



the country was taken by surprise; that the question of securities was evaded. He would therefore vote against the Bill.

Dr. PHILLIMORE said, that with respect to securities, however the House might feel it necessary to impose securities with respect to the Catholics at large, he did not see how they were called for or necessary here. In his mind the cases were very different. On the general question they were to legislate for the Catholic population at large—they were to legislate for the People of Ireland. But here the objects were before them. The Bill went only to place in the House of Lords seven or eight Catholic Peers—men who were known to them all. Who would say that those Noblemen were so dangerous in any way as to render it necessary for that House to enact measures of security or restraint respecting them? The names of every one of those Noble Persons were known to the House—they were all persons who were descended from the most illustrious of the Nobles of this land—men who their high trust had ever acquitted themselves with honour and fidelity to the Crown and to the Country. Here the Hon. and Learned Member entered into an historical detail of the conduct of the Catholic Nobility in former times? When a Bill was sent down from that House to exclude the Protestant Bishops from the Lords, the Catholic Nobles, who then sat in Parliament, were foremost in opposing that measure. The Civil Wars succeeded. Of 300 Nobles who fell in that unhappy struggle, 100 were Roman Catholics.—In the time of Elizabeth, Catholics were entrusted with that able and politic Princess, with places of the greatest power. Howard of Effingham, a Catholic Nobleman, was selected to command an High Admiral—the fleet fitted out to oppose the Spanish Armada—other Catholics held places of safety inferior trust—and none of them were ever forgetful of their duty to their Sovereign or their Country. The Hon. and Learned Member next alluded to the case of Lord Stafford, and read an affecting account of the trial given by Mr. Evelyn, who witnessed the whole of the proceedings. Mr. Evelyn indignantly complained that the life of a virtuous and aged Nobleman should have been taken away upon the evidence of a witness, whose testimony, with impartial men, would not be considered sufficient to hang a dog. When it was said that the Catholic Peers would act with hostility towards the Church of England, what proof of this had they from experience? When the Bill was agitated in the House of Peers in the reign of Charles I. to exclude the Bishops, how did the Catholic Peers vote? How did the ancestor of the Duke of Norfolk vote on that occasion? What greater possible danger could be apprehended from Catholic Peers than from Peers denying the divinity of our Saviour, or the doctrine of the atonement, or professing Presbyterianism, a doctrine much more hostile to the Church of England, in many respects, than Catholicism, and under which the Church had actually been trampled under foot? As a measure of retributive justice and Christian charity, they were called on to pass the Bill. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. W. COURTENAY said, the argument of his Hon. and Learned Friend (Mr. Wetherell) would have great weight, if his object had been to justify the passing of the Act of exclusion; but did not at all apply to the question, whether the line of policy then pursued continued to be justified? The intent of the Act of Charles II. might be gathered from the preamble, which stated, that "Whereas various good laws against Papists had not their desired effect, by reason of the free access of Papist Lords to His Majesty's persons, and the liberty they had lately taken of sitting and voting in the House of Peers, &c." The reason stated, therefore, for the passing of that Act, was the want of effect of the good laws against Papists, by which was to be understood the penal enactments against the body of the Catholic population. But he would ask, which was the most consequence, the access of Catholics of rank, influence, and talents, to the Sovereign whom they might sway their counsels; or, their sitting among the mass of Protestants in the House of Peers?—In practice, there was no other disseverer who might not be admitted into the House of Parliament. The Catholics themselves were now allowed to reach the highest military stations. A Roman Catholic Peer might command the fleet or the army, where he had the greatest power of doing mischief—yet he was not to be admitted to Parliament, where he might be called on to answer for his conduct. Talk of inconsistency—was there any more glaring or flagrant than this?—When he was asked for security, he would say the measure itself was a security. If a Catholic Nobleman was allowed to reach the highest posts in the army, they had the greater security against him, by allowing him to come within the walls of Parliament that they might meet him face to face. In the present state of Ireland, was it of no consequence that the Catholic Peers should be raised to a share in the common interest in behalf of which their power and influence were exerted? His Hon. and Learned Friend had said of the Catholic question, *si res acquiritur ends*. This was really the state of the case, as the Hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Foster) had admitted the question must sooner or later be carried, and there was no time for making a concession better than the present, and no step more fit to commence it by than the present Bill.

Mr. W. PEEL said, that if the admission of six or eight Peers into the House of Lords were the only object or consequence of the measure, he should not have opposed it; but it would necessarily be followed by the admission of Commoners

to the House of Commons; and what opposition could then be made to the admission of any other Dissenters? (Loud cries of hear!) What chance was there that the Protestant religion should retain its ascendancy as the established religion of the Country? He was convinced that a large majority of the People of the three Kingdoms taken together, were hostile to the Catholic Claims. If he had been himself a Catholic Peer, he should have refused to put his claims on a footing different from that on which the claims of other Catholics stood, and should have felt it unwise to agitate the measure at a time when the most sanguine friend of it could not expect it to pass. (Hear!)

Mr. WYN observed, that though the Hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Foster) had qualified his declaration of the necessity that the claims of the Catholics should be conceded, by saying that the Protestant mind was not prepared for it, yet he hoped that declaration would go far to produce the conviction that was desired. The concession of the Catholic Claims was one of great importance to Ireland, not only in itself, but as blending with all other measures, for without it every act of conciliation would lose its beneficial influence, and every measure of coercion fall with greater severity. Because the whole measure could not be carried, he should not therefore reject any part of it; and though he concurred at the time in the abandonment of the Bill of 1813, because the clause admitting Catholics to the House of Commons had been struck out, he now considered it an act rather of indignation than of prudence.—It was said by the Hon. Gentleman who spoke last, that if Catholics were admitted to Parliament, other Dissenters could not be excluded. Why other Dissenters were not excluded, (hear, hear!) which formed a strong argument for the admission of Catholics. (Hear!) The Honourable Member for Oxford (Mr. Wetherell) had said, that if the seven Catholic Peers were to be admitted to Parliament, the prohibition under which the King was placed of not marrying a Catholic might be repealed. But there was no parity in the cases. Six or seven Catholic Lords would be controlled by the general Protestant vote of 300 other Peers, but the King was the sole depository of the executive power. It was, however, objected that the King might create any number, even a majority of Catholic Peers. Now, really, if he supposed that public opinion had no force to prevent such a measure, they might prove the necessity of a qualification of property for the House of Peers. The King, it might be said, when he wished to carry any measures, might create the whole of a regiment of Foot Guards Peers, and march them in a body to give their votes.—There was not one of the powers of the Constitution that was not liable to the imputation of this possibility of extreme abuse. There had now elapsed 200 years since the Reformation, for half of which time the Catholic Peers had sat and voted in the House of Peers, in infinitely greater numbers than they could at present; and if in that time they had been dangerous, or if it could be conceived, that at any time during the last 60 years, they would have been likely to have given their votes in a manner dangerous to the Constitution; he would say there was a case made out for securities. The condition of the Catholics in society was now changed. They lived as a separate and a distinct class, and no longer visited a Catholic, who was not considered as almost a Papist. They were now mingled with the mass of society, and bound together by common notions in points of policy and Government. Their admission to all the privileges of other subjects would be perfectly safe and desirable, but he should support the smallest measure of concession, proposed as, *pro tanto*, an act of justice and policy.

Mr. MARTIN, of Galway, supported the motion. Mr. PEEL said, that after having stated his sentiments to the House so fully on a former night, it was not his intention at present to occupy much of their attention, and he rose merely for the purpose of removing some misapprehensions and misapprehensions. He did not object to the measure, because it was a partial measure, nor did he solicit the vote of any Gentleman who might concur with him in his objections to the particular measure, under the impression that, when the general question came to be discussed, his (Mr. Peel's) opposition to it would be relaxed. It was impossible, after the House had so recently passed a Bill removing the disabilities affecting the Roman Catholics, that he could anticipate the possibility of so decided an opposition to the general measure, as might have been expected in former times; but he would not relax his opposition to the measure, because he foresaw the probability of its ultimate success. He apprehended that it was in the true spirit of the Constitution that Members of the House maintained their opinions to the last, notwithstanding overwhelming majorities against them. If it were probable that the general measure would be carried, the argument for the particular measure was, *pro tanto*, weakened, and in proportion to the probability of the ultimate success of the general measure, he did most earnestly deprecate the success of the present Bill. He should merely state the outline of the argument on which he relied, without referring to collateral topics. If the House should take a different view of this question, he (Mr. P.) should have another interest to look to and another duty to perform; for it would then become his duty to endeavour to create as little evil, and derive as much good as possible from the measure. He did not object to

the present measure because it was partial; for there were some partial measures to which he should not object, such, for instance, as that of placing the English and Irish Roman Catholics on the same footing, or that of granting the distinction of the judicial functions, to Roman Catholic Bishops. There was a great distinction between a specific and a general measure; and his objection to the present measure was, that it was partial in its operation while it was general in its principle. It had been argued, that there could be no danger in restoring a few Noblemen of distinguished rank and excellent character, such as the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Shrewsbury, and Lord Clifford, to the privileges which their ancestors enjoyed; but could any man of common sense fail to see the sophistry of this argument? The question was not whether half a dozen individuals should be restored to the privileges of their ancestors, but whether the disabilities affecting one branch of the Legislature should be removed, while they continued to be imposed on the other—whether the Crown should have the power of creating an unlimited number of Roman Catholic Peers, while the People should not have the power of returning to the House of Commons a limited number of Roman Catholic Representatives. It had been contended that the disabilities affecting the Peers ought to be removed first, because they were latest imposed upon them; but if there were any validity in that argument, it would go to prove that all restrictions should be first removed from the throne. With regard to securities, that part of the subject had not been discussed in the last debate, & in his opinion it would have been better to pass it over in silence, than to allude to it in so ominous a manner as in the present discussion. They were not told that these securities were never necessary, that they had been adopted merely for the purpose of quieting some ridiculous and exaggerated fears of Protestant bigots, and that the best security was to be derived from the unqualified admission of our Roman Catholic fellow subjects to the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges.—If such was the language adopted now, and the present Bill were to pass for admitting Catholic Peers to the House of Lords without any securities, what would be the arguments employed with regard to securities when the general question came to be discussed in the next Session? The advocates of this question so frequently shifted their ground, that it was not easy to anticipate their arguments, or unravel all the sophistries to which they might have recourse.—

"Quo tenemur vellemus motum Protestando?" There could be no doubt, however, that if the present Bill passed, it would be urged as an argument next Session against every species of security. There was one point to which he was particularly desirous of calling the attention of his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Canning). The present Bill proposed only to remove the disabilities affecting the Roman Catholic Peers; but it went much farther, for it would have the effect of relieving the House of Peers from the necessity of taking the Oath of Supremacy. This was a most serious difficulty in the way of the measure. As far as authority went, he had that of the late Mr. Grant, Mr. Pownsey, and almost all the most enlightened advocates of the general question, against repealing the Oath of Supremacy.—So renowned indeed were they of this oath, that another Oath of Supremacy, to be taken by Catholic Peers, had been annexed to the Bill which passed that House in the last Session. The Oath of Supremacy was solemnly recognized by the Bill of Rights, the charter upon which King William accepted the Throne at the Revolution, and which differed from all other Acts of Parliament, in being declared to be permanently enacted as the law of the realm for ever. There was the same guarantee, therefore, for the continuation of the Oath of Supremacy, as for the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the Throne, and the maintenance of the rights and liberties of the subject. He could not but consider it a fatal objection to this measure, that it exempted the House of Peers from the necessity, of taking this oath, which had been framed in the reign of Elizabeth, and which was solemnly recognized by the Bill of Rights. He would admit that at the period when the Catholic Peers were excluded the House of Peers was under a temporary alarm from Oates's plot; he would admit that they acted under duress, and that they were not in possession of their right faculties; he would admit that the trial of Lord Stafford was unjust, and that his execution was a judicial error; yet he still contended that there might be other concurring circumstances which formed a sufficient ground for the enactment of the Bill affecting the Peers. But it was said that, even admitting that there were circumstances which justified the exclusion of Catholics from Parliament, those circumstances had ceased, and the disabilities ought to cease with them. If the validity of this argument were admitted, the House must be prepared to abandon many of the best securities for the maintenance of the Constitution. Neither the Constitution, nor the security by which it was maintained, were *laesum a priori*; they were founded on the experience of the past. They were not called upon to inquire into the causes which led to the Reformation, or to examine minutely the frame of mind in which Henry VIII. wrote a treatise one year *alacris Martiana Lucherna*, and in the next year, on account of his divorce from Queen Catherine, became a violent opponent of the Catholic faith. The Spiritual Bill was enacted in consequence of specific circumstances; but were they to return to Tri-

blal Parliaments, because those circumstances had ceased? Under all the circumstances, he felt himself bound to resist the present motion, and he implored the advocates of the just rights and privileges of the Constitution, to consider whether it was prudent or wise in the House of Commons to originate this measure? All that could be lost by the rejection of the present proposal was the postponement of the general question till the early part of the next Session, when it would be taken up upon a broad and high ground. They could then confide for the eligibility, not merely of Peers to sit in the House of Lords, but of every person to all situations in the Country. If Peers were to be admitted there was no justice in the exclusion of Commoners. He could, therefore, see no good reason for pressing the present partial measure, as a delay of only four months would bring the question before them in its most ample and general form. (Cheers from the Opposition Benches.) He knew not the meaning of those cheers, as he had no object but the pointing out that this delay would really be more favourable to a general question than the carrying of the present measure. There would be no disadvantages resulting from the rejection of this measure, and the House could not, in his opinion, sanction it consistently with their duty. (Cheers.)

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY rose, but from the eagerness of strangers to force themselves into the gallery, we were unable to hear or understand the greater part of his observations. He readily believed that he could trace in the public mind a very general disposition to accede to the wishes of the Roman Catholics. He would by no means impute the public—the Protestant mind—to accede to the proposal of his Hon. Friend; but he thought that, in taking a proper view of the subject, his opinion was that the House should agree to that proposal. He could understand the policy of the proposal, and was prepared to give it his support. He thought it advisable that this partial measure should precede the general question, as there were many hostile views which applied to the general question, which did not apply to this. He thought it safe that the experiment should first be made thus partially, because it would be thereby ascertained whether the degree of power to be acquired by the Roman Catholics, would be such as to endanger the Constitution, if they were made eligible to all kinds of offices. No one could pretend to state any danger that would result from the small number of Catholics which this measure would bring into offices of trust. It might, indeed, be said, that the Crown had an unlimited power in the creation of Peers; but it could not be argued that the Crown could create as Peers an unlimited number of Roman Catholics. Let them concede this point, and then the whole would resolve itself into a question of the degree of power which the Catholics would enjoy. Some might be disposed to oppose the Peers upon the ground that that would be conceding the general principle; but he regarded it as a safe and even a necessary experiment, in order to ascertain whether the general principle could with propriety be conceded. In the event of the concession of that principle, he would concur in securities as necessary. He did not see why the Catholics should not be as closely associated with the Government as the other subjects. They had the same interest, and he doubted not the same feeling in the security of the Country. He had not considered the whole extent of the pledges which they should give. Perhaps the Oath of Supremacy, an oath to which he understood they had no objection, except what related to the word "spiritual," would be sufficient. The question then involved little of political danger, and it interfered not with the power of the Crown. If there was the smallest danger in it—it could in the least tend to shake the tranquillity of the Country—if it would in the least injure the Constitution, he would oppose it; but, convinced as he was, that the Constitution was as dear to Catholics as to Protestants, he felt satisfied that by acceding to this measure, they would support the Constitution. His Hon. Friend's proposition was quite harmless. The friends of the Catholics would see, that the carrying of it would in no way hinder the carrying of the general question, when that should come to be discussed; and they who might feel differently, as to the general question, could find in this nothing that was at variance with the principles of the Constitution. (Hear!)

Mr. CANNING said, that if he had uttered any thing on the former debate in his reply to the speech of his Right Hon. Friend, the Secretary for the Home Department—if he could have let slip any expression which carried in his mind the impression that he had met the question fairly, he must have greatly mistaken him; for it was impossible, in his conception, for the question either in its wider range, or in that more particular view in which he had brought this question itself under consideration, to be more fairly met. He had said that in his argument he had not met the justice and expediency of the case, he did not mean that he intended it only of the justice and expediency of this particular case, and meant that he had not met that part of his (Mr. C.'s) argument which was founded on the particular case of those whose claims he was now advocating. In the latter part of the speech which he made on the former evening, he had accurately developed those views of policy on which he felt himself justified in bringing forward this measure. To go no further back than the period in which the House of Commons, for the first time, had felt itself justified in acceding to the question in favour of the Catholics, he meant in the year 1812; when he

himself had the honour to bring forward a motion in which the whole question was brought into view, where the terms were made as wide as possible, and the debate was as full as had ever been known, what was the fate of that measure in the House? It was thrown out as not according with the wishes of that House. In the succeeding year, 1813, in redemption of the pledge given in the preceding Session, a Bill was brought in, which passed the second reading, and was dropped in the Committee on the failure of the clause for the admission of Catholics into Parliament. He was himself a party to that decision—he meant of the throwing up, of which he had since repented.—He was satisfied now that it was a decision not of spirit, but of temper, and he took to himself his full share of blame for the part he took therein. They were then offered all kinds of partial concessions, if they would give up that clause; but, as it had since turned out, they unwisely and imprudently, as for his own part, he was ready to confess, refused; and an interval of nine years afterwards elapsed, in which little progress was made in the cause. In the last Session a measure was introduced by his Right Hon. Friend, now Attorney-General of Ireland, which passed that House; a measure temperate and wise in its provisions, which blended concession with security; but what was the consequence? when it reached the House of Lords it was rejected. They were then reduced to reflect whether the course they had hitherto taken, was the best for securing a temperate success. The opponents of the measure were now urging him to bring forward the general measure, were only labouring in their vocation, by counselling perseverance in that course which experience told them had always failed. In looking round, therefore, for a measure most likely to effect his ultimate purpose, looking at the proceedings of the last ten years, he had every reason to think that partial legislation was the best for the purpose of securing the ulterior object. The concession of all the partial claims on a former occasion—the arguments of his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel) at present—the reception which the general measure had constantly met with in another place; all confirmed him in that opinion. Experience too supported the conviction; for, if he decided not himself, one portion of the measure had already succeeded; and where did that originate? In the House of Lords. (Cheers.) The exclusion of Catholics from the army and navy, which by the friends of emancipation was always viewed as one of the greatest of their grievances, and by its opposers was strenuously defended as the citadel of the Constitution, was removed. (Cheers.) He remembered the point most impressed on his mind, and on which he made the strongest impression, was the situation of the Catholic subjects excluded from promotion. Was the removal of that exclusion a proof that partial legislation in the House of Lords, more particularly where that measure originated, was more to their taste than a general measure, and therefore more likely to succeed? When, therefore, for reasons which he had no part, but which had been deemed sufficient, it was determined to postpone the general question, he thought that a fair opportunity for trying this partial measure, in order to ascertain the species of opposition which the general principle was likely to meet in the House of Lords. It was difficult to speak of things that passed in another place; but, if looking for the measure on which he should anticipate the least objection, there, he should say it was this. The grounds of opposition to the general measure in that place, had mostly arisen out of the variety of circumstances which it embraced; some individual Peers objecting to one part, and others to another, but each admitting the possibility of agreeing to any thing but the precise point to which their objection was addressed. Among all, however, who objected to the measure, there was none who did not ridicule the idea of securities, and declare that if disposed to make concession it would be without any provision of that nature. The part of the measure which he had selected, was that which, in his opinion, ought to succeed, and which was the only one that could, with more propriety originate in that House than in the other, since it more immediately concerned the other. Besides which, it was the point that least of all affected the general question. The Catholic Peers had sat in Parliament for a century after they were excluded from the House of Commons. Their exclusion had been effected by declaration and falsehood, no objection could be urged to it on the ground of its leading to the general measure; there was nothing in it which would force them into the general question; there was nothing to prevent that from resting just where it stands. They could defend the passing of the present measure as an act of justice—a restoration of rights unjustly infringed; and call upon those who would use it as an argument for the further measure, to show at what time the exclusion from the Commons took place—on what unjust pretences it was founded—what falsehood and fabrication it was effected. His Right Honourable Friend talked of anomalies which this measure would create. But was there nothing of anomaly in that, that the son of a Catholic Nobleman might by meritorious service arrive at the distinction of being placed at the head of a victorious army; that he might, by the repeal of the Act of Charles, go into the presence of the King, that he might advise him, and turn the influence which his high office gave him to the most pernicious uses, while the Peer

himself was deprived of his right to sit and vote in that House to which he belonged, and to exercise the power which was given to his order for the purpose of humbling the pride and controlling the ambition of too powerful subjects. That was an anomaly already existing, and which had been created by a partial measure originating in the House of Lords. His Right Hon. Friend had said that it by no means followed from the badness of a cause that the enactment to which it gave rise might not be good, or that upon the ceasing of the cause the enactment itself should cease; and in support of his position had argued from the Reformation and the Revolution. It was, no doubt, true, that the causes which first gave rise to them had ceased to exist; but other causes had subsequently sprung up to make both the one and the other equally necessary, and their advantages equally desirable now as at the first. And he (Mr. C.) had a right to call on his Right Hon. Friend to show the continuation of some danger to the Constitution from the admission of Catholics to power; danger, not precisely of the same nature, nor proceeding from the same causes as that on which their exclusion was founded; but still danger existing of some kind or other to justify its continuance. He did not call on him to show a Catholic succession to the throne; he did not want him to show a King taking the Sacrament of one Church one day and of the other the next; he did not ask him to point to a Catholic Pretender to the Crown, residing in a foreign Country, intriguing with Catholics in this, and stirring up foreign Powers to aid him in a descent upon our shores; he did not seek to bend to these dangers, or any one of these; but he did ask, and surely that was not too much, that he would show some little danger—(Laughter)—of some kind or other, from some little corner of history—to address some little scuffling of danger—(Laughter)—and if he could show any thing of the kind, he (Mr. Canning) would instantly withdraw this measure. (Loud and repeated cheers.) With respect to the question of securities, he retained the same opinions he had formerly held; and it was not fair to say that because he had annexed securities to this measure, he had given them up, any more than it would be to say, that the Lords had given them up because they had not annexed them to the Army and Navy Bill.—Neither was he bound to answer the question why the same securities were not given here as in other countries of Europe. He had, however, a right to ask if nothing had happened in Europe since the Congress of Vienna a clause was agreed to, declaring that the religious opinions of any German should in no way interfere with the exercise of his political rights. (Cheers.) He had been told that his was a little Bill, which dealt with the subject of an Act of Congress had annihilated all our religious exclusions, and that in a Country where religious quarters had been prosecuted with more candour than in any part of the world. Two years afterwards the Congress of England (for the Congress of Hanover was not with that of England) had given its sanction to a measure which relieved from religious restrictions a territory of 50,000,000 of inhabitants. Six years before he was assured of the fact, that a strongly expressed religious intolerance kept up in Austria, that a mental holding a situation in the stables of the Emperor was discharged because he was found out to be a Protestant, and no he was informed that the President of the Legislature of Hanover was a Catholic. (Cheers.) While these improvements were taking place in Europe, should this Country still persist in the system of odious exclusions; should this Country, whose soil could not be trod on by the slave, for the moment he touched her shores he was free, should she still enthrall with religious bondage the consciences of her citizens? Should these never be an end of dwelling upon negotiations; of swearing to the belief, not of what they believed, but what they disbelieved; of looking upon piratical attacks, and feeling proud of distinctions which made us worse than the rest of mankind? The Right Hon. Gentleman then referring to the three periods of our history, from the Reformation to the reign of Charles I., from thence to the Revolution, and from the last-mentioned epoch to the first modification of the laws against the Catholics in the late reign, pointed out the distinct species of danger that might have been apprehended at each specific period, and said it remained yet to be seen whether there was in those days any danger similar or analogous to those which called for the continuation of these restrictive laws, or for securities on the same principle as those which were formerly necessary. He said our ancestors were not quoted but misquoted, when it was said that the Act of Charles II. was passed in times like these; and yet those did say so, who said that Act ought to be continued in these times. (Cheers.) They misquoted the letter of the Prince of Orange, who applied to the state of our laws on this subject of exclusions. If his Hon. and Learned Friend (Mr. Wetherell) would lead him the manuscript from which he had read that letter, he would not read his manuscript notes—(a laugh)—but he would show him that he had omitted a material word in the reading which had been forgotten to omit in the copying. (Loud laughter.)—The Right Hon. Gentleman, then read from the letter the passage relating to "exclusion from public employments, ecclesiastical, civil, or military," which last word the Learned Gentleman had omitted. If his Honourable and Learned Friend could consent to live under a state of law in which the whole of the military officers

might be filled with Catholics, as ours might at present since the passing of the Army and Navy Act, he should be glad to know on what principle he could object to a measure which would only restore to half a dozen Catholics those seats in the House of Peers, which their ancestors had been deprived on preference now known to be fair, and on grounds that were admitted no longer to exist. He did not think that much importance could be attached to the argument which had been brought forward founded on the Revolution. It would be a most unjust reflection on King William and his advisers, to accuse them of intolerance for not repelling those statutes, which they had found a part of that Constitution which they had sworn to maintain. But, good God! was there no difference between the hour of contest and that more happy hour when the conflict had ceased—between the moment when our feelings are agitated and all our interests at hazard, and the period when our passions had subsided, and reason resumed her seat. The time was now gone when the Protestant and Catholic struggled one with the other who should sway the State, and make her exclusively his own; the hour of combat was past. The Catholics now no longer ried with the Protestants for power or pre-eminence. They now held the language of amity and friendship. "You have been the conquerors, we now yield you willing submission. You are the conquerors, and we call on you for protection."

—Victor, et victum tandem pariter Annulli litteris, tunc est Lavina conjux, Uterius nate videtur.

We no longer pretend to be your rivals, we are willing to continue under your reign—all we require is, that you will deal out to us an equal measure of justice. (Cheers.) But his Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Peel), and those who agreed with him, argued this question in the spirit of conquest, and as if their only effort should be, to harry and subvert the Catholics, how they should keep them down. The fear of danger was only imaginary. The British Constitution and the Protestant Religion were inseparably united, they were settled on a basis simple and secure, that even if the disposition existed, all the powers of Catholicism could not put them in danger. (Hear, hear!) And surely they might now allow these illustrious personages, after a century of peace, and loyalty, and quiet, to be restored to their proper rank and dignity, and enjoy without jealousy, as they might without danger, all the privileges which the Constitution conferred upon those who had clung to it more firmly, and which they could afford to dispense to those who did not come upon it within its embrace. (Hear, hear!) Upon all these grounds he considered the concession justified, and called for. It was called for by justice, and justified by the voice of reason. (Loud cheers.) You have now then (said the Right Honourable Gent.) an opportunity of granting this concession in a manner the most unexceptionable. For admitting, for the sake of argument, that the principle were doubtful, the example may be considered without the possibility of danger. (Hear, hear!)

We most consider that it is not the policy of any State, to found its hope of prosperity on extraordinary views, but on the ordinary good qualities which are to be found in the character of man. But it is undoubtedly an additional argument in favour of this motion, that you are called upon to restore their dignities to persons of the most illustrious standing, upon whose devotion to the State the most anxious doubt has never been cast. Upon qualities like these you may found the confidence. They have been long excluded from their natural stations, suffering not merely on their own account, but without one cheering hope of animating the infant breast of their sons with that noble spirit of ambition which is the pride and boast of Englishmen. But you must not expect that any virtue will long survive these frequent disappointments. You cannot suppose, that while the youthful bosom is uninspired with one ray of hope, that generation will follow generation without degenerating in feeling. I call upon you to restore an individual right so clear and manifest, that no jury in the land could hesitate to confirm. I call upon you to make the best atonement you are able for an age of injustice. You are called upon to confirm by your vote the sacred principles of civil liberty. My Right Hon. Friend has said, that if this Bill were passed to-morrow, all the advantage the Peers would derive would be to sit in the House of Lords a miserable four months before the power of eligibility was given to their Catholic brethren. I say, if it were only a miserable four months, it would be valuable, for you render homage to justice, and perform an act of policy and humanity. At present you maintain a system of the most enormous policy, without any justification. Even when these exclusive statutes were necessary, they were harsh—now that the necessity has ceased, they are inhuman. By refusing this motion you will give a sanction to those very principles of arbitrary power which, when you disqualify them, you admitted to proscribe—(Loud and continued cheering.)

The gallery was then cleared for a division.—The numbers were—

For the second reading.....	95
Against it.....	223

Majority for the second reading..... 128

The announcement of the majority was hailed with loud cheers.

The other Orders of the Day were then disposed of, and the House adjourned.

LONDON.

SATURDAY, MAY 11.

Tue. FENS.—CITY, TWO O'CLOCK.—There is nothing new or important; very little doing.—Consols began at 78½ for the Account, and are now 78½ for the Account, and 78½ for Money; Long Annuities, 101 13 16; Renewed, 77½; 4 per Consols, 94½; Navy, 102½; Spanish Bonds, 63; Danish, 85; Prussian, 86½.

The distress of Ireland was brought forward in the House of Lords last night by the Earl of Danby, with a view to learn what had been done by Ministers for our suffering brethren in that Country. Lord Liverpool stated, that measures had been taken for their relief; but he declined stating the precise period when the relief was first afforded, though, as Lord Lauderdale observed, enough appeared to show that relief was not afforded in time, especially with regard to those Ministers ought to have known was long since required, and the time chosen for supplying it was too late to be of any real service. Earl Grey was highly indignant at the easy indifference displayed by Ministers on the occasion of such a awful situation. "What a picture," he exclaimed, "of a Government! Hundreds and thousands of the population of Ireland dying in the streets and highways for want of food, in the midst of plenty!"

Lord Liverpool spoke in a very subdued tone respecting the new project for a Loan, which has been every where so coolly received. Indeed, the Noble Lord's language bordered almost on despair.

In the Commons several Petitions were presented on the subject of Agricultural Distress. Mr. Curteis took occasion to observe, on presenting a Petition from the Hop-planters of Bexley, and other districts in Sussex (containing statements of dreadful distress), that "the tithes were as grievous in England as in Ireland, and therefore he should expect for the landed interest of this Country the same extent of amelioration that was intended for the Irish."—We trust that steps will be taken for remedying the evil as far as possible in both Countries. The tithes on hops is, we believe, often twice or three times the value of the rent. What a state of things to be continued! Whether it was wisdom in our ancestors to resort to such a tax for paying the Church is a question which we need not discuss; but it is obvious that we exhibit no proofs of wisdom in continuing it. But we not only continue it, but push it to an extravagance unknown in every other Country. In Catholic countries the tithes is in most cases hardly felt; but in England it approaches very fast to an equality with and will soon surpass the rent.

INCENDIARIES IN FRANCE.—The following is an extract of a private letter:—

"PARIS, MAY 8.—It is extraordinary that the detestable practice of setting fire to barns and houses, is still carried on with an audacity that seems to increase. Hitherto only in the departments of Seine and Oise, Oise and Marne—but they now appear nearer Paris; and even in Paris, this morning, an attempt was made to fire a large magazine of coal, near the Park of Mousseaux. The fire engines are at this moment employed in putting out the fire. There was, besides, a great endeavour to be exploded near the Tuilleries yesterday, but the match was drawn out, by a person who happened to see it, time enough to prevent the explosion.

"At Meaux and Pontoise, placards have been stuck up, stating, that whatever precautions the farmers might take, their farms would be set fire to before the 15th of this month.

"All these practices, as well as the objects and motives of them, are incomprehensible. What do the authors and abettors propose?

"It is hoped and believed, that measures of immediate vigour will be adopted; and it is reported, that for the more summary trial of persons apprehended, the *Cours Prescolates* will be again established."

We have received the Paris Papers of Wednesday last. The following are extracts:—

PETERSBURG, April 12.—The talk of the approaching departure of His Majesty for the army. The Emperor, in the first instance, will visit the first corps under General Sacken, having its headquarters at Mohlow. He next visits the army of the South, under General Wittgenstein.

"This article goes on to state, that the same uncertainty and succession of alternate rumours respecting war and peace, prevailed at Petersburg as elsewhere—and that Constantinople was raged by the plague.

FRONTIERS OF MOLDAVIA, April 18.—Intelligence from the Principalities states that the chief forces of the Turks are assembling beyond the Danube. There are left in Wallachia and Moldavia only the troops necessary to give every thing to fire and sword in case of war. These troops, all light armed, are traversing the provinces in small detachments, to carry away the provisions in every direction."

GERMAN PAPERS on the 5th instant were received at our Office this morning. The *Frankfort Journal*, in very pointed terms, an account published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, relative to Prince Michael Souda, and the formation of a corps of Hetarists in Russia. The Russian Government, it states, had no right to prescribe to the Prince, where he should go to; and with respect to the latter, nothing was done or intended, farther than granting an asylum to these unfortunate persons.

The Committee appointed by the Austrian Government in 1810, for the purpose of superintending the redemption of the paper currency, has been dissolved, its object having been fulfilled.