

The Waterford Chronicle.

To the Foundry Slave that makes the Oppressor. T. 1830

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1830

Price 6d

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, APRIL 27.

Petitions were presented against the East India monopoly, against the punishment of death for forgery, and from certain vicars, against the opening of the beer trade.

Several petitions were then presented against the Welsh Judicature Bill, and against the imposition of an additional duty on spirits.

Sir J. NEWPORT wished to know from the Noble Lord opposite, whether any steps had been taken by his Majesty's Government to appoint a commission to examine the present state of the Catholic Church in Ireland?

Lord F. L. GOWER said, he should be able either on Wednesday or the next day to give an answer to the question of the Right Honourable Baronet.

ESTABLISHMENT OF IRELAND.

Mr KING rose to present a petition from the City of Cork, praying for the reformation of certain abuses in the Established Church of Ireland. The petition was most respectfully signed, and it well deserved the serious consideration of the House. The object of the petitioners was to effect a more equal distribution of church property, and also to correct abuses which prevailed in the administration of the secular affairs of the Church.

The petitioners, who were all Members of the Established Church, stated that they were convinced of the purity of the doctrines of the Established Church, and of the excellence of the episcopal form of government, and that they were desirous to support that Church, and to extend its influence. They distinctly acknowledged the right of the Clergy as a body to their property; they did not consider that property too great for the purposes for which it was intended, if it were more equally distributed, and they stated their opinion that any attempt to alienate that property to secular purposes would be a violation of the first principles of justice, would endanger all kinds of property, and would tend to revolution and national ruin. The petitioners, while they admitted that the diversity of orders under the episcopal form of government required a diversity of incomes, convinced that the superabundant revenues which were received by some dignitaries should be more equally distributed, to provide more decently for the needy and working Clergy, and to supply Ministers where the increasing wants of the population required them. The petitioners referred to the abuses which had crept into the administration of the affairs of the church; they complained of the evils resulting from the system of pluralities and non-residence, and they expressed their conviction that most of those evils would be removed by a more equal distribution of the revenues of the Church. They complained of the deficient administration of the laws intended to enforce residence, and they referred to numerous instances where, owing to a laxity in the Church discipline, beneficed Clergy were allowed to absent themselves from their parishes either wholly or partly, thus destroying those bonds which ought to connect the pastor and his flock together, and tending to lessen the influence of the Established Clergy. The petitioners also respectfully requested the House to take into its serious consideration the delay and difficulty attendant upon the deprivation of immoral Clergy of their benefices, with a view to provide a remedy for so great an evil. They hoped that the House would take all these matters into its serious consideration, for the purpose of applying the necessary remedies.

The petition having been brought up, on the motion of the Noble Lord opposite, the petition was read.

Colonel BERSFORD said he did not intend to offer any opposition to the reception of the petition, but he merely wished to state one or two facts, as his Honourable Friend, in presenting the petition, had spoken of it as being most respectfully signed, and as if it represented the sentiments of the entire Protestant population of Cork. Now, the fact was that out of a population of 30,000 Protestants, only 3000 had signed this petition; that though there were seven or eight Peers resident, or connected with that County, only one of them had affixed his name to the petition; and that out of 300 Magistrates, only 58 had put their signatures to it. He (Colonel Bersford) did not at all mean to question the respectability of those who had signed it, but he understood that since the public defence of his motives, which had been made by the noble promoter of this petition, several gentlemen who had signed it had expressed a wish to withdraw their names from it.

Mr HUME was glad to find that the statements which he had been making year after year, as to the abuses which existed in the Protestant Established Church of Ireland—as to the pluralities, non-residence, and other abuses there—thus confirmed to the fullest extent by this petition from a respectable body of Protestants. It would have been better if the Gallant Colonel opposite, who had compared the amount of signatures to the petition with the Protestant population of Cork, had been able to satisfy any of the statements of the petition, or to deny any of the facts, which were mentioned by the petitioners. A petition with 3000 signatures was an important one, and it is only bare names of 58 Magistrates and one Peer, it was to be recollected, that the nobility and gentry were interested in upholding the abuses of the Irish Established Church. No one who had a sincere respect for the Established Church could wish to maintain the gross abuses of the existing system. He thought the revenues of the Church much too large for the purposes for which they were intended. He would maintain that Parliament had a perfect right to deal with the Church property as it should think fit.

If the House should, in its wisdom, tomorrow determine that the established religion of the country should be Quakerism, as in that religion there were no paid Ministers, what would then become of the Church of England? As the duties of its Ministers would cease, the right to hold the property which they possessed would cease also; and Parliament might then apply it to any purpose its wisdom might direct. He denied altogether that Church property was upon the same footing as private property. He hoped the day was not distant when a proper distribution would be made of the Church property in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and that his Majesty's Ministers would avail themselves of the opportunity to correct the abuses of which the petitioners complained.

Mr KING explained, the statements which he had made had been made from the petition. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said he rose for the purpose of entering his protest against the supposition that his unwillingness to enter into the details now argued an acquiescence, on his part, in the principles avowed by the Hon. Member for Aberdeen. That Hon. Gentleman appeared to allude to some contents which he had had with him (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) upon this subject, and he seemed to intimate, that in those contents, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had uniformly attempted to defend, or to deny altogether, the abuses which were stated to exist in the Established Church in Ireland. Now, he was sure that those Hon. Members who had done him the favour to attend to what had fallen from him with regard to those different subjects when under discussion, would recollect that he had on those occasions uniformly expressed his opinion, in accordance with the sentiments of several of the most respectable Clergymen connected with the Church of Ireland, that evils had grown out of the state of the Established Church in Ireland that required correction. There had been, within a few years, a desire in all ranks of people, and especially in the church itself, to remedy those abuses which were admitted to exist, and which owed their existence not to any neglect or fault of the heads of the Church, but to the particular circumstances in which the Church itself was placed. He hoped that this subject would be discussed upon the principle of removing abuses where abuses were proved to exist, but not upon the principle of condemning the whole body of the clergy because there had been some members of it who had misconducted themselves; still less upon the principle of appropriating the revenues of the church, as was proposed by the Hon. Member opposite, to such purposes of their own as might best square with the wants or the convenience of the public exchequer.

Lord F. L. GOWER rose for the purpose of saying a few words in consequence of the self-satisfaction with which the Hon. Member for Aberdeen referred to this petition, signed by 58 Magistrates of the County of Cork, as a confirmation of the peculiar views which he had himself previously taken of the state of the property of the church in Ireland. However valuable the Hon. Member might conceive this petition to be as a confirmation of his own arguments, this he (Lord Gower) would venture to affirm, that there was very little concurrence in the main between these petitioners and the Hon. Member. The petition set out with a description of the advantages which the petitioners considered their country to have derived from the Established Church, a point on which their opinion was much at variance with the opinion usually advanced by the Hon. Member. Then, as to having the church dealt with as the other establishments of the country were, by annual estimates, he must say that he did not rely much on the prophecies which the Hon. Member for Aberdeen had made upon that head.

Lord OXMAN TOWN found fault with the system by which the Curates of the Church of Ireland were left entirely at the mercy of the incumbents of livings of which they discharged the actual duties. He proposed the following alteration, as an improvement of that system—that every Curate should receive his license as soon as he received his Curacy. By such a system he would be placed under the protection of the Bishop of the diocese, instead of being left, as he was at present, in a state of dependence upon his Rector, differing very little from that of a servant upon his master.

Sir J. NEWPORT did not notice to prolong this discussion, but merely to remind the House that it was not many days since it had presented an address to the Crown, praying that it would appoint a Commission to inquire into the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Establishments in Ireland. That Commission had since been appointed; and he therefore was of opinion that, until the report of that Commission was presented, any discussion like the present was both ill-timed and injudicious.

Mr MOORE would not have said a word upon the present occasion, had it not been for the extraordinary misapprehension under which the Hon. Member for Aberdeen appeared to labour. He would beg leave to remind that Honourable Member that this petition had been in progress for some months before it was submitted to the public for signature. Those who had proposed it had challenged all the Protestants of Ireland to come forward in support of it, and that challenge had not been answered.

Mr BARING entered his protest against the doctrine which had just been laid down by the two Right Hon. Gentlemen opposite, that in no case was it competent for Parliament to meddle with the property of the Church, which was to be considered as safe as any gentleman's private property. At the same time he felt himself bound to declare that notwithstanding all the respect which he felt for the public conduct of his Hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen in other respects, that Hon. Member was the last man in

the world to whom he would submit either the reformation or the re-organization of our church establishments. Still he was of opinion that, without some reformation, these establishments might be involved in great danger. He happened to know that a most venerable and meritorious prelate, the Bishop of Hereford, resided, not in his diocese, but at Winchester. The Bishop of Landaff resided in London, a hero he held other parsons, from the insufficiency of his income to provide him a suitable residence in Wales. The Bishop of Rochester, whose jurisdiction extended over a large portion of Kent, had an income not larger than many of our parochial clergy, whilst there were Bishops of other sees, with incomes so great as to amount to 100,000 a year; or at least with incomes which would reach that amount in a very short time. He had no doubt to establish an equality of revenue and of rank in the Church. He felt the advantage of our having and retaining a gradation of both; but still he thought that it would be of great advantage to the character of our hierarchy—which he admitted, stood as high as that of any hierarchy in the world—to have such a distribution of property made amongst them as would enable all of them to reside within their dioceses in a manner suitable to their rank in the church, and to their respectability in society. When he was told that these were matters with which it was not competent for Parliament to deal in any imaginary case, he felt bound to protest against the doctrine. What the state of the Church of Ireland might be, he did not pretend at that moment to know. On that point he should have better information when the report of the ecclesiastical commission was laid upon the table; but this he knew, that there was sufficient power in the three branches of the legislature to revise the distribution of its property. He would say the same with respect to the Church of England; not that he thought that Church too rich or too well paid; all that he contended for was, that Parliament had not merely the power, for that was unquestionable, but also the equitable right to exercise the power of distributing the property of the Church as it thought most advisable among the members of the Church.

Dr LUSHINGTON said he felt himself called upon to rise in order to set right a statement which had just been made respecting some of our bishops, and their mode of performing their duties. His Hon. Friend the Member for Callington had stated to the house that the Bishop of Landaff, who possessed but a small income from his diocese, resided constantly in London, owing to his being unable to provide himself with a suitable residence in his diocese in Wales. Now, he (Dr Lushington) could inform the house from his own knowledge, that that meritorious prelate had held it to be his duty to hire at his own expense a residence within his diocese, and had gone down to it last summer, for the express purpose of performing his episcopal duties. Next, as to the residence of the venerable Bishop of Hereford at Winchester. When the house considered that that prelate was now past 80 years of age, and that he had discharged his duties in the most exemplary manner when his strength and health permitted, he thought that it would hardly expect a man of his advanced age to do more than what he had done down to his own diocese, though with great pain and suffering to himself—hear, hear.—But then, said his Honourable Friend, "There are sees of which the incomes either are, or shortly will be, 100,000 a year." Now, last year they had before them a bill for the purpose of enabling the Archbishop of Canterbury to raise a sum of money for the repair of Lambeth palace and other purposes therein specified. Upon that occasion it was proved that his whole income did not exceed 22,000. That was the greatest amount of income enjoyed by any English Bishop. Neither the see of York nor the see of Durham was worth any such sum. The revenues of the see of Durham, he was assured on good authority, had never exceeded 22,000 a year. As to the revenues of the bishopric of London, he must admit that they were not on the increase. What might be the consequence of building on the land belonging to that see, he could not pretend to tell; but he was of opinion that the most sanguine calculator could not anticipate any thing at all approximating to such an income as his Honourable Friend had just stated from the buildings which had been recently constructed. With respect to the Church of Ireland, he had only a few words to say. The Noble Lord on the other side of the House thought it a defect in the discipline of that Church that Curates were not licensed as soon as they received their curacies. Now, there was no such defect in its discipline as he imagined. If the Noble Lord would look at a small volume, by a writer who possessed as much talent and ability as any bishop who had ever sat upon the bench—if he would look at the first charge which Huxley, Bishop of St. Asaph, delivered in his Clergy, he would see that the Bishop told them, in words as plain as could be, that if they continued to employ curates without licenses, he would proceed against them, one and all, as the law directed. The licensing of curates was, in his opinion, a matter of great importance; and he would wish that greater attention was paid to it throughout the country. He could assure the Noble Lord that the employment of curates without licenses was not the discipline of the Church of England; on the contrary, express provision was made that no one should perform permanent duty in any of our Churches or Chapels, without receiving either institution as incumbent, or license as curate.—The Learned Doctor, after some further observations, proposed to observe that his views with regard to Church property did not accord exactly with those avowed by either of the two parties, which had sprung up in this discussion. In certain cases he considered church property to be

individual property, as in the case of a vicarage; in other cases he looked upon it as public property. As to altering the present system of its distribution, that was a project to which he, for one, could never consent. He knew the inconveniences which occasionally arose from one clergyman holding a small, and another a profitable parsonage; but when he balanced those inconveniences with the advantages which he saw springing every day from the present arrangement for any which had yet been proposed for its reformation, he must have stronger reasons than any which he had hitherto heard to satisfy his mind that he should be doing right in adopting any of the alterations which had been recently suggested. With respect to the church of Ireland, and its might also add with respect to the church of England, he agreed with those who said that pluralities and non-residence were the source of great mischief and inconvenience. He would accede with pleasure to any measure which would put a stop to the vast number of pluralities and non-residences which existed at present. The residence of the incumbent was the greatest blessing that could happen to a parish. He had seen the advantage of it over and over again in England; and, thank God, it had lately been exemplified in Ireland also. There was a time—it was in vain to deny it—in which every appointment in the church of Ireland was regularly bought and sold. At the Union, a number of appointments to offices in the church were made, with regard to anything except the interest which could be secured by them. Of late years that system had been departed from, and the duties of the church had, in consequence, been performed more decorously and more beneficially than before. When he saw the church thus ameliorating, not indeed so rapidly as he could wish, but still at any rate progressing, he could not help hesitating before he gave his consent to any strong measure, which, under the name of reformation, might effect a revolution in its constitution and discipline.

Lord OXMAN TOWN had no doubt that the Learned Civilian had correctly explained the law to him; but if the law respecting the licensing of curates were such as he had stated, it was at present unknown in Ireland. He was himself acquainted with a case in which a clergyman had faithfully performed the duties of a curate for five years. During the whole of that time he never could succeed in obtaining a license from the rector, and at the end of it he was dismissed without any cause being assigned for his dismissal. After a few observations from General HART, which were inaudible in the gallery, the petition was read.

On the question that it be laid on the table, Mr BARING said, that from the observations which had just fallen from the Hon. Friend, he was afraid that he had unintentionally used expressions which reflected on the conduct of the Rev. Prelates whose names he had mentioned in his former speech. He assured the House, that if he had used such expressions, it was most unintentional. No one could entertain a higher respect than he did for the Bishop of Hereford; and he fully agreed with his Hon. and Learned Friend, that so long as he had health and strength, no prelate was more anxious to perform his duty to the congregations committed to his charge.—The usefulness of the Bishop of Landaff's labours to the Church was undeniable; and it was impossible that any duty which that prelate undertook could in any respect be defective. He believed that at no former period was the roseted bench more respectably filled than it was at present.—Still, he thought it was a great incongruity that one Bishop should have only 1500 a year, whilst another had 32,000. In his opinion the Hon. and Learned Friend had strangely underrated the income of the sees of the Church. He had judged of the amount from his ordinary income, and had not taken into his consideration the fines paid to them for renewal of leases, which were considered as part of their extraordinary income, though some fell in every year. To know that some sees received in this manner more than three times the amount of their ordinary income.

Sir R. INGLIS concurred in the observations which had been so pertinently made by the Hon. and Learned Civilian who had just addressed the House. From every information which he had been able to acquire, the Hon. and Learned Civilian was perfectly correct in the maximum of income which he had assigned to the different sees of Canterbury, York, and Durham, arising not only from ordinary, but also from extraordinary receipts. The income of the Bishops in Ireland had been grossly exaggerated, that if he were to say that it approached a fourth part of the sum which was ordinarily stated, he too should be guilty of gross exaggeration.

The petition was then laid on the table. On the question that it be printed, Mr HUME took the opportunity of complaining that two of the Right Hon. Gentlemen on the opposite benches had strangely misrepresented what he had stated respecting church property.—He would never shrink from language which he had uttered; but he thought it a little too bad to hear language passed upon him which he had never used. There was all the difference imaginable between the property belonging to Bishops and Chapters, and the property which private individuals had in advowsons. He wished that the vested interest of every incumbent and of every advowson should be held sacred. His observations merely applied to church property belonging to Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, and other ecclesiastical corporations. The result of this debate satisfied him that some further inquiry was necessary, and he trusted that Ministers would institute it speedily.

The petition was ordered to be printed.

Mr O'CONNELL rose to call the attention of the House to the statute of the 7th of George IV. which operated by the great body of the people of Ireland. The House must be aware that numerous petitions had been presented against that statute. The representation of the bad nature of which the statute was held amongst the people of Ireland did not depend on his own statement. He observed in a newspaper an account of a meeting held in a church at Galway, over which the Archbishop of the Established Church presided, for the purpose of petitioning against the Act. The chairman on that occasion declared that the magistrates on the bench had described the Vestry Act to be an abominable substitute for the penal laws. He (Mr O'Connell) would not apply such strong language to the statute, but would content himself with describing it to be an invasion of private rights. The Act enabled Protestants to receive parsons in any manner for the building or rebuilding of Churches and Chapels, and for the due performance of divine worship. It also excluded Roman Catholics from any interference in vestries in those matters. Up to the passing of the Act Roman Catholics were only excluded from voting in vestries with respect to the building of Churches, and not with respect to the rebuilding of Churches and Chapels. The Act further gave the bishop of the diocese power to tax both the Protestant and Catholic inhabitants, for by the 23d section it was provided that the bishop might assess parishes to any amount he thought proper for the building and rebuilding of churches and chapels, and for other purposes connected with the due performance of divine worship. The petition and unjust operation of the Act must be remitted when the House reflected that in many parishes in Ireland the proportion which Protestants bore to Catholics was extremely small, and in some there were no Protestants at all. It was unjust in principle to make the Members of one religious persuasion build churches for those of another; but in the bill which he intended to move for leave to introduce, he proposed to make no alteration in that respect. He would leave the Established Church in possession of all the power which they ought to have. All he desired was, to give to every man who was compelled to pay rates the power of expressing his opinion as to the propriety of their imposition, and application. It might be said, that Catholics voted with those subjects in vestries, the interests of the Protestant Church would be neglected. He denied that there was any danger of that. If a contentious and unjust opposition should be offered to the building or rebuilding of a Parsonage, an application for a mandamus might be made to the King's Bench, and the whole expense of the proceedings would fall on the party or parties opposing the measure. It was notorious that a number of parishes under the present system had been given up to the hands of the Catholics. The great object was to relieve the consciences of his Majesty's subjects from the necessity of keeping their pockets open for another class to put their hands in. He concluded with moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and amend the laws relating to vestries in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he was the person who introduced and carried through the house the measure which had been so often attacked, he might be permitted to say a few words in its defence. When the statute was passed, it was generally acknowledged to be an improvement of the law which had before existed, and an alleviation of the burdens and obligations of that class whose cause the Hon. Member professed to advocate. It received the approbation of men who were as jealous of the interests of the Roman Catholics as the Hon. Member was; and among others, of Lord Plunkett, then Attorney-General for Ireland. He differed entirely from the Hon. Gentleman with respect to the view which he had taken of the general question; and he did so, because he sought an established church was an integral part of the constitution, which was necessary to the well-being of the people, and which ought to be supported for the benefit of the state by the general contribution of all classes of the community. It therefore, he said, in preparing a bill proceeding on a principle different from the principle entertained by the hon. gentleman, it was because he had a strong feeling in favour of an established church, instead of permitting dissenting sects to support their own institutions, without contributing to the expenses of that established church. The hon. member complained that a measure now under discussion gave greater powers of assistance to Protestant vestries than they enjoyed under the former law. He told the house, that until this bill was passed, the assessments could only extend to the building and repairing of the churches, but that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had added the expense of the churches, and building and repairing of chapels, from which the petitioners were before exempted.

Mr O'CONNELL remarked, that he did not say a building in addition, but only enlarging.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—Well, then, only enlarging. The Hon. and Learned Member could remember that the parishes in Ireland were without any parishes; Acts of Parliament for that purpose, and that the present system had been long in force. What ever hardship, therefore, Roman Catholics might suffer from paying rates to wards the support of the Protestant Establishments, did not arise from the present bill. With respect to the objection of the Hon. and Learned Member to the power of the Bishop exercised in Ireland of ordering the repair of Churches, he, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could assure the Honourable Member that such a power was exercised in England, and had always been done without complaint. It had been stated that it was a hardship that the Churchwardens of parishes in

(For continuation see Fourth Page.)

Mr O'Connell rose to call the attention of the House to the statute of the 7th of George IV. which operated by the great body of the people of Ireland. The House must be aware that numerous petitions had been presented against that statute. The representation of the bad nature of which the statute was held amongst the people of Ireland did not depend on his own statement. He observed in a newspaper an account of a meeting held in a church at Galway, over which the Archbishop of the Established Church presided, for the purpose of petitioning against the Act. The chairman on that occasion declared that the magistrates on the bench had described the Vestry Act to be an abominable substitute for the penal laws. He (Mr O'Connell) would not apply such strong language to the statute, but would content himself with describing it to be an invasion of private rights. The Act enabled Protestants to receive parsons in any manner for the building or rebuilding of Churches and Chapels, and for the due performance of divine worship. It also excluded Roman Catholics from any interference in vestries in those matters. Up to the passing of the Act Roman Catholics were only excluded from voting in vestries with respect to the building of Churches, and not with respect to the rebuilding of Churches and Chapels. The Act further gave the bishop of the diocese power to tax both the Protestant and Catholic inhabitants, for by the 23d section it was provided that the bishop might assess parishes to any amount he thought proper for the building and rebuilding of churches and chapels, and for other purposes connected with the due performance of divine worship. The petition and unjust operation of the Act must be remitted when the House reflected that in many parishes in Ireland the proportion which Protestants bore to Catholics was extremely small, and in some there were no Protestants at all. It was unjust in principle to make the Members of one religious persuasion build churches for those of another; but in the bill which he intended to move for leave to introduce, he proposed to make no alteration in that respect. He would leave the Established Church in possession of all the power which they ought to have. All he desired was, to give to every man who was compelled to pay rates the power of expressing his opinion as to the propriety of their imposition, and application. It might be said, that Catholics voted with those subjects in vestries, the interests of the Protestant Church would be neglected. He denied that there was any danger of that. If a contentious and unjust opposition should be offered to the building or rebuilding of a Parsonage, an application for a mandamus might be made to the King's Bench, and the whole expense of the proceedings would fall on the party or parties opposing the measure. It was notorious that a number of parishes under the present system had been given up to the hands of the Catholics. The great object was to relieve the consciences of his Majesty's subjects from the necessity of keeping their pockets open for another class to put their hands in. He concluded with moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and amend the laws relating to vestries in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he was the person who introduced and carried through the house the measure which had been so often attacked, he might be permitted to say a few words in its defence. When the statute was passed, it was generally acknowledged to be an improvement of the law which had before existed, and an alleviation of the burdens and obligations of that class whose cause the Hon. Member professed to advocate. It received the approbation of men who were as jealous of the interests of the Roman Catholics as the Hon. Member was; and among others, of Lord Plunkett, then Attorney-General for Ireland. He differed entirely from the Hon. Gentleman with respect to the view which he had taken of the general question; and he did so, because he sought an established church was an integral part of the constitution, which was necessary to the well-being of the people, and which ought to be supported for the benefit of the state by the general contribution of all classes of the community. It therefore, he said, in preparing a bill proceeding on a principle different from the principle entertained by the hon. gentleman, it was because he had a strong feeling in favour of an established church, instead of permitting dissenting sects to support their own institutions, without contributing to the expenses of that established church. The hon. member complained that a measure now under discussion gave greater powers of assistance to Protestant vestries than they enjoyed under the former law. He told the house, that until this bill was passed, the assessments could only extend to the building and repairing of the churches, but that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had added the expense of the churches, and building and repairing of chapels, from which the petitioners were before exempted.

Mr O'CONNELL remarked, that he did not say a building in addition, but only enlarging.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—Well, then, only enlarging. The Hon. and Learned Member could remember that the parishes in Ireland were without any parishes; Acts of Parliament for that purpose, and that the present system had been long in force. What ever hardship, therefore, Roman Catholics might suffer from paying rates to wards the support of the Protestant Establishments, did not arise from the present bill. With respect to the objection of the Hon. and Learned Member to the power of the Bishop exercised in Ireland of ordering the repair of Churches, he, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could assure the Honourable Member that such a power was exercised in England, and had always been done without complaint. It had been stated that it was a hardship that the Churchwardens of parishes in

(For continuation see Fourth Page.)

Mr O'Connell rose to call the attention of the House to the statute of the 7th of George IV. which operated by the great body of the people of Ireland. The House must be aware that numerous petitions had been presented against that statute. The representation of the bad nature of which the statute was held amongst the people of Ireland did not depend on his own statement. He observed in a newspaper an account of a meeting held in a church at Galway, over which the Archbishop of the Established Church presided, for the purpose of petitioning against the Act. The chairman on that occasion declared that the magistrates on the bench had described the Vestry Act to be an abominable substitute for the penal laws. He (Mr O'Connell) would not apply such strong language to the statute, but would content himself with describing it to be an invasion of private rights. The Act enabled Protestants to receive parsons in any manner for the building or rebuilding of Churches and Chapels, and for the due performance of divine worship. It also excluded Roman Catholics from any interference in vestries in those matters. Up to the passing of the Act Roman Catholics were only excluded from voting in vestries with respect to the building of Churches, and not with respect to the rebuilding of Churches and Chapels. The Act further gave the bishop of the diocese power to tax both the Protestant and Catholic inhabitants, for by the 23d section it was provided that the bishop might assess parishes to any amount he thought proper for the building and rebuilding of churches and chapels, and for other purposes connected with the due performance of divine worship. The petition and unjust operation of the Act must be remitted when the House reflected that in many parishes in Ireland the proportion which Protestants bore to Catholics was extremely small, and in some there were no Protestants at all. It was unjust in principle to make the Members of one religious persuasion build churches for those of another; but in the bill which he intended to move for leave to introduce, he proposed to make no alteration in that respect. He would leave the Established Church in possession of all the power which they ought to have. All he desired was, to give to every man who was compelled to pay rates the power of expressing his opinion as to the propriety of their imposition, and application. It might be said, that Catholics voted with those subjects in vestries, the interests of the Protestant Church would be neglected. He denied that there was any danger of that. If a contentious and unjust opposition should be offered to the building or rebuilding of a Parsonage, an application for a mandamus might be made to the King's Bench, and the whole expense of the proceedings would fall on the party or parties opposing the measure. It was notorious that a number of parishes under the present system had been given up to the hands of the Catholics. The great object was to relieve the consciences of his Majesty's subjects from the necessity of keeping their pockets open for another class to put their hands in. He concluded with moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and amend the laws relating to vestries in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he was the person who introduced and carried through the house the measure which had been so often attacked, he might be permitted to say a few words in its defence. When the statute was passed, it was generally acknowledged to be an improvement of the law which had before existed, and an alleviation of the burdens and obligations of that class whose cause the Hon. Member professed to advocate. It received the approbation of men who were as jealous of the interests of the Roman Catholics as the Hon. Member was; and among others, of Lord Plunkett, then Attorney-General for Ireland. He differed entirely from the Hon. Gentleman with respect to the view which he had taken of the general question; and he did so, because he sought an established church was an integral part of the constitution, which was necessary to the well-being of the people, and which ought to be supported for the benefit of the state by the general contribution of all classes of the community. It therefore, he said, in preparing a bill proceeding on a principle different from the principle entertained by the hon. gentleman, it was because he had a strong feeling in favour of an established church, instead of permitting dissenting sects to support their own institutions, without contributing to the expenses of that established church. The hon. member complained that a measure now under discussion gave greater powers of assistance to Protestant vestries than they enjoyed under the former law. He told the house, that until this bill was passed, the assessments could only extend to the building and repairing of the churches, but that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had added the expense of the churches, and building and repairing of chapels, from which the petitioners were before exempted.

Mr O'CONNELL remarked, that he did not say a building in addition, but only enlarging.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—Well, then, only enlarging. The Hon. and Learned Member could remember that the parishes in Ireland were without any parishes; Acts of Parliament for that purpose, and that the present system had been long in force. What ever hardship, therefore, Roman Catholics might suffer from paying rates to wards the support of the Protestant Establishments, did not arise from the present bill. With respect to the objection of the Hon. and Learned Member to the power of the Bishop exercised in Ireland of ordering the repair of Churches, he, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could assure the Honourable Member that such a power was exercised in England, and had always been done without complaint. It had been stated that it was a hardship that the Churchwardens of parishes in

(For continuation see Fourth Page.)

Mr O'Connell rose to call the attention of the House to the statute of the 7th of George IV. which operated by the great body of the people of Ireland. The House must be aware that numerous petitions had been presented against that statute. The representation of the bad nature of which the statute was held amongst the people of Ireland did not depend on his own statement. He observed in a newspaper an account of a meeting held in a church at Galway, over which the Archbishop of the Established Church presided, for the purpose of petitioning against the Act. The chairman on that occasion declared that the magistrates on the bench had described the Vestry Act to be an abominable substitute for the penal laws. He (Mr O'Connell) would not apply such strong language to the statute, but would content himself with describing it to be an invasion of private rights. The Act enabled Protestants to receive parsons in any manner for the building or rebuilding of Churches and Chapels, and for the due performance of divine worship. It also excluded Roman Catholics from any interference in vestries in those matters. Up to the passing of the Act Roman Catholics were only excluded from voting in vestries with respect to the building of Churches, and not with respect to the rebuilding of Churches and Chapels. The Act further gave the bishop of the diocese power to tax both the Protestant and Catholic inhabitants, for by the 23d section it was provided that the bishop might assess parishes to any amount he thought proper for the building and rebuilding of churches and chapels, and for other purposes connected with the due performance of divine worship. The petition and unjust operation of the Act must be remitted when the House reflected that in many parishes in Ireland the proportion which Protestants bore to Catholics was extremely small, and in some there were no Protestants at all. It was unjust in principle to make the Members of one religious persuasion build churches for those of another; but in the bill which he intended to move for leave to introduce, he proposed to make no alteration in that respect. He would leave the Established Church in possession of all the power which they ought to have. All he desired was, to give to every man who was compelled to pay rates the power of expressing his opinion as to the propriety of their imposition, and application. It might be said, that Catholics voted with those subjects in vestries, the interests of the Protestant Church would be neglected. He denied that there was any danger of that. If a contentious and unjust opposition should be offered to the building or rebuilding of a Parsonage, an application for a mandamus might be made to the King's Bench, and the whole expense of the proceedings would fall on the party or parties opposing the measure. It was notorious that a number of parishes under the present system had been given up to the hands of the Catholics. The great object was to relieve the consciences of his Majesty's subjects from the necessity of keeping their pockets open for another class to put their hands in. He concluded with moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and amend the laws relating to vestries in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he was the person who introduced and carried through the house the measure which had been so often attacked, he might be permitted to say a few words in its defence. When the statute was passed, it was generally acknowledged to be an improvement of the law which had before existed, and an alleviation of the burdens and obligations of that class whose cause the Hon. Member professed to advocate. It received the approbation of men who were as jealous of the interests of the Roman Catholics as the Hon. Member was; and among others, of Lord Plunkett, then Attorney-General for Ireland. He differed entirely from the Hon. Gentleman with respect to the view which he had taken of the general question; and he did so, because he sought an established church was an integral part of the constitution, which was necessary to the well-being of the people, and which ought to be supported for the benefit of the state by the general contribution of all classes of the community. It therefore, he said, in preparing a bill proceeding on a principle different from the principle entertained by the hon. gentleman, it was because he had a strong feeling in favour of an established church, instead of permitting dissenting sects to support their own institutions, without contributing to the expenses of that established church. The hon. member complained that a measure now under discussion gave greater powers of assistance to Protestant vestries than they enjoyed under the former law. He told the house, that until this bill was passed, the assessments could only extend to the building and repairing of the churches, but that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had added the expense of the churches, and building and repairing of chapels, from which the petitioners were before exempted.

Mr O'CONNELL remarked, that he did not say a building in addition, but only enlarging.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—Well, then, only enlarging. The Hon. and Learned Member could remember that the parishes in Ireland were without any parishes; Acts of Parliament for that purpose, and that the present system had been long in force. What ever hardship, therefore, Roman Catholics might suffer from paying rates to wards the support of the Protestant Establishments, did not arise from the present bill. With respect to the objection of the Hon. and Learned Member to the power of the Bishop exercised in Ireland of ordering the repair of Churches, he, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could assure the Honourable Member that such a power was exercised in England, and had always been done without complaint. It had been stated that it was a hardship that the Churchwardens of parishes in

(For continuation see Fourth Page.)

COMMITTEE ON WEXFORD ELECTION PETITION.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Petition of Charles Roper, Esq., of Ballyfarham Castle, in the County of Dublin, Esq., and others, complaining of an undue Election and Return for the Town or Borough of Wexford.

Memorial de Martii, 1830.

HENRY CLIVE, Esq., in the Chair.

The names of the Committee were called over; all present.

The petition of Charles Roper, Esq., and others, freemen of the Borough and Town of Wexford, was read.

Mr Harrison and Mr Adam appeared as Counsel in support of the petition. Agents, Mr Maguire and Mr Alderson.

Mr Sergeant Taddy and Mr Wigram appeared as Counsel for the sitting Member. Agents, Messrs Whittin and Gregson.

Mr Starkie and Mr Lynch appeared as Counsel for the returning Officer. Agents, Messrs Whittin and Gregson.

Mr Harrison stated that the first thing to be done was for the parties to exchange Lists and Statements of the Right of Voting.

Mr Sergeant Taddy stated, that the question as to the Right of Voting was not raised upon the petition, and that therefore the parties were not called upon to exchange Statements of the Right.

Mr Harrison was heard on the other side. Mr Sergeant Taddy was heard in reply.

The Committee determined that the question of the right of voting was raised upon the petition.

The parties agreed to exchange Lists and Statements in the course of the evening.

Memorial de Martii, 1830.

The names of the Committee were called over; all present.

Mr Harrison was heard to open the case on the part of the petitioners.

George Harrison Reid, Esq., was called in; and having been sworn, was examined by Mr Adam as follows:—

I believe you were Mayor and returning Officer of the Town of Wexford at the last election?—Yes.

Did you receive the poll from any body? Yes. Have you got the poll book with you? Yes. Produce it, you are not the poll-clerk of course? No.

Did you receive it from the poll-clerk? From the deputy poll-clerk, Archibald Jacob.

Has it been in your custody ever since the election? Ever since.

Is it in the same condition now as it was when you received it, or has any alteration been made by you? Never since the election but it has been opened.

When was it opened? Immediately after the election. I sealed up the poll book with the corporation seal on the day of the election, and I had a letter from Sir Edward Deering's agent to request as a favour I would allow his agent to open the book to regulate his own book, to compare the book with the poll book; and in compliance with that I thought it my duty to do it, and the poll book was slipped out.

He saw it? Yes, and wrote out of it, Who was that gentleman? His name was George Little, and I have the letter.

No alteration was made in it on that occasion. No, never.

Produce it. [The Witness produced the same, and handed it to.]

Cross-examined by Mr Sergeant Taddy. How long have you been acquainted with the Borough of Wexford? More than forty-one years; that is, I have been a member of the corporation more than forty one years; but I have known it since I was a child. I was made a Burgess in the year 1778.

Are there any particular days on which the admission of freemen have taken place, and exclusively upon those days? As long as I recollect it has been upon the two charter days, the 20th of September and the 20th of June; but by giving eight days' notice before the election, you may then bring forward the election of a freeman or Burgess.

Are there any particular days on which the admission of freemen takes place? The two charter days are the particular days, the 20th of September and the 20th of June.

Besides those days are there any others on which the admission takes place? None other that I recollect.

Are there any other on which it may take place if notice be given? Yes, by giving notice of eight days, you can call an assembly for that purpose.

Does the eight days' notice apply to admissions generally, or any peculiar sort of admissions?—The eight days is in consequence of giving legal notice to every person that there is an intention of making freemen. In general the notice for the election of a Burgess is eight days, and very often then freemen are made in consequence of the eight days' notice.

When you say giving notice to every body, what notice do you mean? Posting notice, that you mean to assemble at the Courthouse to elect a Burgess.

When you say posting notice, is that what you mean by giving notice to every body? It is there for any body to see; there is no other notice that I ever knew of but posting it on the Courthouse.

You do not mean that the notice should be given to every body? No.

But by a public notice posted up? Yes. Is that the usual notice? Yes, for electing a Burgess or freeman.

In the time you have known the borough, has residence been at all required as necessary to the admission of a Burgess or freeman? No.

Then I understand you, that during the whole of the period you have spoken to, from the time you were very young down to the present, residence has never been spoken of? No; it was never heard of till it was mentioned here.

Till the present contest? Yes; till it was mentioned in the petition.

Have freemen constantly been admitted, from the earliest periods down to the present, without any objection from any party, who were known to all not to be resident? Certainly, they always have; there was no objection; I never knew the objection stated or started.

Have persons who have served apprenticeships also been admitted freemen as such? Certainly, upon a certain form being complied with.

Persons who have served apprenticeships have always been admitted, upon a certain form being complied with?—Yes.

Were any particular days set apart for those admissions? I never knew them to be admitted but on the two charter days; but subsequent to the election.

Never mind that? I never knew them admitted but on charter days; those are the apprentices.

Others have been admitted on eight days' notice? Yes; that is, when you wish to have a Burgess elected or a freeman made; since that I have heard that there was—

We cannot hear that; my question was, whether you had ever known it? No, I never knew an instance; the impression upon my mind was, those were the days on which they were to be elected.

You say they were admitted on complying with a certain form. Yes.

What was the form? The form was, that a person who had served his time brought his petition and lodged it with the town clerk, and on either of the charter days, either in September or June presented that petition to the mayor in assembly; the mayor read the petition, and if he thought it should be entertained, if he knew the parties had served their time, he told out a jury of the present freemen to try the merits of it.

A jury of any particular number? Of twelve freemen, told out of the assembly; they retired into an adjoining apartment; they called for the master and the indentures and the witnesses to the indenture, and if they found the apprentice had served his time faithfully and properly, and that there was no collusion in the business, he was then returned as a Burgess and proper person; the master proving that the indentures were fair, and that the man served his legal time.

And upon receiving the verdict of the jury, stating he had served the due time, it was then usual to admit him? Yes, with good conduct, he was then admitted and enrolled in the Corporation book.

Besides the persons you have mentioned, had the Mayor the privilege of nominating any persons? Yes; at the time I came into the Corporation the Mayor exercised the right, upon coming into office or going out of office, to nominate two gentlemen to be freemen, who are what we call peculiar freemen.

Do you mean that he had a right of nominating two upon coming in and two upon going out?—No—he took his choice.

He had a right, either upon coming in or going out, to nominate two, called his peculiar freemen? Yes.

With respect to others proposed, with the exception of the two peculiar freemen of the Mayor, did the corporation exercise the right of nominating, that is to say, was the question proposed to the corporation, whether certain persons should be admitted or not; with the exception of apprentices and the peculiar freemen, did the corporation body exercise a judgment upon the subject, as to admitting them or not? The peculiar freemen were never opposed, but immediately acquiesced in.

The apprentices claimed as a right, and that was submitted to the jury; now my question does not apply either to the peculiar freemen or apprentices, but as to other members proposed, did the corporation exercise the right of rejecting them or of admitting them? Certainly, on making a freeman on the charter days or where the eight days' notice was given, a Burgess proposes such a person to be a member of the corporation, and seconded by another; the question was then put, whether he should be elected or not, and the mayor finding that the voices were in his favour, he was elected and put down and enrolled.

Was it determined by a majority of those present? The question was put.

And determined by a majority of those present? Yes.

During the period you have known the corporation of Wexford, have you known any books belonging to the corporation in existence? I never saw any book belonging to the corporation but the book (B.) that is a regular book of the corporation which is now, I believe, with the present Mayor.

When you say with the present Mayor, it is, I believe, here? Yes, it is here.

You are the present Mayor? No, I went out last year.

I think you said you belonged to the corporation forty one years? In 1788 I was made.

You have known it forty one years? Yes. And were made a Burgess in 1788? Yes.

Previously to the rebellion in Ireland did you see any corporation books? Never but that one;—to the best of my knowledge I never did; there was no other book used or brought to the court but that book.

That is the book you designated by the letter (D)? Yes.

Perhaps you can tell us, as a matter of history, how long were the rebels in possession of the town of Wexford? The rebellion commenced the 27th of May 1798, and I happened to retreat with the retreating army, who came into Wexford the 21st of June in the year 1798.

The rebellion began upon the 27th of May, and we were obliged to give up the town three days afterwards; we marched afterwards to Ross.

How long were the rebels in possession of the town? From the 30th of May till the 21st of June, about three weeks; I ought to recollect it; I went through a great deal.

That was the fact, they were in possession about three weeks? Yes.

You never saw any books before or after that period? Never; no regular corporation book but that I ever saw.

Re-examined by Mr Adam—You knew the corporation, and were a member of it, previous to the rebellion? Certainly.

I understood you to state you never saw any book except the book (D)? No; that was the regular book of the corporation.

Did you see any other book which contained entries respecting corporation matters? Never, but a roll book, a private roll book.

Who did that private roll book belong to? The town clerk.

Mr Jones?—Yes Mr Jones.

Do you happen to know where that private roll book is now? Yes.

Where? With one of the members who is up here, I believe, Mr Hughes.

Do you mean the present Mayor? Either the present Mayor or some other gentleman that brought it.

Do you recollect an application being made, either to yourself or to Mr Hughes, for leave to inspect that roll? Certainly.

Did you refuse permission? I cannot recollect exactly what I might have said; but immediately or a day after, I received it from Colonel Johns, who is son-in-law to Mr Jones, as he gave it me; it was taken away from me; I never saw it till I came here.

Who took it from you. I fancy it was some of the gentlemen; I cannot say. It was some friend of the present Mayor.

Did you refuse it to any body? Yes, I did, because it was not in my possession.

Did you assign that as your reason. I had it not.

Did you say so. I dare say I did.

Who made the application. I do not know; on my oath, I do not.

You do not know whether, in the answer you gave, you assigned the reason you now give. I cannot say; I am affected with a very unpleasant fear, but I do not recollect what I said at the time; I told the person I had it not.

You were affected with some complaint. Yes, in my nose.

Does that impair your memory. No.

Did you give that answer. I cannot say whether I did; I thought it of so little consequence I cannot recollect.

Was it much locked at while in your possession. Never; I believe I looked at one name.

Whose name was it. I believe, Colonel Moore.

Was Mr Haro with you when you looked at it. No.

Was Lord Ely. No.

Any person. No.

How came you to look at it. Colonel Johns was in my office, and I asked him had he any corporation book I might look at; and he said, upon upon earth except the letter (D); I said, has not Mr Jones some book. He said, no, nothing but an alphabetical list; and he brought it into my office, and it remained there; it was of no consequence, and I looked at that name.

How came you to fix on the name of Colonel Moore. I wished to see his name, as he was a relation of mine.

How came you to think he was there. I understood all the corporation was there from 1781.

You did not return the book to Colonel Johns. No.

To some of the friends of Mr Hughes? Yes. Mr Hughes is of the same party in the town as yourself? I do not doubt but he is.

You know it? I do not doubt it.

You are sure of it? I am pretty sure of it.

Are you not quite sure? Upon my word, I cannot be sure of any thing.

Is that Lord Ely's party in the corporation? He is friendly to Lord Ely's interest, I believe.

Have you any doubt of it? I could not say positively, I assure you, as to any man; although I might think so now, to-morrow I might alter; at present, I think he is.

Have you the least doubt that Mr Hughes is a friend of Lord Ely's? I do mean to say I think he is.

You returned that book either to Mr Hughes or some friend of his? I cannot say; it was taken out of my office.

You got the book from Colonel Johns and returned it to Mr Hughes or his friends? Colonel Johns left it in my office.

Did not Colonel Johns apply for it? He applied for letter (D).

Did he not apply for that poll? I do not recollect, upon my oath, whether he did.

How long ago did that take place? In May last.

Will you swear he did not apply for it? I believe he applied to me for the letter book (D), but not for that.

Does your memory enable you to say whether Colonel Johns applied to you for his own book? I do not recollect that he did.

Did any body upon his part. There was no application from the agent of Sir Edward Deering for it.

Did any body, on the part of Colonel Johns, apply to you for it. Not that I know of; some of the agents of Sir Edward Deering applied for it and wished to see it.

When the agent of Sir Edward Deering applied for it, did you tell him you had delivered it to Mr Hughes. No; I told him I had it not.

Was that all you said. I do not recollect any thing else I said.

Do you recollect the agent's name. No, I do not; there was an agent that used to attend there very often, Mr Baker; whether it was to him I told it, I do not know; he constantly attended at the office.

You state there are particular days on which apprentices are admitted, and on which the peculiar freemen are made, and the elections of freemen made. Yes; on the corporation days; there are two charter days.

You have also stated, upon eight days' notice freemen may be elected, according to the custom of the borough. Whenever there is a Burgess to be elected eight days' notice is given, and then freemen are elected, or eight days' notice is given.

In your forty years' experience how many days have you known freemen to have been elected by choice of the corporation? I do not mean by apprentices; but by the nomination of the Mayor. In the year 1813 was one.

The course of examination was waived.

Mr Adam—Have you any recollection, except in the year 1813, of any election of freemen in the town of Wexford not on charter days? It is impossible I can be prepared to answer that; things of that kind are only posted; if you look at the corporation book you will see; that is the only thing I can say; and you will see the election that took place; my memory is not burdened with the days.

How often have you been Mayor. I dare say six, seven, or eight times.

In those six, seven, or eight years, during which you sat in the chair, was there an election of freemen except upon charter days? That is a thing I should like to look at the book for.

You cannot recollect having been present at one. I have been present at them all, I dare say; but whether I was Mayor I cannot say; if you refer to the book, you will see the days, and I will prove that the election did take place.

Has any taken place in the last ten years. The only one I can recollect is 1813.

Can you tell me whether any election of freemen took place in your time upon the charter days.—That might not occur.

Do you believe it did. It might occur.

Do you believe it did. There might have been a member elected as a compliment; a man who should serve his country.

Honorary members in the strictest sense of the word. Yes; any gentleman who desired the compliment.

I mean persons elected to keep up the corporation. No.

Since 1813 do you remember in your experience any one member elected a freeman, except the honorary persons you have mentioned. I cannot remember the time; there were many made in 1813, but I have not the names by heart.

Then you cannot tell whether in forty years there has been an election upon any day whatever. I thought you wanted to know who they were.

No; I mean the day; has there ever been an election of freemen in the town of Wexford, except the honorary members you have mentioned, and except in the year 1813. I do not recollect.

(To be continued.)

THE NEW STAMP ACT—MEETING AT KILKENNY.

On Monday there was held, pursuant to requisition, a numerous and highly respectable meeting of the citizens of Kilkenny, at the City Courthouse.

At one o'clock the Mayor (Captain Wheeler) was invited to take the Chair. The City Sheriff and Mr Neville sat with him on the Bench.

The requisition being read, Councillor James Ross at the call of the meeting, and said, it had not been his intention to have spoken, but he considered it would be a dereliction of duty in any person to remain silent on this subject, if his voice could weigh any thing against the proposed increase of the Stamp Duties.

The difference that exists at the present time between those duties in England and Ireland is not greater than should be, if the vast wealth of the one country, compared with the other, were taken into consideration.

The proposed increase of taxes would add one million to the burdens of Ireland, and he would endeavour to show what the result of laying on this additional tax would be, on various classes of the community.

First, every person who has to make any transfer of property, will be affected by the new system.—Secondly, all the mercantile portion of the community will find it an intolerable impedit, it will be a double weight on them, at a moment when their present taxes are more than commensurate to their present trade. But it would act most oppressively of all, between landlord and tenant.

The Subletting Act had already drawn a wide line of distinction between this country and England, and the present act also raised himself in the scale of society, by taking small districts of land, and increasing them according as his means permit.

Here he cannot do so. The Subletting Act absolutely prevents the tenant from ever bettering his situation. See now the effect of the proposed Stamp Duty on the Irish Tenant. He is destitute of capital, and, as if the obstacles to his rising in the world were not already sufficiently great, this Act threatens to double the expense of every agreement between him and his landlord.

He (Mr J.) had known many tenants who had suffered from the weight of the present Stamp Duties; who, though aware of the danger to themselves and families, absolutely declined taking leases, owing to their inability to pay the expenses of stamp, even at the present rate of taxation.

How great then must be the evil that will result from this description of persons from an increased duty on stamps. Councillor James said he was not much in the habit of coming forward at public meetings, on account of the insupportable burden likely to be imposed on various classes of the community; but he felt called on to come forward on the present occasion; from another motive also, namely, out of gratitude to the present administration. Indeed, he thought every Irishman was bound to manifest his regard for ministers who had done so much for the tranquillity of this country. These he (Mr J.) considered the best friends of ministers, who came forward to give them information with respect to the hearing, and probable effect of any measure, proposed to be introduced and particularly to furnish them with local information through the authentic and constitutional channel of public meetings.

A due and timely consideration of the public sentiment in Ireland on the proposed measure might save ministers from being embarrassed by the agitation of a question which might materially disturb the peace of the country. He meant the question respecting the repeal of the Union. And, on the other hand, a pertinacious adherence to the proposed scheme of increased taxation might produce an universal call for a repeal of the Union. For what is more likely to produce such a call than an injudicious system to assimilate the laws of the two countries in matters where they ought not to be assimilated, and refusing to assimilate where they ought to be assimilated. The plan of raising our stamp duties to the English standard was plainly unjust towards Ireland. This was a case where the law ought to be different; for why should the inhabitants of a poor country be subjected to the same taxes as those of a rich. Should not each be assessed in proportion to their wealth? Hear, hear. On the other hand, why should the laws between land-

lord and tenant be different in the two parts of the empire. And why should the elective franchise of Ireland be within such narrow limits as has been done in the case of the forty shilling freeholders, while in England the old law continues unaltered. The consideration of these subjects were not the business of the meeting, but he (Mr J.) hoped meetings would shortly be held to apply the Legislature of the public feeling on these important subjects also.

(Here the Chairman called Mr J. to order, observing that he ought not to make any criticism on the acts of government.)

Mr J. continued and observed, that every man had a right—may, was called on to state at a public meeting what he considered injudicious either in the acts of Ministers or the Legislature. On the present occasion, he trusted, there would be no difference of opinion.

Upon the motion of Mr Duffy, the following gentlemen were appointed as a Committee, and retired for a short time to prepare resolutions and a petition to submit to the meeting:—Councillor James, Mr Duffy, Mr Costelloe, Mr R. Sullivan, Mr D. Cormack, Mr P. S. Butler, and Mr O'Dowd. When the Committee came out, Mr Butler stated that they had agreed on a petition and a series of resolutions.

The first resolution, pledging the meeting to petition against the assimilation of stamp duties, was moved by Councillor James, seconded by R. Sullivan, Esq.—That from the various consequences likely to follow to all classes of the community in this impoverished portion of the Empire from the proposed assimilation of the stamp duties of England and Ireland, we feel it incumbent on us to petition both Houses of Parliament against that measure.

T. C. Duffy, Esq., moved the second resolution, expressive of the firm conviction of the meeting that the proposed measure of stamp duties, instead of assisting, would materially injure the public revenue.

Mr O'Dowd seconded the resolution, and spoke at some length.

Mr Costelloe also addressed the meeting.

Mr P. S. Butler—Mr Chairman, it would be idle for me to trespass on your attention, as the gentleman who spoke before me have so fully discussed the subject under consideration, but upon rising to move the resolution in my hand, I cannot forbear congratulating you, Mr Mayor, and Ireland in general, on the harmony and union that seems every where to prevail. Formerly Protestant and Catholic could hardly agree on the most trifling political matter, but now we see Corporators and Independent sitting together to advocate the same measures.

Mr Butler then proceeded to allude to the disfranchisement of the 10s. freeholders, which he described as an act of legislative plunder. But it was some consolation to gentlemen who felt strongly upon that subject to find in return for that deprivation, that a perfect equality of political opinions can now no longer be essential to private friendship. Not being an inhabitant of Kilkenny, it may be an intrusion on my part to occupy your time, but it is the bounden duty of every person to come forward on an occasion like the present, and I own I could not forbear taking a part in the proceedings of an assembly, where the distinctions arising from religious and political contrariety of opinion gives place to the wish to effect a national good. Owing to circumstances, Sir, which I need not detail, I feel myself under a debt of gratitude to the people of Kilkenny, and I also feel that I am bound to come forward on every occasion where my humble exertions can be exercised to promote their patriotic good as well as the general welfare of Ireland. I shall not detain you, Sir, with any comments on the measures ministers have now in contemplation, with the Duke of Wellington at their head, for I feel confident that if our petitions against this tax be couched in respectful but firm language, those ministers who have already done so much for Ireland, will deserve still further the good opinion of Irishmen, and not press forward a measure against the voice of the nation. I will not occupy you longer, except by reading the petition, and it is one, which I think will meet your approbation, Mr Mayor, as well as the assent of the entire meeting. I think it is couched in such moderate and respectful language as cannot excite angry feelings or recollections, although it is at the same time firm and to the purpose. Mr B. concluded with general applause by reading the petition, and moving that it should be the petition forwarded to Parliament. The petition was seconded by Mr P. Byrne, and unanimously adopted.

On the motion of Mr D. Cormack it was ordered that the petition be entrusted to the Messrs of O'Rourke in the Lords, and Lord Duncannon in the Commons.

On the motion of Mr Cormack, the Mayor left the chair. P. S. Butler, Esq., being called thereon, thanked were voted to the Chairman, who was cheered by the meeting, and Mr Costelloe observed, that the first time he had seen the Mayor do any thing after his coming into office, was collecting at a charity sermon in St. James's Chapel.

The Mayor returned thanks, and said, it would always be a gratification to him to forward in any way that he could the interests of the city of Kilkenny.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

It is with much pleasure we have to announce that the numerous Tradesmen and Labourers employed in the New bridge Works of Limerick held a meeting on Tuesday, in the Yard, and came to the following resolution:—That, as members of a Temperance Society to be non-conformist formed in this City, they would discontinue the use of ardent spirits; if any member amongst them should be so refractory after this arrangement as to have recourse to liquor, he will be looked upon with contempt, expelled this highly creditable society, and ultimately discharged from employment amongst them.

Printed and Published for the Proprietor at the Office on the Quay.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Yearly, £3 5 0; Half-yearly, £1 12 6; To be paid in advance. Quarterly, £0 10 3.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: On the mornings of Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.

Orders and Communications, in every case, free of charge, to be addressed to the Proprietor, at the Office, on the Quay, Waterford.

NE

The n

sure are

that any

become r

land has

The Cou

kenney, a

Kilkenny

for next

shortly m

Sheriff.

ronce and

gate Mea

people in

that the revenue is less from a duty of 18s 10d per gallon on Geneva and Brandy by 128,000l. a year than it was from a duty of 14s per gallon. In the case of Ireland the evidence is still more decisive in an opposite ratio. In proportion as the duty diminished, the revenue increased. Hear, hear. Seven years ago the duty was reduced from 5s 6d to 2s 10d. The duty in 1822 was 811,428l.; in 1828 it was found to have augmented to 1,407,860l., being an increase of more than 70 per cent. Hear, hear. What, then, are the deductions to be drawn from all this? That when a tax has been carried to a certain point, every after increase is a diminution, and not an augmentation of revenue. Now, it is quite obvious that the proposed tax on spirits, under the present state of the country, will pass that maximum. Hear, hear. But this is only a part of the loss which is likely to be experienced. I have not taken into the calculation the losses consequent on smuggling; and that smuggling is the inseparable concomitant of taxes disproportionate to original cost of production and price, is one of the best established facts in the whole range of political economy. These losses arise out of two charges: first, the expense of keeping up a preventive establishment; second, the actual losses by non-payment of duty to the revenue. Smuggling is now chiefly confined to spirits and tobacco—yet the establishment requisite for its prevention annually costs the country 650,000l. Hear, hear. The complaints of Sir H. Vivian, and the evidence of Mr. Dean, are sufficient proof how extensive and profitable it has been rendered by the mistaken policy of Government. In Ireland there were years in which the service necessary for this object demanded an expenditure of no less than forty or fifty thousand pounds, yet these services, active as they might have been, were altogether unequal to suppress the evil. Illicit distillation became every day more profitable, and fully compensated all pecuniary and other risks. Mr. Haig calculates that the quantity of spirits produced by the stills in Ireland, amounted in 1822 to about 16,000,000 gallons—2,370,647 gallons of this paid duty; the remainder, 7,500,000, more than two-thirds, were thus the produce of illicit distillation. Similar facts are instances in the Tobacco trade. The annual consumption is calculated from the revenue returns, at 4,000,000 lbs—it ought to be, and probably is, 16,000,000 lbs, if we take into consideration the increasing population and unaltered habits of the people; so that full three-fourths of the Tobacco now consumed in this country goes unprovided, as well as spirit, by smuggling. Will Mr. Goulburn, then, say that he expects from this proposed augmentation of duty a parallel augmentation of revenue? Can he alter these facts, or can he draw any other inference from them than that which I have just stated? To what then does he fly? Does he look to the amelioration of our Agriculture?—to the improvement of our morals? Smuggling and illicit distillation, may make up for the sudden check of demand which such a tax is calculated to produce, but what an eulogy on a tax to say that its evils can only be corrected by frauds on the revenue, and violation of the laws—cheers. If illicit distillation can be prevented, it must produce the most extensive injury, and precisely at the moment and to the interests to whom such injury would be most fatal. Diminish distillation by one half, or even one third, and what will be the results to the agriculturists of Ireland?—hear, hear. We cry out against open ports and unchecked importation of grain. This sets (if it can act at all) in a manner no wise different—hear, hear. As to morals—no sumptuary laws ever corrected a populous nation—they are fit only for families, or states so small that they approach to the nature of families. Besides, is a bonus to illicit distillation a corrective?—hear, hear. The whiskey drinking will go on, but it will go with additional crimes in its train. It will bring with it defiance to the authority and name of law—private outrage, public wrong, guilt in its worst shape, national demoralization—cheers. It is not in a government charged with the morals of a nation to create, first, temptations, and then to punish for yielding to them—cheers. If they cannot prevent, they should not bribe into crime. The people are taught to feel an interest in vice—the sanction of society does not go along with the punishment—it is totally subversive of all the original distinctions between justice and injustice, between right and wrong. And what does Mr. Goulburn offer for all this? One overbalancing advantage! He would assimilate the taxes of the two countries. Assimilate the taxes! Let him first assimilate the countries—loud cheers. Taxes, like other burdens, are light or heavy, not according to weight or amount, but according to the muscle and sinew of those destined to bear them. Make us another England, and then tax us like England; but as long as we are the miserable country we are, show a common-sense regard at least to our misery. What are our resources? The net revenue of Ireland in 1828 was only 3,728,000l.—that is, about 5s a head; and that of England 59,188,042l., or 70s a head;—add yet, in reticence to its capital, perhaps the highest taxed country in Europe. Ireland produces less than the Pope's States. The revenue of that country amounts to 3,800,000l. of excise; its population is less than one half of ours, and its commerce and agriculture totally neglected. The wealth of England, on looking to her Customs and Excise returns, is derivable from commerce. The assessed taxes are not more than five millions—her excise and customs seventeen or eighteen millions each. Ireland has no trade but with England—even Colonial produce must come through her; and all our imports are almost exclusively for our home consumption. With such facts before him, how is it possible to rave of assimilation! Until our agriculture, skill, and capital be assimilated—until our manufactures be assimilated—until our wealth, and the resources of our wealth, be assimilated—we cannot bear an assimilation of burdens. But this assimilation is not only in direct violation of the maxims of sound commercial policy, but it is a palpable infringement of the 7th article of the Union. (Here Mr. Wyse read the article in question.)—Where is "the just and reasonable"—the "comparison of the real value of the exports and imports of the two countries," which is so solemnly guaranteed? Where are "the abatements and exemptions, as circumstances may appear to demand?" We were originally rated too high in

our proportion to the exigencies of the empire—two-sevenths were beyond our means; but a fictitious capability was kept up, by the same delusion as the Sinking Fund—borrowing from England to pay England—until at last we were declared bankrupt, and the two exchequers were consolidated in 1817. The same forced assimilation is still pursued—and financiers still wonder at the broken energies and inadequate resources of an impoverished country. Even the few chances of restoring her to a sounder state of commercial exertion have been checked; and this brings me to the second object of our present remonstrance—the new impost upon Tobacco. The cultivation of tobacco has, in a great degree, been guaranteed to us by the Acts of our own Legislature. During late years it made considerable progress in the neighbouring counties, particularly Wexford, &c. No article was better calculated to remedy the depression of the landed interest. The enormous duty upon foreign tobacco—3s per pound, or nine hundred per cent. (4d being the prime cost of American produce)—gave great encouragement. The growers hoped to raise, by degrees, an article of consumption capable, from its nature, of employing a larger proportion of her population than any other species of cultivation known. Hear, hear. The profit in some instances arose to 60 or 70l, and with such advantages, there is little doubt it would soon have become general throughout Ireland. The revenue, by a graduated tax, increasing annually, would ultimately have gained, and foreign produce would not eventually have suffered, with the powers of protection in the hands of the legislature. But the contemplated duty extinguishes it at once, for the duty is more than the cost of production, and the quality not yet of that description which would entitle it to a preference over foreign produce. Hear, hear. This is another instance of Imperial assimilation! When connected with the check on your distillation, no Irishman surely can be insensible to its advantages. But the best and most important item remains behind—I mean the tax on Stamps. All the observations I have applied to the spirit duty apply as forcibly to this. Hear, hear. It cannot augment the revenue—it must impoverish the country—but above all, it must shackle; it must—no, it shall never—oppress knowledge. Look to the calculations of Mr. Pawlett Thompson—there read the advantages of this augmented duty. Marine insurances in 1814 had produced 418,000l.; in 1826 only 199,000l. So again with advertisements in Ireland, from 26,915l. in 1812, the produce fell in 1830 to 14,985l. So far for the revenue; but what is the influence on the country? The great object of all modern legislators, and writers on legislation and morals, the great desideratum is to bring justice and the means of justice down to the poor man's door. Now, is this, I ask you, to be achieved by an almost absolute prohibition; for, as in other instances, high taxation is prohibition, and the result will, or ought to be, a desertion of the public tribunals for private ones—a substitution of smuggling law, of private arbitrations, for the court law of the country. How many grievous wrongs must, however, be supported—how many inflamed before such a substitute can occur, and what disorganization must or loss introduced before its general adoption throughout Ireland.—Again, in commerce the press, in the telegraph which annihilates space, and brings distant bodies into actual conference with each other. If this 3s 6d duty stand between them, how many retrenchments must take place? How truly broken up must be this rapid communication of the community with each other. He who has not a road loses half the value of his farm. Why? Because he cannot bring his supply to the market in due time. He who cannot advertise, loses his road, ton, to the public wants, and is thus literally debarred of a large portion of his profits or his income. I speak not of its effects on Probates and other legal documents. The injustice is so glaring, it needs only the plain statement of the Sobolew to expose it. But its influence, its far larger and more pernicious influence, on the public press, I can and must speak. Loud cheers. Does Mr. Chancellor Goulburn think we are over educated, or over free, or over happy? Hear, Day after day, hour after hour, do we not feel the necessity of instruction for Ireland?—and right, and just, and glorious is this call for intellectual power, for moral elevation. I hail it as the brightest phenomenon of the age, the best pledge of higher destinies, the noblest augury of our coming importance amongst the civilized nations of Europe. The Press is the thermometer by which we must measure this progress—but it is not only the measure but the cause. It receives light and heat from the nation, and reflects both back to the nation tenfold increased. It is the high interpreter between the governors and governed—the warmer of dangers—the dissipator of dissensions—the corrector of wrongs—the awarder of honor and renown to the good and faithful servants of the country. In this hour, when more than at any other, man requires to approach man in the sentiment of brotherly affection—when the growth of a national spirit is to be tenderly and wisely watched and nursed into maturity—when a public opinion, truly such, is literally to be created, are we tamely to endure these shackles upon our mind—this attempt at blinding our eyes to the unpeeled eyes and unpeeled consciences of our country? Now, if ever tax was calculated to achieve this it is surely this impost of Mr. Goulburn. In France, in 1819, the Censure was established, and the people were forbidden to think aloud without the fiat of royalty. It was done boldly—the act was despotic, and the act was called so. There was no duplicity—no stratagem—the rod was brandished in open day. In the debates of that time, M. De Lafayette praised England in order to shame France. He thought it impossible that an English Minister would dare—would wish to lay a fetter on the press. He dreamed little of Chancellors like Mr. Goulburn; but I am sure he prophesied justly when he uttered—or if he did, what English spirit would surely bear it? Day after day, the expedient has worked with a fatal rapidity. How comes it that in London, in 1821, there were thirteen daily newspapers, and in 1830 only sixteen? In Ireland only four—in Scotland none. The total number of newspapers published in the year was 27,227,000, amongst a population of 28,000,000. In the United States, there are 800 newspapers amongst a population of 10,000,000—five to one of those

published in England in proportion to its population. Is this sufficient for our intellectual wants, and are the means of supplying them still farther to be diminished. It is a feeble, an unwise, a disastrous policy. A just Minister, an energetic Minister, a capable Minister, will not fear the Press—nor will the Press wrong him. It behoves us, then, ere it be too late, to speak, to cry aloud, to knock—England has done it, and England has succeeded. With the grateful evidence before us today of the complete oblivion of all past dissensions, shall we, or can we, despair? We are now, indeed, an united people, and I trust shall long continue so. It depends henceforth upon ourselves that we should also be free, a prosperous, and a happy one. Long continued cheering.

Mr. WILLIAM HUGHES, in seconding this motion said, that he fully concurred in all that had fallen from Mr. Wyse.

Mr. H. V. BARRON in proposing the resolution representing the injurious consequences that must result from an increased duty on spirits said—

In rising to propose the third resolution, I cannot but congratulate the Chancellor of the Exchequer in effecting the union of all parties in this country. I am really and unaffectedly happy to see myself surrounded by men with whom I differ on some subjects. I am proud to see the Dean and Mayor of Waterford cooperating with the Catholic Clergy and us Liberals. I rejoice at seeing the supporters of the Baresford family coming forward to support our principles. Let them pursue this line of conduct, and I can promise them at all times my most ardent cooperation. Whenever they support the rights and liberties of the people, I shall never consider their past conduct, but will lend my humble assistance to effect all the good that I can in union with them. I shall ever be ready to reach out the right hand of friendship to them, when in my opinion they are right. But no taunts, no reproaches, no contumely, no slander, shall ever tempt me to give up my principles for the praise or censure of any set of men, however I may in private respect them. Men will differ as long as they are human. I only ask for myself that right of judgment which I freely concede to others. Having promised thus much, I beg to make a few remarks on the immediate subject of the resolution I hold in my hand—it is one more immediately affecting the landed interest. It is condemnatory of the imposition about to be placed on spirits. This tax will have the effect of destroying the most important branch of our export trade. It is to be considered in a threefold point of view—first, as concerns the home market, where a tax of two pence per gallon is imposed on the manufacturer—second, as to the exporter, who has to pay one shilling additional on sending it to England—and thirdly, as regards the English consumer, who has to make his choice between it and rum, which is to have the duty reduced by one shilling a gallon.—Thus making a total additional impost on whiskey of two shillings and two pence against whiskey and in favour of rum. In other words, sacrificing Irish interests to West India monopoly. With these prospects before us in the present depressed state of agriculture in this country, the immediate consequences must be the throwing 500,000 acres of land out of cultivation; for it is well known that at least that amount of land in cultivation at present in Ireland is only capable of producing inferior corn, which is used in the distilleries alone; and of course when there is no longer the foreign demand, these lands must relapse into their natural state of barrenness. The landed proprietor will be ruined—the farmer become a pauper—the poor man have his now scanty employment reduced—and new committees will be appointed to find out the means of support. There is not a class in the community that this tax will not reach—the poor and the peasant, the manufacturer, the merchant, the clergy of every persuasion, but most of all, the poor labourer, who lives by the sweat of his brow, will be deprived of his only means of support for himself and his wretched family. The law respect gentry in our country will banish themselves in disgust at the misery they see surrounding them, and seek in foreign countries a state of society, more congenial to a man of feeling and to a cultivated mind. The only resource I see for the people is loudly to protest against these imposts. It is really monstrous, after fifteen years of peace, to see a British Minister daring to impose on us new taxes. It is not to be tolerated—we will not endure it. We must resist—we must petition—we must remonstrate—we must agitate. A rose by any other name will smell as sweet, and however unpalatable or disagreeable to ears polite the sound may feel, we must commence agitation again. Every county, every city, every town, every village, every hamlet, must petition against these burdens on a struggling and impoverished people. Now is the time to try the sincerity of the boasted promises of our Irish Members. Let us mark well the men who will vote for the country, and those who about themselves from their duty to their constituents. Instead of heaping new taxes upon, we must insist on relieving many of the burdens that oppress us. We must tell the minister boldly that he must reduce places, and pensions, and sinecures, and the many overgrown establishments of this country. If he does not, it will be quite idle to expect that we can pay the interest of the national debt, and all our evil in anarchy, confusion, and ruin. It is intended, also, to place a duty on or rather completely to extinguish the home-grown tobacco. This is most impolitic, inasmuch as it gives more employment than any other branch of agriculture, and requires more capital expended on it. It is throwing a valuable branch of commerce and agriculture entirely into the hands of foreigners. I shall not dwell more on this subject, as my learned friend who moves the next resolution, is far more competent, and his resolution more immediately bears on this subject. The Press is likewise to be taxed. We are to be beaten to the ground by taxes, and our opinions are to be taxed—and an excise levied off our complaints. No, we will not endure—we must not endure this monstrous stretch of power. Much as I admire the Duke of Wellington—much as I am disposed to lend him my very humble support for his past great services—

I feel no hesitation in saying that if he persists in these taxes, he is totally unworthy the confidence of his sovereign or the country. He will, if he pursues this line of conduct, be hurled by the voice of public indignation from his present proud elevation. He will be taught to feel that a spirit of independence—an intellect—a moral force is in this country that cannot be subdued—he must be taught that Kings and Ministers, and Governments, and Laws, were made for the good of the people, and the people alone. Let us then all unite, without distinction of creed, or sect, or party, for the common good of our common country. As for my part, I had rather remain as I was than see the granting emancipation made a pretext for forging new oppressions, new chains for my country. A few years must have passed—our political rights, and all we ever required—equality—bear, hear.—but if this is to be made the pretext for imposing new oppressions on the people—for restricting the liberty of the press—for cramping our commerce—for impoverishing our already too wretched peasantry, and ruining the landed interest, I would much prefer remaining as we were. Let us then unite in opposing these measures as one man. Let all Ireland unite as happily I see all my fellow-citizens uniting here this day, and let ancient animosities be forgotten in seeking for the welfare of all. Loud cheers. Mr. Barron concluded by proposing the third resolution.

Mr. ROBERT CURRIS seconded this motion.

Consulor WASH, in proposing the fourth resolution, condemnatory of a duty upon tobacco of Irish growth, said—

Mr. Chairman—Having been appointed in Committee to propose the fourth resolution, which regards the threatened taxation of our home tobacco, I have now the honour to discharge that duty, which is simple. The proposition contained in the resolution which I have to announce, is plain and irrefragable. To this I mean to confine myself, notwithstanding the too flattering appeal which has been made to my eloquence and talent by the Honourable Gentlemen who spoke last. Mr. Barron, and whose animating, judicious, and manly observations expounded the necessity of any further discussion from me. Besides, Mr. Wyse has wonderfully enlightened us all by speaking to all the resolutions in *globo*, and to the principles which should regulate fiscal impositions with a gravity and research only possessed by himself. If I can presume, however, after such a display of learned lore and profound discussion to offer a simple but practical observation, I would say, that the present financial attempt of our English masters is as unjust as it is inane—at least as regards the time, and manner, and amount of the taxation sought to be imposed on our home tobacco. It is my astonishment that a manufacturer—for I will call it so, as it owes more of its properties and preparation to skill and labour than to the mere bounty of nature—I say it is my astonishment that a manufacturer which is yet in so infant and struggling a state as scarcely to be seen and felt by ourselves, should so suddenly fall under the scrutinizing vision of our financial philosopher. He must be hex-eyed indeed in pursuit of objects for additional taxation—and this too in a country, and at a period when and where fifteen years of peace, which in all other countries is attended with happiness and plenty, have brought us nothing, under the iron grasp of debt, taxation, and monopoly, by which we are bound to England, but increased and increasing poverty, starvation, and distress. So much so is this the fact, that our very prudent masters and benevolent legislators in England, in the failure of our own unexampled liberality, are at this moment gravely deliberating the propriety of imposing or rather our ability to bear a compulsory poor rate which is to serve as a species of quarantine to guard themselves against the infection of our pauperism and beggary; and this too, though that pauperism and beggary is the very work of their own hands. My countrymen, is not this the truth, the real truth, unvarnished, and unexaggerated? I know not how to characterize such iniquitous injustice—neither can its cruelty be justified by its insanity—it is inane, it is wholly irrational to expect any benefit to the revenue from a tax that transcends the very marketable price of the article on which it is sought to be levied as in the case with our home tobacco. What can be meant? Is England as unmitigable in her hatred of Ireland, as only to be satisfied with the universal pauperism of its inhabitants, which the present attempt of her minister must produce, if successful? It will have a universal and desolating operation on all our resources and relations, mercantile, manufacturing, agricultural, literary and ecclesiastical—withering all, both poor and rich, young and old. Will this conduce to the strength and honour of England?—or will Ireland endure it?—or will it not drive her, one and all, to unite for the repeal of that accursed measure misnamed the Union?—Let no man doubt it—and let every man who hears me be persuaded that nothing else will serve or save us. England's Parliament has no sympathy for us, or wisdom for herself. She favours a foreign colony at our expense—her next sister and best consumer—and whom she affects to call an integral part of herself, and without whom she must shortly become the vassal tributary of the most inglorious of her foes—"Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat."—After some other observations on the peculiar advantages of the cultivation of tobacco to the country under its present circumstances, in relieving the pressure on its other agricultural produce, and on the extensive employment which it would give by reason of the great portion of manual labour which is required in its preparation, and which could be performed by the youth of both sexes—a consideration which he thought of the most paramount and blessed importance—Mr. Wash concluded, amid the applause of the meeting, by proposing the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM ARKWARD, in moving the resolution relative to an increase of Stamp Duties, said, that from his own experience he could state that such an increase would operate to the most injurious extent against the commercial interests of this country generally, leaving out of view entirely the destructive effect which it would have upon the public Press, and many other branches of society.

Mr. NUGENT O'REILLY seconded this resolution.

The Rev. JOHN SHERMAN proposed, with a very appropriate observation, the resolution calling upon the Members for Ireland generally to approve, in every constitutional way, the proposed increase of taxes. The Rev. Gentleman added that when this resolution was discussed in Committee, it was stated that many Members who held situations under Government might feel a reluctance in coming forward to oppose a Government measure. It was, however, but justice to state, that, in reply to this objection, Dean Lee observed that those Members should entertain a stronger desire to support the wishes of their constituents, who sent them into the House, than the wishes of Government. Cheers.

It was then resolved that the Committee should be instructed to draw up a petition, and that it be entrusted for presentation to the House of Lords to the Duke of Devonshire, and to Sir John Newport for presentation in the House of Commons; and that copies of the resolutions and petition be forwarded to the following Noblemen and Gentlemen:—

Lord Portman	Mr. Brownlow
Lord Grey	Hon. G. Lamb
Vicecount Middleton	Lord George Beresford
Lord Beresford	Mr. Home
Lord King	Mr. Pomeroy
Rt. Hon. M. Fitzgerald	Mr. O'Connell
Mr. Spring Rice	Mr. Carey
Lord Eldon	Mr. Brougham.

Mr. PETER KENNET moved that a subscription be entered into to defray the expenses. He congratulated the meeting on the union of parties. Men met this day who bend to different altars, and men possibly who bend to no altar. Without publicity from the Press their Resolutions would be "vox at praterita nihil." As a veteran agitator, he begged to propose a new Rent.—Laughter.

The Very Rev. Dean Lee was then called to the Chair, and thanks having been voted to the Mayor, the meeting separated.

We never witnessed a greater degree of unanimity evinced on any former occasion. All the resolutions were passed without a single dissenting voice.

WATERFORD HOUSEHOLDERS' CLUB.

The usual weekly meeting of the Club took place on Monday evening.

MR. THOMAS GRANT in the Chair.

Mr. NUGENT said, it was necessary for the Club, and not only the Club, but all the citizens, to be informed of the importance of attending the forthcoming Vestries. The Vestry for residing and farming the Churchwardens accounts demanded their particular attention. The citizens never had a better opportunity than was afforded to them this year of testifying on the Law Church ministers for their clamours and indignity. The Vestries for last year were altogether illegal. The Churchwardens knew the assessments were illegal, and yet with this knowledge they levied the assessments. Now, the citizens could make them suffer by throwing the tax for the past year on their shoulders altogether. This, then, could not be effected but by union, and if the people united on this occasion, he pledged himself for the result.

Mr. COX could not go so far as Mr. Nugent, in fixing the whole weight on the shoulders of the Churchwardens. They may be ignorant that the Vestries at which the assessments were laid on were illegal, and he could not think of throwing the whole amount of the tax on two individuals. Mr. HALPENNY remarked, they could not, and ought not to be ignorant of the fact of the Vestries being illegal, and if they were ignorant on this point, it was a willful ignorance, the worst kind of all ignorance, and we will instruct them how to act in future, by adopting the Secretary's plan.

Mr. NUGENT was well aware that Churchwardens never collected three pounds of the tax without taking the opinion of Council. The opinion of Council, it is presumed, could not favour the levy of the tax assessed at an illegal Vestry. Having then this strong presumption, who would say but the Churchwardens were the most culpable for levying and collecting an illegal tax, and that they ought to be visited with all the consequences? Not a single halfpenny they collected but what they would be bound to give up, if the people acted in union at the next Vestry, which he hoped they would. If any proof were wanting of the illegality of the tax, he could in his own person furnish a triumphant instance—he was summoned before a bench of magistrates; they decided against him, but why did they not follow up their decision by issuing their warrants?—O'Connell's opinion, put the extinguisher upon them—he opened their eyes, and they gave up the job. But with regard to the ignorance of the Churchwardens, nothing could afford him greater pleasure than to impart one lesson to these gentlemen who were not ignorant. The law did not recognize their ignorance; and if they were really so, after he (Mr. Nugent) telling them at the opening of the Vestry of 1829 that the Vestries were illegal, they must then have shut their eyes to the truth, and levied the tax on their own responsibility. An example could be made of these persons; and he hoped another year would not come round till that intolerable nuisance, the tax Vestry Act, be swept off the statute book altogether. The Bishop had issued his prohibition for holding an extraordinary Vestry, for levying on the assessments for this year. If the people attended the Vestries, and stood by him, he pledged himself to prove this Vestry as illegal as the Dean had declared that of Easter Monday to be. If they did not attend, the onus would necessarily rest on their own shoulders. He hoped that the creatures called illegal Catholics would not interfere, as they did last year, to increase the burdens of the people. He could and would give this new notice to be illegal in more parts than one; but, leaving the Dean would take advantage of his hints, as he had taken of the "Small Farmer's," he would for the present content himself by calling on the people to attend, and be alive to their own interests.

Mr. COX and another gentleman objected to any hasty measures being adopted by the Club, and recommended an adjournment to Sunday evening, which was accordingly put and carried. It was also resolved that the first dinner of the Club should take place on Sunday week, at Grant's hotel.

Some routine business having been disposed of, and thanks voted to the Chairman, the meeting separated.

Table with 4 columns: Bank Stock, Div. Div. Red, Div. Div. Blue, Div. Div. Green. Rows include various stock types and prices.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must request our valuable correspondent, 'A SMALL FARMER,' to send his communications to our Office at an earlier hour. His last came too late for insertion this day.

The Waterford Chronicle.

SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1830.

The London Mails to Wednesday, inclusive, have been received—the following are extracts:—

HIS MAJESTY'S HEALTH.

London, Tuesday, April 27.

We regret to state that his Majesty has had a relapse, as will be seen by the following Bulletin:—

Windsor Castle, April 27, 1830.

The King continued as well as his Majesty has been for several days past, until this morning, when his Majesty experienced a return of the embarrassment of his breathing. His Majesty is now again better. (Signed) H. HALFORD, M. TIERNEY.

(From the Court Circular of Tuesday.)

After the issuing of the bulletin yesterday Sir Matthew Tierney left the Palace and returned to town, and did not return to the Palace during the day. Sir Henry Hallford remained in attendance on the King, and it was expected would sleep at the Palace last night. During the day his Majesty appeared to be rather better. A King's messenger was sent from the Palace on Sunday evening, with an account of the state of the King's health, to the Duke of Clarence, at Busby Park. The Earl and Countess of Harcourt arrived at the Palace yesterday morning, to make their inquiries after his Majesty's health.

London, Wednesday Evening, April 28.

The following Bulletin has been issued this day:—

Windsor Castle, April 28, 1830.

His Majesty has suffered less from the attacks in his breathing since our report of yesterday. His Majesty has passed a good night.

In consequence of the attack alluded to in the bulletin of yesterday, both the physicians remained in attendance on the King during the day, and it was expected would sleep at the Palace last night.—Court Circular.

NEW TAXES UPON IRELAND.

The amount of injury which these taxes, if imposed upon Ireland, as it is now proposed, would inevitably entail upon the country, is now well known to us, therefore, it appears most extraordinary, why there should prevail such unaccountable apathy on the subject. Why exhibit such listlessness at a moment when we are threatened with destruction? It is true, in some districts there have been public meetings; but as we have repeatedly said before, this is not enough—there must be petitions from every parish and village in Ireland. We know that there does exist a strong and universal feeling of hostility to the proposed measure of increased taxation, and a determination to resist it. Why, then, postpone carrying this determination into effect? The evil may be accomplished before steps are taken to oppose it, and then, when it has become a law, there will be a loud and general outcry against it. However, now is the time to enter a protest against it with effect, and we feel satisfied that if a firm and determined feeling of constitutional hostility be generally manifested in reference to this measure, it will not be perpetrated. We rejoice to find that New Ross, ever alive to the public interests, has come forward. The resolutions will be found in our advertising columns. Indeed, we had commenced to give way, in some degree, to a sense of surprise at the apparent backwardness of Ross on this occasion. It gives us pleasure to find that this spirited little town has maintained that character which it had already so well established for itself. In conclusion, we have only to implore of those districts which have not as yet assembled, to do so at once, and to impress upon those who have adopted petitions, to lose no time in forwarding them, in order that they may be presented immediately, for we are aware that not unfrequently too much delay attends this part of the proceeding. As Parliament reassembled, after the Easter recess, on last Monday, the discussion on these matters will come on immediately, so there is not a moment to be lost.

VESTRIES.

On this subject we would beg to refer to a letter from a correspondent which we publish in our present number, as also to the proceedings at the meeting of the Householders' Club on last Monday evening.

NEW TAXATION—COUNTY LOUTH.

A requisition bearing the signatures of a number of most respectable and influential Freeholders was to have been presented to the High Sheriff of the County of Louth on last Wednesday, calling upon him to convene a meeting for the purpose of petitioning against the proposed additions to the already too burdensome taxes of this Country.

MEETING IN GALWAY—STAMP DUTIES.

There is to be a meeting in Galway on Sunday next, to petition Parliament against the new Stamp Duties and the increased tax upon Newspapers. The requisition for the meeting is signed by eighty of the leading gentlemen of the county.

IRISH VESTRIES.

Nothing now remains for the great majority of the people of Ireland who are so grievously plundered under the present Vestry system, but to reject every item, without exception, on which they are allowed to vote, and to oppose to the utmost extent the law will allow them, all the assessments. This is now their only remedy, for on last Tuesday evening, in the House of Commons, Mr O'Connell moved for leave to bring in a Bill to alter and amend the laws relating to Vestries in Ireland. The motion of the Hon. Member for Clare was supported by Mr Spring Rice, but indeed the Chancellor of the Exchequer (towards whom Ireland must entertain so deep a sense of gratitude for the favour which he now proposes to confer upon her in the shape of additional taxation), Lord F. L. Gower, and Mr Peel opposed the motion, and it was lost, the numbers being on a division—Against the motion, 177—For it, 47—Majority against the introduction of the Bill, 130. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the course of his observations said, "No doubt that angry feelings had arisen in various parishes in Ireland, in consequence of the operation of the law on the subject of Church Rates." Lord F. L. Gower stated distinctly that "he admitted there might be an improvement made." Mr Secretary Peel stated, "the respect entertained for religion, and the zeal of society required that the means should be procured, and should they not be found voluntarily, they would be compelled to find them; and the only way was by parochial taxation. There might be points in the Vestry Bill that needed amendment, which ought to receive the most considerate attention of the Government. He pledged himself that they should have that attention, at the same time keeping always in mind the leading principle. He should on the present occasion, content himself with giving his decided negative to the motion of Mr O'Connell." Here is pretty humbugging. One of those gentlemen admits the present system excites angry feelings. Another, that there might be an improvement made; and a third, that the points in the Vestry Bill, which, according to his view, needed amendment, would receive the attention of Government, keeping however, always in view, the leading principle. So then, all we are given to hope it, that the principle of the Vestry Bill will remain as it is, with some slight modification of a few of the clauses. Now, we at once boldly and unequivocally pronounce that this will not do. The principle of the system is bad, unjust, and inequitable in the extreme—so much so, that even Protestants themselves are ashamed of it, and many of them have resolved upon entering into a subscription amongst themselves rather than have recourse to the mean alternative of calling upon their Catholic fellow Parishioners to contribute to the repairing of their Churches, &c. As well, according to the principle of justice, might one man call upon another to defray the expenses of building his house, paying the rent of it, or the wages of his servants. If this be the course selected by Mr Peel for maintaining the respect entertained for religion, he is greatly in error. Really the thing is absurd far beyond that which calls for serious argument, and we confidently appeal even to any conscientious Protestant, if our assertions on the subject be not borne out by the fact. But we tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his confederates that their second edition of this Act will not do—the principle itself is essentially bad, and must be abolished, and to accomplish this, the only effectual way will be to give it every legitimate and constitutional opposition. Let the parishioners of Trinity Town this in mind on next Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday, for it is on those days that the Vestries, as referred to in the letter of our Correspondent, 'A ROMAN CATHOLIC CITIZEN,' in another column, are to be held. We rejoice that the intentions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Co., have been made known before these Vestries had taken place, and for this we have to thank Mr O'Connell.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—TUESDAY, APRIL 27. The House balloted on Tuesday for two election Committees. The following were declared to be those selected to try the merits of the Limerick election petition:— G. H. D. Pennant, R. Colburn, Sir C. Carrington, Sir A. Clibber, G. C. Anstruther, J. H. Penruddock, G. Bernard, J. Weinsay, R. E. Heathcote, A. Sanderson, M. Ure. Mr Colburn was chosen as Chairman.

STAMP DUTIES.

On Thursday a highly respectable Meeting of the Merchants and Traders of Dublin, was held at the Chamber of Commerce—Thomas Crothall, Esq., in the Chair—and it was resolved to petition against the proposed increase of the Stamp Duties in Ireland.

A Meeting of the County for the like purpose was held on same day at Kilmacshane.

We have received Papers and letters from Buenos Ayres to the 11th February. The Republic remains in a very agitated state on account of the hostile movements in the interior provinces. It was rumoured that General Quiroga was dead; another rumour was, that he had been defeated. Forbes, the American Minister, had been accused of spreading wild rumours, and of fomenting disturbances in the interior, and had been under the necessity of publishing a vindication of his conduct. An action had been fought near Santiago de Chili between the army of the President Pinto and his opponent Prieto; the latter was defeated with the loss of 100 men. Exchange, 71 to 8.

VESTRIES.

To the Editor of the Waterford and Weekly Waterford Chronicle.

Mr Editor—Although it may appear presumptuous of any man to step between your talented correspondent, 'THE SMALL FARMER,' and the Clergy of the Church Establishment or the Vestries—yet, when I recollect we have come so very near the Vestry for settling the accounts of the late Churchwardens, and consider the possibility of our being disappointed now as we were at Easter, I have ventured to address you on this subject, with this understanding that if you have received the promised letter of 'The Small Farmer,' you will please to suppress mine.

Of the letters of the Small Farmer, no man can be a greater admirer than I am, for I fully concur with the great majority of my fellow citizens, that they are the production of a man of education. I concur too in the view he has taken of the Vestry Act—that it affords ample protection to the public against the injurious mode that has been hitherto pursued in assessing and levying Vestry taxes, and that the people would not merely be wrong, but that they would act criminally if they did not make every exertion effectually to correct these abuses. I agree with him too, fully, in the deep veneration he professes, and I am sure he feels, for the Roman Catholic Priesthood, because they are over the shield of the people—and never a scourge but to the wicked.

With that Priesthood, Sir, there is nothing secret—there is no underworking—what they appear in public they are in private. Their suitability, their mildness, their simplicity—all concur to make us look up to them with reverence, with admiration. Devoted as are their lives to the advancement of the trust interests of their flocks, they are never known to abandon their charge or be forgetful of the great duties imposed on them—in fact, Sir, look at them as you will—their public, their private character, they cannot fail to elicit respect even from their enemies.

In all these, I am quite of his mind. Perhaps I do not entirely agree with him upon the propriety of his mode of attack, because I cannot help thinking that if his thoughts had been expressed in his own natural language, he would have been able to make his positions much stronger. Upon the whole, we must admire the honesty that pervades these letters, and we must agree with the writer that to him is mainly attributable all the good that has been accomplished at the Parochial Vestries in the South of Ireland. Having paid this tribute to the talents, the honesty, and the integrity of the 'Small Farmer,' permit me, Sir, to speak of the Vestries now approaching.

We were all in the dark about the law of Vestries until the 'Small Farmer' and the Householders' Club commenced their courses of lectures upon the Vestry Act; and really I must say, that their arguments are well arranged and judicious, and their reasoning just, as indeed the sequel has proved; for we find the opinion of Mr O'Connell, as well as that of Baron Smith, and countless magistrates, merely to recede the opinions given here by those I have alluded to, nearly twelve months ago. This remarkable coincidence of opinion has made me give more than ordinary attention to the Vestry Act, particularly in regard to the Vestry of Monday next; and as my opinions are borne out by those of the gentleman who take a leading part in the Householders' Club, as well as those of the 'Small Farmer,' I trust they will be received by the public as they (the public) ought to receive every thing intended for their advantage.

Since Easter I have attended with tolerable regularity at the meetings of the Householders' Club, and I have but one regret, and that is, that those meetings are not attended by those who call themselves the aristocracy of our City. We may blame the Householders' Club—we may disapprove of some of their acts—but certainly the principle that called them into existence was a just one, one of benevolence, and being so, I consider it was and is the duty of those gentlemen to attend the meetings, and attend whatever they may think needs amendment. If gentlemen oppose the principle, let them have the candour, the willingness to go there and express their sentiments; and, from what I know of the Householders' Club, I am convinced their attendance would not alone be permitted, but be taken as a favour, for truth and justice are the objects they seek.

I have, as I said, attended these meetings lately and I was highly pleased at the temper and good feeling there manifested—certainly I will admit that the Clergy of the Establishment get a few knocks, but then we all have our feelings in direct hostility—not to them, but to the manner in which their support is drawn from the people.

The Vestry of Monday, Sir, as the notice tells us, is an adjournment of the Vestry of Easter Monday. But the Vestry of Easter Monday was, before the adjournment, pronounced by the Very Rev. Gentleman who presided at the Vestry to be illegal. Ergo, (as the Logicians say,) the Vestry of next Monday will be illegal! This is quite a clear position, and one which I think quite incontrovertible; however, to make it stronger, I shall deduce one argument, and I shall content myself with one, from the late Vestry Act.

Allow me, Sir, to direct your attention to the 21st section of that Act. This section says:—'That immediately after the other necessary business of such Vestry shall be concluded, the Incumbent or Curate, or other person presiding therein, shall, and he is hereby required to adjourn such Vestry to a certain day.' &c. Now, the only question to be asked is, what is meant by 'the other necessary business?'—The Chairman had no power whatever, under the Act to adjourn, except that given him in this section. I shall try to answer the question.

The 30th section relates to the vouching the accounts of the late Churchwardens—therefore it follows, that the 'other business' mentioned in the next section cannot mean that—it must mean something not mentioned in the 30th section,

and which something the law required to follow the vouching the accounts. This is quite clear. The section says expressly 'immediately after.' Therefore, under this section the Minister had no power whatsoever to adjourn, except as stated 'immediately after the other necessary business shall be concluded.' As well might he arrogate to himself this power on Easter Tuesday, or on any other day, as on Easter Monday, except at the time pointed out specially by the Act. I, therefore, conclude, that if Easter Monday's Vestry had been ever so legal, this adjournment is quite contrary to law, as no other business whatsoever was commenced or concluded after the vouching the accounts until this adjournment. This is the more clear, as Easter Monday's Vestry was, by the Very Rev. Chairman himself, under the opinion of Council, declared to be illegal.

However, let us now regard the mode of proceeding to be adopted on Monday by the people, if the Vestry proceed. They have their choice of four modes of action.—The first is—let them admit fully the accounts as they stand; the next is, to refuse to allow the expenditure of any sum not assessed at the Easter Vestries of 1829; the third is, not to allow or give credit for any sum not contemplated by the Act; and the fourth is, to refuse to allow the expenditure of any penny of that assessment, inasmuch as the Vestries of Easter, 1829, had no power to make any assessment, any more than the Vestries of Easter, this year. I shall, for the present, content myself with making a few remarks upon the latter mode of acting, and hope to lay a proposition before the public which will act as a panacea in healing a great deal of the acrimonious feeling excited by these very oppressive taxes.

The parishioners have the power to throw the whole assessment overboard—and I'll admit that pure justice would require their adoption of that course; but then, Sir, we must reflect that it is upon the Churchwardens the whole onus falls—and would it be fair to inflict so heavy a penalty on such a citizen as Mr McQuane, who certainly is not a voluntary agent in this proceeding? I blame him much for not having taken the advice given by the 'Small Farmer,' in September last—for not having then gotten the opinion of Council upon the subject—and he would then have seen that he was standing upon a precipice—and I am quite convinced that, from the amiability of his private character, he would not have continued to sit; but now he stands committed—and, for my part, while the people, as I said before, in justice judge themselves, are bound to throw the whole assessment overboard, I would strongly recommend a middle course—and that is, let Protestants pledge themselves in future to free us from all charge for every thing not mentioned in or contemplated by the Act—viz. for Vestry Clerk, Beadle, Rector, Collector, &c. &c.—to strike the other parties at the minimum of the Act, viz. Clerk and Sexton, £10 each, and let them, the Protestants, make up the deficiency to those officers, and let the late Churchwardens make good to the credit of the parish all that portion of the assessment not yet collected, and let the public pay an act of indemnity for all bye-gone acts, and believe me we would all be animated by better feelings in future. This, on the part of the Protestant portion of the community, would be only an act of justice, and I trust that some benevolent character will make the overture at their side, and thus most effectually break down the rapidly increasing expense of the Householders' Club. I find, Sir, I have gone farther than I intended—and that I have occupied too much of your space; and, as time now presses, I must apologise for finishing abruptly, assuring you that I am,

With great respect, your's, &c.
A ROMAN CATHOLIC CITIZEN.
Waterford, April 28, 1830.

EASTER TERM.

On Wednesday last, at the King's Bench the four Judges presided. Judge Jubb said there was nothing which required any charge to the Grand Jury. Some motions, of course, were heard.

The Archbishop of Dublin and family, sailed from Howth on Thursday morning for England, where his Grace will remain for the benefit of his health.

The Recorder, who has for some time been seriously ill, is now out of danger, and recovering.

A deputation of the tobaccoists had interviews on Saturday with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade.

THE GAITH APPEAL AGAIN.—Captain T. Gaith, since the death of General Gaith, has left his cottage in the neighbourhood of Galois, and is now living at Windsor. Negotiations for the final settlement of differences relating to a delicate affair here, we understand, have terminated.—London Paper.

Above sixty acres of fine plantations, belonging to Nathaniel Bond, Esq., at East Holms, were, a few days since, entirely consumed, through the carelessness of an individual, who set fire to the heap in the direct course of the wind to the plantation, with which it very shortly communicated, and defied every attempt to stop its progress.—Sherburne Mercury.

Table with 4 columns: Butter, Flour, Oats, Barley. Rows include various commodity prices and exchange rates.

PROPOSED TAXATION.

Pursuant to public requisition from the Mayor, a meeting of the Citizens upon the subject took place on last Tuesday, at the Town Hall.

The MAYOR in the Chair.

The feeling of hostility evinced towards the contemplated measure was very strong indeed, and in this feeling all classes and creeds participated, as may be seen by referring to the names on the committee, and to those who moved and seconded the resolutions. Upon the return of the Committee appointed to draw up resolutions, which consisted of the following gentlemen:—

- Very Rev. Dean Lee, Rev. John Sheehan, Henry Winston Barron, Wm. Marchant Ardagh, Richard Walsh, and William Aylward, Esq., Thomas Wyse, Esq.

The Very Rev. Dean Lee came forward to move the first resolution, expressive of the distressed state of this country and the consequent necessity which existed for the fostering hand of a wise and parental Legislature in the distribution of the public burdens, and stated that as it was one to which he could anticipate nothing but the most cordial concurrence, he deemed it unnecessary to dwell upon its merits. He would therefore content himself by simply moving it.

Mr EDWARD HOBSON seconded this resolution, which having been put from the Chair, passed unanimously.

Mr THOMAS WYSE proposed the second resolution, which went to record the deep sense of surprise and indignation experienced by the meeting upon learning that instead of this protecting care, not only so much required as stated in the first resolution, but guaranteed by the Act of Union, it was now in contemplation to impose additional burdens upon this country. In moving this resolution Mr Wyse said—

In the resolution just adopted, you have recognized in clear terms what are the bounding duties of every government not absolutely indifferent to the impoverished portion of the United Empire. I mean to follow it up by one in which the conduct of the actual government will be set in due contrast with these obligations. In looking to the financial propositions of this session, I search in vain for any symptom, even of such a disposition. So far from this anxiety for the amelioration of a country which a series of political and financial blunders, has sunk lower than any other country, with the same share of natural advantages in Europe, I see nothing but large sacrifices to the claims and clamours of England, at the expense, I am sorry to say, of every thing Irish. Three millions and a half of taxes have been remitted in England—so they ought to have been, and I applaud the English people for having wrung the indulgence from the hands of the Minister, by increasing remonstrance; but what has been done for Ireland? A million and a half has been inflicted on us. The leather duty and the beer duty have, indeed, been repealed; but are these balances intended for us? I am far from undervaluing their advantages. The leather tax was a most oppressive impost—our trade in this article, confined like almost all others to England, still, of late years, was considerable; but it has greatly fallen off. From 1812 to 1822, there has been a decrease of exports in skins alone to the amount of 105,200 dozers. It requires great encouragement and great exertion to bring it back. The beer duty exacted is chiefly in an indirect manner. We now brew for ourselves, and so far from importing from England, as was the case to a large amount in 1792, we send her considerable exports in this article of consumption every year. The consumption will, of course, increase in England, and there may be an increased demand for our grain; but what is this when balanced against the check to our distillation? Distillation consumes a much larger quantity of grain than brewing; of the number of barrels of malt annually used in Ireland, considerably more than one-half is employed in distillation. What then are our profits and loss? Our profits scarcely any thing—our loss enormous. The one million and a half is a simple and unqualified burden. Whichever way we choose to regard it, it is all impost the most impolitic and unjust. What does the Chancellor of the Exchequer propose to himself? The prosperity of the Country? Impossible! Augmentation of the revenue? Equally absurd! The prosperity of the country is involved in her agricultural prosperity, and here are three duties which attack it in all its bearings. But does he hope to augment the revenue? His proposition is in the very face of the first principles of political economy. In no instance is an increase of duty followed by an equal increase of revenue—the holdy even in articles of the most limited consumption; but when laid on commodities of extensive demand, and whose price cost is inconsiderable, it actually diminishes the consumption so much as to lower the revenue considerably below the former receipts. Look to the case of wine for instance, in Ireland. When the duty on wines did not amount to more than 2s 9d per French wines, and 1s 9d on others, in the four years so 1799 we paid a larger revenue, viz. 20,000l., to the Exchequer than we did in the four years to 1821, when the duty on French wines was 6s a gallon, and 4s on every other. But our population, in this interval, had very greatly increased, and the consumption, had the former duty continued, would have been commensurate. The same may be said of the duties on tobacco. In four years to 1798, when the duty was 8d a pound, the quantity of tobacco entered in Ireland for home consumption was 32,000,000 lbs. making an annual average of 8,000,000. In the four years to 1821, the annual average was only 4,000,000. Just half what it was thirty years ago, when the population probably did not amount to half its present number. Even in articles of less general use, such as flint and plate glass, the same causes produce similar effects. The duties were doubled in 1813—what was the result—a parallel increase of duty? No such thing; the revenue fell off from 340,000l. to 35,000l. But perhaps the most conclusive instance is in this very article of spirits itself. In England it has been systematically demonstrated by Sir Henry Parnell, in his late excellent work,