BRIG MARTHA, AS SHE NOW LAYS.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

THE BRIG MARTHA, AS SHE NOW LAYS.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION. AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HOUSE.

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

TO BE LET, For any Term not exceeding Sixteen Years.

BY THE LORD LIEUTENANT AND COUNCIL OF IRELAND. A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament passed in the Third Year of His Majesty...

MEMBER OF THE MANDATORY ASSOCIATION. A meeting of the Mandatory Association...

NOTICE TO FIRE POLICY HOLDERS. PERSONS assured for the whole Term of Life...

FOR QUEBEC, TO SAIL THE 10th, 15th, & 20th OF MAY.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS—TUESDAY, APRIL 30.

DEBATE ON MR. CANNING'S MOTION, FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF PARLIAMENT.

MR. SECRETARY PEEL then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. P.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

MR. CANNING then rose, and commenced his Address by remarking, that if His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) knew the full extent of the admiration which (Mr. C.) entertained for his abilities...

Itence it was not repealed, and as hostility to the Roman Catholics then characterised Parliament, and no doubt it was kept as the basis for more severe enactments. We are then confined to a reign of Charles the Second. And as that monarch not indeed openly, but secretly, favoured the Roman Catholic religion, and his brother James was avowedly a Catholic, and wished to have the power of disposing of the laws of the realm, it was no wonder that a jealousy was entertained by Parliament of designs, which were afterwards declared, but then only suspected, of using persons of the Catholic persuasion as instruments of subverting its spirit and forms. (Hear, hear!) Here we enter on the most detestable ground of history for extreme opinions, but I will state the facts without adopting the opinions of either of the high parties that have commented on them. It is impossible to read that history without perceiving that the predominant feeling of the Parliament was the dread of a Popish succession; when we look back to this fact, we find that much became clear that was otherwise confused; much was struck of its severity, which otherwise appeared cruel; and much was excused, that otherwise could find no ground of apology. (Hear, hear!) To this feeling was to be referred the great object of debaring the Duke of York from coming to the Throne; and to this was to be referred the Address to banish him the kingdom, and all the proceedings of the House of Commons thereon. Thus the object of the House of Commons at that period was, by every means, to effect the exclusion of the Duke of York from the Throne. I do not state this as a matter of blame or imputation—I state it as a fact, of which no reader of the history of that time can possibly be ignorant. It was with this view that the Test Act was introduced, the immediate consequence of which was, that the Duke of York laid down the office of Lord High Admiral, and ceased to be a Minister of the Crown. Afterwards they attempted to get rid of the Duke of York, by rendering Papists as incapable as the Test Act had rendered Dissenters. But to excluding the Papists, the object was to touch the Duke of York alone. The bill, however, failed. It failed in the covert object which the House of Commons had in view. The House of Lords passed the Bill excluding the Papists, but they excepted the Duke of York from its operation. The House of Commons, then, in despair of all milder remedies for the evil of which they were apprehensive, passed the Exclusion Bill. Having failed in effecting their object indirectly by the prior measures to which they had resorted, they at last came to the proposition in naked terms, of excluding the Duke of York from the succession to the throne. Rapin, who was at least an impartial historian on the subject, distinctly states, that the exclusion of the Duke of York from the Crown was all along the governing motive of the House of Commons; but that they were desirous to effect that object by degrees, and did not resort to the main and direct measure of exclusion, until all the minor and collateral means had failed. What do I infer from that? Do I infer that the House of Commons were wrong? Do I infer that they entertained an unreasonably jealous view on the subject? Do I infer that they were blameable for persevering in the pursuit of their object? No such thing. The inference which I draw from all the circumstances, is to ask if there is now a Popish successor to the Throne? If not, are we justified in resorting to, or in persevering in, the same means as those which were resorted to by the House of Commons in the reign of Charles II.? (Hear, hear!) I will not enter into any nice disquisition how far it was morally defensible, when a great national object was in view, to sacrifice the interest of offending individuals for the attainment of that object. I will not inquire, whether or not the Parliament of Charles II. had a right to take the steps which they took for the attainment of their present full House, could have been overborne only by the fear and agitation of the moment, by the measures to which they were subjected, and by the hazard which they ran of being deemed ready to enter into a conspiracy to murder the Sovereign, and to subvert the Constitution of the Country. But even that does not account for the order of 1673 being left on the books of the House of Lords. The natural course certainly would have been, when the statute of 1678 was passed, to expunge that order; and the inference which I draw from its not having been expunged, is the same inference as that which I have drawn from other circumstances, namely, that the measure was intended only as a temporary proceeding; that it was intended to be only one of those suspensions of the Habeas Corpus which leaves the Habeas Corpus Act untouched, ready to revive in all its functions as soon as the suspension is removed. There can be little doubt, that when they agreed to the Bill of 1678, the House of Lords looked forward to the time when the storm which then raged should blow over, and when they should be enabled to repeal the measure to which temporary circumstances had induced them to give their consent. (Hear!) Grant that as their motive, and their whole proceeding, for which it is impossible otherwise to account, becomes perfectly intelligible. This construction of the motive by which the House of Lords were influenced derives considerable force from a consideration of the act itself. It is, indeed, a most unhappy specimen of a measure which was to be considered unalterable, and fundamentally important to the Constitution. Whether we advert to the preamble, or to the enact-

ments, it presents a clumsy exhibition, seldom recalled, even in the present days of hasty and enormous legislation. The preamble in particular is not a little curious. It states, that "forasmuch as divers good laws to prevent the increase of the dangers of Popery have not had the desired effect, by reason of the free access of Popish recusants to his Majesty's Court, and by reason that they have of late come, and sat, and voted in Parliament, therefore be it enacted, &c.;" and the enactments are two:—the expulsion of the Catholic Peers from the House of Lords, and the banishment of Popish recusants from the presence of the King. With respect to this preamble, it is only the first part of it, "the free access of Popish recusants to his Majesty's Court," that can fairly admit the construction of being a ground for the proceeding; for the second cause, "that they have of late come, and sat, and voted in Parliament," is nugatory. They never did otherwise—they never did abstain from coming to sit and vote. Into the House of Commons, it is true, to which Catholics were not admissible by law, they might surreptitiously have found their way; and, indeed, the House of Commons had not long before expelled three of their Members as being Popish recusants; but it was sheer nonsense to say of Catholics, with reference to the House of Peers, that they had of late come, and sat, and voted: for from the House of Peers Catholics had never been excluded. Yet that was the ground stated for enacting the exclusion of Catholics from the House of Lords; and that, and the other ground, were assumed as the motives for expelling them from Court: for the Bill proceeded to enact the expulsion of the Catholics from the King's presence. Now, Sir, those who consider this Act as the bulwark of the Constitution—those who claim against touching a hair of its head, nevertheless overlook the fact of the subsequent repeal of that clause, which excluded Catholics from the presence of the Sovereign. How can the removal of that clause be reconciled with the maintenance of the opinion, that Catholics ought not to be admitted into the House of Lords? By the 30th of Charles II. all Catholics were excluded from the presence of the King. The Act of 1691 restored that privilege, though to Catholic Peers alone. The distinction in this repeal between Peers and Commons makes for my argument. It is an admission that the Catholic Peers have privileges distinct from the Catholic Commons. It is an admission that the Act of banishing the hereditary Councils of the Crown from the presence of the monarch was considered an infringement of their natural and legitimate rights. In what state, then, are the Catholic Peers placed by this double measure on the part of the Legislature? I will take the liberty of reading enough to show the character of the Oath of Supremacy, for not taking which Roman Catholic Peers were, by the Bill of 1678, excluded both from Parliament and from the King's presence, and of the oath, by taking which they were, in consequence of the Act of 1691, admitted into the Royal presence. [The Right Hon. Gentleman here read extracts from the Oaths prescribed at the two periods, by which it appeared, that in 1691, a Catholic Peer might be admitted to the King's presence, if he denied the Pope's temporal and civil authority; but that he could not be admitted into Parliament, unless he also denied the Pope's spiritual and ecclesiastical authority.] I cannot but think this distinction most strange. Here is the case of a man born with certain privileges. One of these privileges is to sit in Parliament, and to give such advice as he may think beneficial to the realm in the face of his colleagues, and of the Country. Another privilege is, that as an hereditary member of the Crown, he may go into the King's closet, and tender his counsel on public affairs to his Sovereign. By this oath, however, if he denies the Pope's temporal and civil authority, he may go into the King's closet, and tender his counsel; but unless he also deny the Pope's spiritual and ecclesiastical authority, he cannot take his seat and vote in Parliament. If he deny the temporal and civil authority alone of the Pope, he may withdraw his advice in the ear of his Sovereign, but he cannot present it in the face of his Peers and the world. In the name of common sense, for what purpose is such a distinction? (Hear!) The same individual may drive in his carriage to St. James's, where, if he has taken the oath disclaiming the temporal and civil authority of the Pope, he may have an audience of his Sovereign; but if he turn his horse's head towards the House of Lords, he must stop before the way at the residence of some Justice of Peace, to take the spiritual and ecclesiastical oath, before he can enter Parliament, to defend the counsel which he has just given to his Sovereign. (Hear, hear, hear!) And how, Sir, was this Bill of 1678 passed? Under the honours of a pretended Popish plot, and with Titus Oates thundering at their doors, our ancestors were induced to leave such a specimen as this of their legislative wisdom. (Hear, hear, hear!) From all these considerations, I draw two inferences; and from those two, a third. In the first place, it is evident that the House of Lords legislated under duress when they passed this Act. In the second place, it is evident that no such danger as that which was put forth in the preamble as the ground of the measure existed, since, in better times, one part of the enactment which was to guard against that danger was repealed, as not necessary for the purposes of security. From those two inferences I draw the conclusion, that if the legislation in the 30th of Charles II. was wrong, the enactment last superseded by the Act of 1691 cannot be too severely reprobated; but that if, on the other hand, the legi-

lation in the 30th of Charles II. was right, we cannot too soon restore the sister provision in that case, so unaccountably expunged by the Act of 1691. (Hear, hear!) Sir, we are often, and sometimes justly, checked in our proceedings by being called upon to consider their anomalous character. I may, however, ask, if it is possible to imagine any proceedings more anomalous than those which have taken place with respect to the Roman Catholics? The reign of his late Majesty was fertile in relief to the Catholics, of which anomalies constituted no small portion. Even in the auspicious reign of the present Sovereign, some little anomalies had been introduced, and some proceedings had taken place calculated to aggravate the hardships of the case of which the Noble Persons in question complained. Sir, his present Majesty is the first Monarch of England for above a century by whom the Roman Catholic Peers have been summoned to a Coronation. At that august act, which is degraded if considered merely in the light of an ostentatious spectacle—at that grave ceremonial, that solemn renewal of the compact between the King and his subjects, when the Sovereign received the homage of the Nobility and of all the other orders of the realm, before the eyes of Parliament and the whole Country, the assembled Representatives of the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

lities, so that their merits may be acknowledged by the world, and excite a virtuous emulation, &c. Now the honour conferred on him by his Majesty, now no doubt has been personally bestowed justifying to Earl Fingal; but as to any emulation to be thereby excited, how is such an effect to be expected, when it is considered that when that Noble Earl left the Court, and retired to his own estate, there was not a Protestant labourer on his ground who was not qualified to vote for a Member of Parliament, which he as a Catholic Peer was not? Now, I say, that here is another anomaly—an anomaly which ought to be, which must be, done away. The measure which it is my intention to propose, will of course relieve the disabilities of all, and include in its provisions both the Irish Representative Peers, and those by whom they are to be returned. Hitherto I have considered the Act of 1678, and its consequences, in a political point of view; but I should greatly understate the importance of a repeal of that law, if I did not say something of the distinction on the individuals who suffer the distinction which it draws between those who are legally capable of sitting in Parliament and those who are not. It is impossible to look at the period at which, and the circumstances under which this Bill was passed, without seeing that it was passed by the House of Lords under duress, and under the various Powers of Europe must have viewed with respect and admiration, and have reported to their several Courts, the awful and imposing majesty which, on such an occasion, always accompanies the King of a free People! (Hear, hear!) When, on that great occasion, I stepped the whole Passage of Great Britain? the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the Peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to say the homage of pledging his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier Peer, in the presence of the assembled Peerage of the kingdom?—again, the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (Hear!) Can it be imagined that it could occur for a moment to the Minister of any Catholic Potentate—to the Minister of Catholic Austria, to the Minister of Catholic France, to the Minister of any Power most bigoted to the Catholic tenets, (if there be any bigoted), that this pre-eminent individual, thus distinguished, thus honoured, the moment the ceremony was over, must step himself off his magnificent robes, not to be called upon to re-assume them until the day—which we all trust will be a distant one—of a similar ceremonial. (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that the Duke of Norfolk, with all his titles, that Lord Clifford, descended from so illustrious a line of ancestors, were used only like other parabolical—like the was candles or the lustres, just to grace the pageant of the day, afterwards to be thrown aside as useless lumber?—(Hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that a Nobleman would be selected to set the example of homage to his Sovereign, who could never enjoy an opportunity of proving his loyalty and zeal in action? (Hear, hear, hear!) Could it have occurred to him, that one thus grand and honoured by his King, who was not allowed to take his place in that Legislature of which his presence on so august an occasion proclaimed him to be a rightful member? (Hear, hear, hear!) Sir, all these incongruities and anomalies are not so trifling and unimportant as to some persons they perhaps appear. Much better policy would it be, to leave these illustrious persons under the disability to which they have been rendered liable, than to bring them forward, as it to show by contrast of what they have been disposed of, and to add to the other disgraces with which they are loaded, that of being suspected of any inclination to be satisfied with such tattered distinctions, in lieu of the solid and important dignity, which attaches to the legislators of such a Country as England. (Hear, hear!) When this summoned to a grand act of state, in the presence of his fellow Peers, and of his Country, any additional distinction, under such circumstances of privation from real dignity, must, by an ingenuous mind, be felt as an additional degradation. While permitted to bear the cup or hold the train of Majesty, such a mind must be bitterly sensible of the humiliation attendant on his being excluded from that seat in Parliament, and from that share in the legislation of his Country, to which his birth would, under other circumstances, be entitled. (Hear!) Sir, the ceremony of the Coronation of his Majesty was followed by other occurrences, the effect of which was similar to that which I have been describing. In the course of the Royal Visit to Ireland—a visit which I perfectly agree with my Right Hon. and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General for that Country, in considering a measure of equal wisdom and grace—a Noble Lord, professing the Catholic religion, was by the favour of his Majesty decorated with the ribbon of Ireland. When I heard of that circumstance, I became anxious to learn if there were any particular circumstances connected with the order in question, which made the conferring of it by the grace and favour of his Majesty in the case in question peculiarly appropriate. In the course of my inquiry, I happened to procure the statute that statute sets forth the quality which ought to belong to the confidant invested with the order. It states that "Whereas it has been the custom of wise and beneficent Princes, in all ages, to distinguish the virtues and loyalty of their subjects by marks of honour, bearing testimony to their dignity and eminence in all estimable qua-

The Waterford Chronicle.

TUESDAY, MAY 7.

We have received since our last publication the London Journals of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, leaving no Mail day. Our limits prevent us from entering more at large into the contents of these papers than the election of the following paragraph.

THE MEETING AT THE BANK OF ENGLAND.—The Meeting at the Bank of England took place on Thursday. The matters submitted to the Proprietors were only the extension of the Charter for ten years, from 1835 to 1845; the withdrawing of the clause respecting Six Partners in Banking Establishments, (except within sixty-five

To this I answer, that the cases are widely and essentially different. There is a broad and marked distinction between eligibility and possession. In the one case, expediency is to be considered; in the other, there is a claim of justice. (Hear, hear, hear!) I am not now here to contend in favour of the Catholic Claim generally, though I may perhaps be permitted to say, that his exclusion from the benefits of the Constitution is a wrong; but then it is a wrong of a different nature from that which I now propose to redress. In the one case, you only deny the eligibility of the parties to an office, which not one in a thousand could in any case expect to attain, while in the other, you deprive the Catholic Peers of a right to which they have as just a claim, as they have to the protection of their lives and properties. (Hear, hear!) And this you do upon the authority of a law which originated in delusive and party feelings, and which was supported and passed into a law upon false pretences. In saying this, I must observe that I am as willing as any man to concede the claims of the Catholics generally. I should be sorry, while I advocated the cause of the Peers, to surrender or neglect the interests of the great body of the Catholic People. But I again repeat, that the cases are totally different. A Catholic may be, and is of course admitted from Parliament; but then he feels not so much, as he is in the same situation with millions, who, even if the disabilities were removed, could never hope to obtain a seat in this House. Is it so with the Catholic Peer? Who is there who sees the Duke of Norfolk in society, that does not at once feel impressed with the disabilities under which he labours, on the score of religion? Who is there that sees the coronet upon his brow, and does not conceive that coronet as a brand and a stain, rather than a decoration and an ornament? (Hear, hear, hear!) Why, then, I ask, are the Catholic Peers to be continued under the infliction of the privations under which they have so long laboured? The Commons of England may, it is true, suffer certain privations, but they endure no shame. In bringing forward this motion, I feel that I only call upon you to render truly justice to those illustrious persons, the Roman Catholic Peers of this Country. They have stood by as silent spectators, while you made repeated concessions in favour of the Catholic Commons of the United Kingdom; and if they now appear before you to solicit their restoration to those rights and privileges of which they have been so long deprived, do they do so in the person of an unauthorised proxy? I cannot say against their will, for I do not know the fact; but I certainly can say, without their concurrence or consent. (Hear, hear, hear!) I am sure Gentlemen must see that they cannot refuse their assent to any motion which would bring not only an injury to the State, but also a private injury to the individuals whose cause I advocate. Indeed so confident am I of the justice of my case, that if it were possible—so to shape it as to bring into the consideration of a legal tribunal, I have no doubt but the claims of the Catholic Peers would be at once favourably decided by the verdict of a British Jury. (Hear!) Supposing the question to be submitted to a jury, what set of men could, taking into consideration the Popish Plot, the Bill of Attainder, the innocence of the parties accused, the blood of Stafford: what sort of men could, with all these facts before them, refuse to do tardy justice to the Catholic Peerage, and at once restore to them those honours and privileges of which they have been so long and unjustly deprived?—Now, I ask what is likely to be the effect of this resolution? Is it for a moment supposed that it will