

the whole Catholic community. Where was the imperious necessity that dictated to them this form of entering upon the subject? It was, as far as we know, the first instance of the question being thus divided. From the year 1805, when for the first time after the Union, it was brought before the House by Mr. Fox, seconded by Mr. Grenville, no proposition had been submitted to the Legislature affecting Peers exclusively. Neither could he perceive in the present circumstances any peculiar reason for taking up the subject in this mode. What were those circumstances? Among the chief, it could not fail to be recollected by the House, that his Right Hon. Friend, the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunkett), had given notice that he intended to bring forward the whole question at an early period of the next Session. (Hear!) Why then now, when approaching to the end of the present Session, should they wish to confer on Roman Catholic Peers the barren privilege of being entitled to sit in Parliament during an interval when no Parliament was held. (Hear!)—At the commencement of the ensuing Session the subject would, they had ground to expect, be opened by his Right Hon. Friend in all its bearings. He confessed that, notwithstanding the eloquent and ingenious speech of his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning), he was not satisfied that any clear or substantial case had been stated in support of the present motion. Still, he remembered, that he had given a pledge at the commencement of his observations, which he hoped not to abandon; it was that of accurately examining that course of legal and constitutional history which formed the basis of his Right Hon. Friend's whole argument. Might he not then fairly say, that his Right Hon. Friend had endeavoured to trace the exclusion and final disabilities of the Catholics to the Popish Plot, and to the discoveries of Oates? (that previous to the year 1678 they were not so disqualified? Now he (Mr. Peel) must here protest against the selection of detached periods of history on which to raise an argument of this kind. It was not from isolated events, or the peculiar circumstances attending one occasion, that they could deduce a just or fair conclusion upon a question so extensive. Times of commotion required them to carry back their views into antecedent circumstances, before they came to a final judgment. Neither the French Revolution, nor any epoch resembling it, would ever be regarded in its true light, unless the predisposing causes were understood as well as the concurrence of fortuitous events that happened contemporaneously. On various considerations, the policy and principles to which he had been alluding were re-acted and confirmed at the period of the Revolution. The Bill of Rights was itself an example of the firm and enduring nature of this policy. Whatever his Right Hon. Friend might think of Oates or of the Popish Plot, it was, in his (Mr. Peel's) opinion, manifest that there did then exist a formidable and infamous conspiracy against the Protestant Establishment. (Hear!) The object of the conspirators was not merely to extinguish and destroy the Protestant religion;—immediately after the downfall of Clarendon, a disposition was evinced by the Court, as well as by particular individuals, for rooting out the Protestant faith, and subverting the Constitution in Church and State. It was due, in common justice to our ancestors, to the memory of those who established the rights which we now enjoy, to refer to the situation in which they were placed, and the motives that influenced their conduct. If he admitted all the monstrous injustice which was said to have been committed in the case of Lord Stafford, did it follow that no foundation existed for the policy that was adopted by our forefathers in 1678, and that was afterwards sanctioned and continued. (Hear, hear!) He did not agree with Mr. D'Israeli, who had said:— "Some truth there was, but dashed and brewed with lies, "To please the fools and puzzle all the wise; "Succeeding times will equal madows call; "Believing nothing, or believing all."

And if he granted that in what was called the Popish plot might be found an extravagant fabrication and tissue of wickedness, still he must ask what was the prevailing temper at that time, and how were those disclosures received? (Hear, hear!) People at that time were in possession of their common sense; it was the period when, according to Blackstone, our Constitution had become theoretically perfect. Mr. Fox had described it as the era of good laws and of bad Government. Would these stories against the Catholics have been listened to that there was ground for jealousy and suspicion? King Charles the Second had, throughout his reign, by every sort of artifice, and apparently out of favour to the Dissenters, exerted himself to procure a relaxation of the laws against the Catholics. The Dissenters, indeed, to their great credit, saw through the artifice, and refused to accept any advantage that might be purchased by granting the Crown a dispensing power. Was there, indeed, not amply enough to alarm their suspicions? It was now known that King Charles was engaged in a secret treaty with Louis XIV., and the letters of Coleman, Secretary to the Duke of York, in 1675, actually developed a plan "for destroying that pestilent heresy with which the northern parts of Europe were infected," and described it in another passage "as having a greater prospect of success than any design framed since the time of Queen Mary." (Hear!) Surely all this throws some light on what occurred in 1672. In the secret treaty was an article that pledged Charles II. to a change of the religion he professed. It stated

that he was convinced of the truth of the Roman Catholic religion—that he would shortly be reconciled to the Church of Rome, and that in case his subjects should rebel, which was not likely, that his Most Christian Majesty should furnish a sum of £200,000 to his assistance. Here, then, was an instance of a British Monarch proposing to barter away the religion and rights of his subjects, and for the sum of £200,000. He wished only to remind the House, that the chief advisers and instigators of that secret treaty by which the liberties of the Country were bartered for £200,000, (a less sum by half than was now voted for a Caledonian Canal or a Penitentiary), were Lord Arlington, Lord Clifford, and Lord Arundel, of Wardour. (Hear!) Such being the fact, was it surprising, that independent of the terror the Popish plot might produce, Parliament should feel so much jealousy lest Catholic Peers should again become the advisers of the Crown. His Right Hon. Friend had dwelt with great force upon, and attached much importance to, an order of the House of Lords made in 1675, and which declared that Peers being an inherent right, no Bill should pass which tended to impose a test upon Peers. Hence it was inferred, that it could only be under the influence of duress and compulsion, and the effect of some extraordinary terror, that the Peers three years afterwards passed the law of exclusion. His Right Hon. Friend, however, had not adverted to the fact, or perhaps he was not aware of its existence, that in that very Bill, out of which the order originated, a test was imposed upon Peers. True it was, the Bill did not pass, but to the latest date the test remained inserted in the Bill. The date of 1675 was highly important. It was probably known that the whole history of that Act, and of the debates upon it, was given by Mr. Locke, in what was called a letter to or from a person of quality. The Act especially to exclude from seats those infected with the old leaven of the civil wars. No less than 17 days were occupied in the debates on this order was made, the House of Lords did in fact the very thing that was objected to. After the order had been made, the Lord Keeper proposed a test equally applicable to both Houses; and in Mr. Locke might be found a protest on the subject, the ground of which was, that it was inconsistent with the order. The Lord Keeper stated, nevertheless, that the House was master of its own orders, and as far as the Bill went it was accompanied by a test, the effect of which would be to exclude Roman Catholic Peers. The general history of the motives actuating Lords Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Hollis, to support the order, was given by Burnet, who said that the new test was opposed by those whom he terms Papists, because they well knew that if there were any precedent of a test, it would be applied to themselves. He added, that Lords Shaftesbury, Halifax, and others, thought it was not right that any test should be imposed upon Members of Parliament; that Peers were appointed by the Crown, and Commons elected by the People; and that it was absurd to impose a test that would shut them out from the national deliberations. At the Revolution, the Bill passed requiring the declaration against transubstantiation, and altering the oath of allegiance & supremacy; and if any Act of Parliament could in its nature be permanent, permanent ought to be long to those Acts passed at the period of the Bill of Rights, when it was declared that James II. had a design to extirpate the Protestant religion, and had been under the direction of evil counsels and Ministers. Such was the intention of the legislators of that day, and he never could believe, if it were not the intention, that Lord Somers and the other Whigs would, in 1705, so soon after the Revolution, have inserted the articles in the Scottish Union, that the Peers and Commons from thence should necessarily be Protestants only. At the Revolution a view was taken of all the dangers to which the Country had been exposed. The Statesmen of that day had seen that Charles I. had been under the influence of a Catholic Queen, and that James II., who was a avowed Roman Catholic, had endeavoured to subvert the religion of the State, and that Charles II., though in external conformity a member of the Established Church, did not by that outward compliance afford a sufficient guarantee for the safety of the Church. It was found that he, too, had been influenced by evil counsellors. At the Revolution, therefore, provision was made for excluding a Roman Catholic Queen from the Throne; for preventing a Roman Catholic King from presiding over the affairs of the Nation, and for shutting out of the councils and the legislature all who were not of the Protestant faith. Ten years after the discoveries of Oates, the Houses of Lords and Commons took these sage precautions; and whether they were right or wrong, they established the Protestant character of Parliament. (Hear!) His Right Hon. Friend had referred to two other points: the one was, that the summons to Catholic Peers to attend the Coronation established a peculiar claim in their favour. He (Mr. Peel) confessed that upon this point he had heard his Right Hon. Friend with some surprise and pain. He should have thought that he would have been one of the last to discourage these acts of favour and liberality on the part of the Sovereign, by endeavouring to prevent them into an argument of this kind. If they had been told at once more fully that they were excluded from legislation, it was possible that they might have listened with regret, and perhaps with disgust; but if it had been ex-

plained to them further, that the Constitution was essentially Protestant—that laws had been passed requiring conformity with the Church, abjuration of the tenets of Catholicism, and that there was no disposition to extend them further, they might have listened with patience and acquiescence. He would not give to the Duke of Norfolk and other Catholic Peers what the Right Hon. Gentleman termed temporary privilege, but he would not exclude them from such honours and personal distinctions as the Sovereign might think fit to bestow. If in the case of Lord Fingall there was a wish to give a Roman Catholic the full benefit of an honour conferred, he hoped it did not impose the necessity of extending the concession further. Of this he was perfectly certain, that if a Roman Catholic Peer had been excluded from a privilege he was qualified to enjoy—if in the case of Lord Fingall it had been contended that he could not receive the honour proposed, on the ground of his faith, the Country would never have heard the last of such a glaring instance of obsolete bigotry. (Hear, hear!) If he (Mr. Peel) were called upon, he should unquestionably advise the Crown to set up, on the principle it had then adopted, the law. Yet, not carrying the spirit beyond the concession, he should suggest a recommendation, that he should propose like that of his Right Hon. Friend, or one of a more enlarged description. His Right Hon. Friend, in the next place, had referred to what he considered a strange state of legislation upon this subject; but would his motion cure any one of the anomalies at present existing? (Hear, hear!) Supposing this bill passed, would the condition of a Roman Catholic Peer of Ireland be improved? He would be qualified to sit and vote in the House of Peers, and to vote on the election of a Representative Peer; but if he were chosen by any county or town to sit, as he might, were he not a Roman Catholic, in the House of Commons, he would be turned back because he could not make a declaration, from which he was freed in the House of Lords. (Hear!) He would put it to any man whether the anomaly was not thus rendered more striking than at present? (Hear, hear!) Again he would ask if it were right that a Roman Catholic Peer (the Duke of Norfolk, for instance) should enjoy all the hereditary privileges of his rank and station—should sit and vote in the House of Lords, and advise the Crown upon all matters, and among them de rebus concernantibus ecclesiam Anglicanam—would it not, indeed, be a most strange state of legislation if he were by law not permitted to receive from the Crown the slightest mark of official confidence? (Hear, hear!) This was one of the strongest arguments that could be used for postponing the consideration of the Peers (which was all that was necessary for him now to maintain) until the great question relating to the whole Catholic body were brought before the House. He (Mr. Peel) saw around him many who had both supported and opposed the Roman Catholic claims upon perfectly distinct grounds. He presumed that the latter, who on constitutional principles had voted against the admission of Catholics to legislation as a dangerous departure from the law of the land, would resist the motion now before the House. The enemies of general emancipation, as it was termed, would hardly be disposed to admit to another place those who would support the claims of the whole Catholic body, which had hitherto been effectively resisted. (Hear, hear!) In conclusion, thanking the House for the indulgence he had already shown, (hear, hear!) he wished to address a few observations to such as had hitherto supported the Roman Catholic claims. There were many, probably a large portion of the advocates of an extension of privileges, who thought, whenever the general subject was discussed and decided, the result should be, to quote the words of his Right Hon. Friend, "a final and conciliatory arrangement." To them the arrangement now proposed could neither be final nor conciliatory. (Hear, hear!) There were others who thought that whenever the point arrived for removing the disabilities of our Roman Catholic brethren, the whole state of the Roman Catholic Church should be taken into consideration, with a view to some such securities as were enacted in the Bill of last Session. It had been distinctly urged at that time that measures of concession and security should go hand in hand; and this notion had been supported by the Right Hon. Gentleman who introduced the subject. A notice had been given, that within six months the whole subject would be introduced; and of those who had supported securities he would ask, whether they thought it wise to pass a partial measure opening one branch of the legislature to Roman Catholics without any securities at all? (Hear!) What would be the situation of those who should insist on securities hereafter? Would it not be most invidious? A right was given to the Crown to increase the House of Lords, and that without any securities. Yet when Parliament came to consider the case of Catholic members of the House of Commons, whose functions would be only temporary, being elected at most for seven years, if securities were then demanded, would not the situation of those who required them be most painful and invidious? Might not the Commons justly say that though there can be no doubt of the fidelity and loyalty of the present Duke of Norfolk, or of Lords Clifford and Shrewsbury, yet their posterity, which may not be equally loyal and faithful, is admitted to the privilege of sitting and voting to the latest generation without any attempt to obtain the slightest security. (Hear, hear!) If no security were re-

quired of the aristocracy, chosen by the Crown for more than the period of their lives, it was a little too much to ask security from the Commons, who, at most, would only sit in Parliament for seven years. (Hear, hear, hear!) Besides these classes, there were others, who, admitting some remote and possible danger to the Constitution, would be disposed to incur it, on account of the present state of Ireland; they contended that the Government of that Country rested on too narrow a basis, and that it could not be safe, solid, and permanent, unless the Catholic inhabitants were admitted to the privileges the Protestants enjoyed. Would it advance the views of peace and good order in Ireland, would it show that the interests of the great majority were regarded, to tell them that Roman Catholic Peers had been admitted into the House of Lords, but that representatives and senators for the People were still excluded from the House of Commons? Other Gentlemen had argued this question upon the broadest and most constitutional principles; and at the head of this class was the Right Hon. Member for the University of Dublin. They had taken the most enlarged and comprehensive view, and it could not be explained more fully or more accurately than in the emphatic words of the Right Hon. Gentleman himself. He said "I speak in the presence of enlightened constitutional lawyers and statesmen, and I do not fear contradiction when I assert, that the doctrine of exclusion is not to be found in the principles or in the analogies of the Constitution. It is not to be found in the history of our Country, or in the opinions of any of our Statesmen; and it is at once inconsistent with the subject's rights and the King's prerogatives. Ours is a free monarchy, and it is the essence of such a Government, that the King can call for the services of all his large subjects, otherwise it is not a monarchy; and no class of subjects can be excluded from privileges, otherwise it is not a free monarchy." He (Mr. Peel) appealed to those who had used or adopted this language, and of them he asked, the time being arrived when it was wise and safe to remove the restrictions preventing admission into the House of Lords, if it was just or decent to continue the restrictions to admission into the House of Commons? (Hear, hear!) If admirability to office were a general right belonging to all ranks of Roman Catholics, why were the disabilities of the great mass of that body to be postponed to the claims of a few, however respectably founded as those claims were, only upon the same inherent right? All he required (and it formed the whole object of his address) was, that the claims of the Roman Catholic Peers should be postponed until the whole question, with the securities, were again introduced. He gave his Right Hon. Friend full credit for the best intentions; he was perfectly sure that he fancied there existed in the case of the Peers a peculiarity warranting this distinct motion in their favour, but he was equally certain that it was neither worthy of the great abilities of his Right Hon. Friend, nor of the character of the House, thus, by a partial measure, to give an advantage to the great question, independent of the principles upon which it must rest;—hypocritism. He had thus attempted to state why he had arrived at a different conclusion from his Right Hon. Friend, and, in order to give effect to his arguments, it was not his intention to vote the previous question to secure some stray vote, but to meet the motion in the most fair and open manner. (Hear!) He should pass now the course in which he had always proceeded on this subject, by giving the proposal his most decided resistance. (Hear, hear!)

Lord FRANCIS GOWER briefly supported the motion. Lord NUGENT contended that the restrictions on the Roman Catholics was an anomaly in the British Constitution, and stood unsupported by any doctrine laid down by our greatest lawyers. The Claims of the Catholics were founded in clear matter of right, and could only be rejected upon some case of great danger being made out. No such case had been, or in his opinion could be, made out. Let them look at the great names whose power to serve their King and Country was thrown into the dark by these disabilities. He considered that this question stood upon all these principles of liberty and justice upon which our most inalienable rights depended. The strong belief and conviction that he retained that whatever subject discharged his duties as a citizen was entitled to the privilege of being a Statesman, induced him to take that view of this question which he was then advocating. This was not an innovation that was proposed, but an act of restoration. For the sake of the Noble Persons themselves he did regret that this question had been agitated. For the space of a century and a half they had stood at the head of their sect for purity and integrity of motive. They had been told that it was without their knowledge or consent that this question was brought forward. If he had been authorized, he assured the House that he would quote a magnificent disclaimer made to him by a Noble Friend of his. He did not mention names, however, from motives of delicacy, lest it should appear invidious to the rest of that body, who all were his own felt equally solicitous for the welfare of their fellow-countrymen. He should give the vote for the motion, from a conviction that the motion, of which his Right Hon. Friend, the Member for Dublin, (Mr. Plunkett) had given notice, would in less than a twelvemonth be carried triumphantly. He had hoped that the visit of the King of these realms to his Irish dominions had been the herald of peace and emancipation; which prevented Catholics from coming within five miles of London—that atrocious Act which deprived them of education, of property, and religion, was one of those laws which were now being repealed, and upon the same reasoning its repeal must be considered an infringement of the principles of the Revolution. But what was the history of this Act? The party who were distinguished with the Revolution wanted to embrace King William, whose whole life had been a warfare against intolerance. The Court party were aware of the effect which it would have on him, and by their influence the Commons were induced to load the Bill with absurdities, in order to prevent it from passing. The Lords, however, took it with all its absurdities, passed it, and sent it back to the Commons; and thus the Bill was completed, with clauses so disgraceful and unjust, that even the commentary of Mr. Burke could scarcely place it in a light sufficiently odious. The Hon. Member then proceeded to quote a passage from the writings of Mr. Burke, in which the history of the measure was detailed, and the Act itself described as loaded with double injustice through the violence of conflicting parties, and a libel by the Legislature contrary to their first intentions. He might be told that these Acts were now done away, but what became of the glorious Revolution? The same arguments which he had heard that night might as well have been used against the Acts of 1791 and 1793 as against the proposition at present before the House, and the revival of the abrogated laws might be called for upon the same principle by which this measure was opposed. If those laws existed at the time of the Revolution, or before it, was it, therefore, that they were to be prevented from doing acts necessary to the public safety? It was not by a reference to these particular laws that such a question was to be decided. They should go to the spirit of the Revolution itself, and determine whether that spirit was in hostility to the liberal improvement of enlightened times. There could be no greater mistake than to suppose that the principles of the Revolution, the principles which established the House of Brunswick on the Throne, demanded the support of exclusion. (Hear, hear!) The Protestant religion was independent of such aids, it had been raised by the spirit of freedom. On looking at the history of the Protestant religion, they would find, that in the reign of Henry the Eighth the real cause why the people went along with the Reformation was founded, not so much upon an objection to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as upon the desire to resist the exactions of the See of Rome, which they felt to be inconsistent with the liberty of the Country. Afterwards, in the reign of the Stuarts, the same love of liberty was manifested. It was the happy mixture of civil and religious liberty that gave our Constitution its highest claims to respect, and no man could be a greater enemy to a Protestant King or a Protestant Parliament than he who would make them inconsistent with the liberties of all, or dependent upon any system of exclusion for their support. Mr. Burke had said, that if ever he could be brought to believe that the interest of the Protestant Church was necessarily opposed to the civil rights of the People, he would then tremble for the Protestant religion. It therefore became, then, for the sake of the establishment itself, to oppose their best exertions to such a belief. The principal object he was rising was to avoid the implication that he was not friendly to the measure. In whatever shape it might be brought forward, or whatever portion of the great and general question might be settled, he should at all times feel it his duty to afford every assistance in his power towards the advancement of the cause, considering such a larger or more limited scope the principle of getting rid of all exclusive enactments. If a proposition had been made to release out, one individual of that community from its injustice, he would not object to it, because every case in which it was enforced, it was every hour in which we continued it, we were guilty of gross injustice. He would venture to say, notwithstanding what had been stated to the contrary, that the measure now under discussion would be received by the People of Ireland as an act of grace and conciliation. With respect to what had been urged as to the impolicy of this House interfering with the privileges of the House of Lords, it had been already answered, and he thought with some reason, that as the measure inflicting the disabilities had originated in the Commons, the redress might also originate in the same place. The test of the 5th of Queen Elizabeth was not a test of religion but of loyalty. Besides, the Septennial and Triennial Bills had both originated with the Peers; though it was evident that they interfered with the Constitution of the House of Commons. The advocates of the Catholic cause had proposed a Bill as a joint measure; and, as a joint measure, it was rejected, because it was separate; for whether joint or separate, there were persons always to be found, who would discover that there was something objectionable in the form. He had not heard one word about the oath of Supremacy.—Against the justice of the measure, not a syllable had been uttered, and it was their duty to consider it upon its own grounds. They should not permit themselves to be checked by any formal objection, but go forward boldly, and present the measure to the Lords; leaving it to themselves to determine whether their privileges called for its rejection or not.

Mr. WELFORD, moved a loud cry for the question, postponed the motion, but the greater part of his observations were rendered inaudible by the interruptions. Mr. CANNING then rose to reply. After the full measure of attention he had received from the House, he was only desirous of availing himself of the privilege which the House allowed those who brought forward a motion. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman had considered the measure he proposed to introduce as one of a singular nature; but, with the exception of the hostility of the Hon. and Learned Member, and that of the Right Hon. Friend, it appeared they had been discussing an object which all were desirous to promote. Notwithstanding the opposition he was alluded to, he ventured to say he should be the harbinger of that success the Honourable and Learned Gentleman might deprecate, but could not prevent. Mr. Canning then explained his statement with respect to the 5th of Elizabeth. The plain fact was, there was a test which excluded some from the House of Commons, and with regard to the House of Peers there was no exclusion at all. On that he had built his argument, that Parliament did wrong to the Bishops, and required that wrong. So also, as they had done wrong to the Peers, they ought to do them justice at the present day. With regard to the rights of the Peers, he had been charged with inconsistency in not stating the restriction imposed on Scotch Peers by the Act of Union. He had not taken into account the limitation with respect to the number of Peers allowed to legislate, but nothing he could say or do on that subject would cure the anomaly. The Scotch had contracted that no change should take place, and they were without remedy. The Irish, in the Act of Union, were more prudent. He had been charged with differing from the principles upon which Mr. Pitt and others had supported the Roman Catholic Claims? It was said by those who, some years ago, opposed the general measure—"Let us have parts of the measure before us." On the present occasion, a part was offered, and they called for the general measure—"Your great capacity had stomach for it all." The Catholic Peers had been unjustly excluded, and the question would be, whether the exclusion was to descend to posterity for ever? If the Peers had been wronged, it was the duty of the House to set them right. Men sent to legislate in that House for millions of Catholics, should keep themselves free from prejudice against tenets which once were general in England, though now considered by some as a crime. He could not feel that it was a gross distinction and comfort to say that, at the Table of the House, which did no good, but had a tendency to excite painful feelings in his countrymen. It was too much to see the Roman Catholics excluded from the rights of the Constitution, and at the same time call upon them to expend their lives and fortunes in support of the Constitution, which was the instrument of their degradation. His Right Hon. Friend had said he had underrated the dangers of the reign of Charles II. He had admitted the dangers of that reign. A more corrupt and profligate Monarch never sat on the throne. The slave of France, the adherent of Popery, and Professor of Protestantism; a bigot in the beginning, and a tyrant in the end. The more, however, they exposed the dangers of the reign of Charles II., the more reason they had at this time to repeal every law existing on the Catholics. Had there a Catholic King on the throne at this day? Was it to be supposed that the admission of six Catholic Peers would overturn the religion of the Country, and convert a Protestant King to Popery? The equivalent for constitutional privileges was not required in the measure he proposed. The equivalent might be adjourned with the Hon. and Learned Gentleman's speech. Mr. Canning concluded by saying, if this measure were carried it would be productive of great public good, and the House of Commons would atone for former acts of injustice.

The House then divided on the motion.
Ayes, 249
Noes, 234
Majority for the motion, 15

LONDON.
SATURDAY, MAY 4.
CITY, ONE O'CLOCK.—Mr. Bross has just communicated to the Gentlemen of the Stock Exchange, a letter received by the Governor of the Bank of England, signed by Lord Liverpool and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, requesting that they will be ready to meet, at the Treasury Chambers, at 12 o'clock on Tuesday next, such persons as are in the habit of contracting for Loans, in pursuance of the Resolution of the 31st of May, at 4 o'clock for Money defined from 7½ to 7½; and for Account, from 7½ to 7½, in consequence of this notice.

The following is an extract of a private letter:—"Paris, May 1.—There is nothing new, except that the Chambers are to be closed to-day for the present session. They will be again convoked for a short session on the 4th of next month, merely to pass the budget for the next year. The Funds fell a little yesterday, but it was occasioned by its being settling day."

It with sincere pleasure we perceive that the appeal which has been made by the public press, in behalf of the starving peasantry of the South and West of Ireland, has produced the desired effect. A meeting is announced to be held on Tuesday next, at the City of London Tavern, under the benevolent auspices of some of the principal Merchants and Bankers. We have but one thing to impress upon the minds of these philanthropic individuals—despatch. This, indeed, is pre-eminently one of those cases in which the immediate application of the intended aid,

The Waterford Chronicle.

THURSDAY, MAY 7.

The London Journals of Saturday and Sunday have arrived.—No Mail due. A few extracts have been sufficient to convey every thing of interest which those Journals have communicated. Accounts have reached this City from London, which render it highly probable that an additional duty will be laid on the importation of Foreign Butter. Sir R. Sney has postponed his motion for the repeal of the Window Tax, to the 30th instant. On this subject, we have extracted the following paragraph from the *Dublin Evening Herald*:—"Sir R. Sney has twice postponed his motion on the Window Tax. It is stated, that he has written a letter to town, in which he announces, that Mr. Yassowicz has at length consented to give up that import, and also the Hearth Tax, which would not be worth the expense of collection after the abolition of the other impost." Mr. Gougeon arrived in Dublin on Friday, from London. His journey had all the appearance of having been undertaken with suddenness and conducted with great speed—and is referable, no doubt, to the representations that have been made, relative to the condition of the western Counties. Ministers have received accounts from Staffordshire relating to the discontented spirit which prevails among the manufacturing classes in that extensive district, of an unsatisfactory nature, that they have ordered Lord Talbot to repair thither and join his regiment immediately. His Lordship, who was preparing to visit the Continent, has, in consequence, been obliged to give up his plan, and left town for Staffordshire on Thursday evening.