

THE BRITISH ARMY. mentioned, the last named is that companies of the regiments are

- 44th do Bengal; Chatham
- 45th do Madras; Chatham
- 46th do Canterbury
- 47th do Millingar; Chatham
- 48th do Madras; Chatham
- 49th do Bengal; Chatham
- 50th do N S Wales; Chatham
- 51st do Corfu (ordered home); Limerick
- 52nd do Belfast
- 53rd do Gibraltar; Hall, ordered to Plymouth
- 54th do Madras; Chatham
- 55th do Madras; Chatham
- 56th do Madras; Chatham
- 57th do Madras; Chatham
- 58th do Madras; Chatham
- 59th do Madras; Chatham
- 60th do Madras; Chatham
- 61st do Madras; Chatham
- 62nd do Madras; Chatham
- 63rd do Madras; Chatham
- 64th do Madras; Chatham
- 65th do Madras; Chatham
- 66th do Madras; Chatham
- 67th do Madras; Chatham
- 68th do Madras; Chatham
- 69th do Madras; Chatham
- 70th do Madras; Chatham
- 71st do Madras; Chatham
- 72nd do Madras; Chatham
- 73rd do Madras; Chatham
- 74th do Madras; Chatham
- 75th do Madras; Chatham
- 76th do Madras; Chatham
- 77th do Madras; Chatham
- 78th do Madras; Chatham
- 79th do Madras; Chatham
- 80th do Madras; Chatham
- 81st do Madras; Chatham
- 82nd do Madras; Chatham
- 83rd do Madras; Chatham
- 84th do Madras; Chatham
- 85th do Madras; Chatham
- 86th do Madras; Chatham
- 87th do Madras; Chatham
- 88th do Madras; Chatham
- 89th do Madras; Chatham
- 90th do Madras; Chatham
- 91st do Madras; Chatham
- 92nd do Madras; Chatham
- 93rd do Madras; Chatham
- 94th do Madras; Chatham
- 95th do Madras; Chatham
- 96th do Madras; Chatham
- 97th do Madras; Chatham
- 98th do Madras; Chatham
- 99th do Madras; Chatham
- 100th do Madras; Chatham

The Waterford Chronicle

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1834

Price 6d.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION—No. III.

Wherefore do we claim for Ireland the high prerogatives of a nation, the privilege of self-government, the power of legislating for her own advantage, according to her own uncontrolled will? Because without them she cannot be great or happy; because she is endowed with all the attributes that are necessary to justify the claim.

We shall not entangle ourselves for the present in the intricacies of fiscal argumentation. A very little ingenuity will enable any one to make plausible deductions in favor of his own opinions on this matter, from the details of our imports and exports; and, until the true doctrine, with respect to their value, as indexes of a country's prosperity be discovered and recognized by all; until controversialists agree in principle and cease to maintain discordant hypotheses; the same facts must necessarily lead us to conclusions the most hostile. Aids to this, that a mere marshalling of figures, imposing and decisive as they may appear to the superficial, can never be of weight, unless we consider the statements of the dancer in connexion with the general condition of a community, with the population, the rental of land, the appropriation of that rental, the relations of property, and the whole scheme and system of social life. The school of pragmatical economists who acknowledge Spring Rice as their master, most grossly deceive themselves and delude their followers by fixing their attention upon a single division of the argument, and withdrawing it from all the rest. The amount of imports and exports, and of taxation, should be taken as only one, and we believe not the chief or most trust-worthy guide, in our consideration of the state of Ireland. When it is separated, and pursued exclusively, it is a mere *façade* leading the spectator through endless mazes of error and confusion. Thus much we have said, that our readers may not repose implicit confidence in the elaborate and pompous calculations with which our opponents are wont to mystify the public. Hereafter we may speak more fully on this division of the subject, but now we would explain the simple and easily comprehensible positions on which we are content to bring our cause to issue.

It has often afforded us occasion for regret, that some among the ablest and most honest advocates of the principle of independence, have rested their argument in its defence on the contingencies of circumstance, the conduct of a minister, or the proceedings of a session in the British legislature. We hold that, rightly understood, it cannot be weakened by any act of any Cabinet or Parliament; that no change in the imperial government which may be rationally contemplated; no transfer of authority from Tory to Whig, or from Whig to Radical; no partial improvement in the policy of our alien rulers, can justify us in foregoing the paramount duty of seeking the full recognition of this glorious principle. We are not conditionally the supporters of domestic legislation. We support it, because of the enduring necessities of our country's state.

We say that the united parliament is incompetent to the right administration of our affairs. Three things are essential to the character of a wise and efficient legislature—*Knowledge of the country which it governs*—*Ability for the useful application of that knowledge*—*Inclination to apply its knowledge and its time for the benefit of the people committed to its care.* We deny that any one of these essential qualities pertains to the British Senate, in its relation to our island.

An overwhelming majority of its Members are Englishmen; born and educated in England, trained in the habits of English society; conversant only with the condition of the English people. What do they know of their neighbourhood? What do we are placed in their neighbourhood; but we are far different from them. As well might a convention of Frenchmen make laws for Britain, as a British assembly legislate for France. This will be pronounced a wild assertion; nevertheless it is most true. In national circumstances, in national character and feeling we are widely dissimilar from our "sister" nation. She has mounted to supremacy among the states of the earth; we are not *potentially*, but actually debased beneath them. She abounds in riches; she is borne down by the very accumulation of her wealth; her capitalists cannot find investments for the gold that bursts their coffers; and we are poor, and without capital. She is the emporium of the world's commerce; we are a commercial people? Manufacturers employ millions of her population, and engender a peculiar spirit throughout the whole; where are the manufacturers of Ireland? Her inhabitants have been accustomed to the enjoyment of equal rights and equal laws; protection for their industry; the strict and sparing exercise of a Government which, though it may have been corrupt, was national, and therefore beneficent. Mark, in every point, the melancholy contrast with our oppressed and wretched land! Her resources have been called forth and applied to the uttermost; ours, more abundant and more various, have been utterly neglected. From this palpable distinction in national circumstances, the national character of the countries, which we believe to be in every case almost wholly the creature of circumstances, has necessarily become distinct. Different principles govern the minds, different impulses direct the conduct of their people. Is it not clear, then, that a Parliament may be well qualified to rule England, yet not at all qualified to conduct the rule of Ireland? The same course of conduct befits not the two nations; and how can they who are acquainted only with one, regulate the other rightly? The very information which teaches them to do well towards Britain, may produce pernicious mischief and error in their acts towards Ireland. Mere proximity of geographical position cannot make them competent to the office of legislation; a man may know as little of the concerns of his neighbour's household as of the concerns of the inhabitants of the Antipodes, and be as completely unqualified to guide the former as the latter.

Let no one tell us that the countries are identified. Every session produces measures which are applicable to Ireland only; and how can they who know her not determine wisely on these measures? Read the leading journals of Britain. Mark the

TEMPERANCE versus DRUNKENNESS.

A benevolent writer has advanced a series of letters through the *Waterford Chronicle* to the lower classes on the importance of Temperance, from which we make the following graphic extracts, and recommend it to the serious consideration of the same classes here:—

"Temperance, by fortifying the mind and body, leads to happiness; intemperance, by enervating the mind and body, ends generally in misery."—*Art of Thinking.*

A zealous friend of mine has just told me the following:—A few months since, Doctor Kinsella, Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory, was holding his annual visitation in the parish chapel of Ballynabulbin, and was accompanied on the occasion by the Right Rev. Dr. England, R. C. Bishop of Charleston. The former prelate, in his discourse from the altar, was describing to the dense congregation, the evils of intemperance, and cautioning his hearers, for the love they should bear to God, to avoid the snare of home, health, and salvation, to avoid the public house, when, turning towards Doctor England, who was sitting at the foot of the altar, he concluded this part of his sermon thus:—"You, my Lord, have been for seven years in a situation to know how much of misery is the effect of frequenting the public-house; in your chaplainship for that period, to the convicts who were sent to the Hulks at Cove, who saw and conversed with each of the hundreds whom the violated laws of their country had condemned to exile and to slavery; and now, my Lord, I ask you, that my flock may benefit by the fact, is the presence of that Devil whose ministers we are, how many of those unhappy beings were there, who did not trace their ruin to the public-house?" Doctor E. thus appealed to, advanced up the steps of the altar, and with a sincerity and solemnity of manner that caused a breathless stillness and attention throughout the chapel, answered, "My Lord, I do not recollect one such instance—those convicts who left Ireland during the seven years I was appointed to attend them, told me many a varied history of crime and guilt; but all ascribed their ruin to the public-house—the guilty were there first taught the ways of vice, and lured to crime, and hardened against the counsels of religion; and even those who were innocent of that for which they had been sentenced to a painful banishment, still told me with eyes dimmed by tears, that the company of the public-house had been the cause of their destruction, for there they met the murderer, the robber, and the informer, to their association with whom, though guiltless themselves they owed their subsequent disgrace and misery."

Fathers! if the honor and safety of your families are cared for by you—mothers! if you have the underlying affection for your children which should characterize you—sons! if the happiness of your fathers and the smiles of your mothers be dear to you—husbands! if you are not tired of the joys of a devoted and contented wife, and of a pleasant and bright residence—and wives! if you wish that those who are dearer to you than ought else in this extended world, save your own honor and your own virtue, should not become disgraced before men, and despoiled by heaven—if you desire that they should not be the means of your heart sorrowing, and of their own and their children's infamy, read the above, and shudder, when you think of the public-house, and vow, with the assistance of that Providence whose blessings are too often rejected, but who still gives strength and joy to those who are willing to receive them—never—never, to expose yourselves to contagion—to death—to despair! within its unholy and cursed, and gully walls!

ILLICIT GLASS MANUFACTORY.
On Saturday, the Collector of Excise, through his counsel, Mr. F. M. McCarthy, appeared at the Police Office, before the presiding magistrates—Aldermen Bagnell, Gibbins, Jun. and Gardie, for the prosecution of Patrick Bunting, and some others, who were detected in the month of November last, in the house lately used as a cholera hospital in St. Finn Barr's, where were discovered certain materials for the manufacture of glass, for which no license had been taken out.

Messrs. Thomas Grant, William Jenkins, and Philip Hillman, Officers of Excise, and Mr. John Hagarty, peace officer, deposed to the facts with which the public are already so well acquainted, of having found the prisoners engaged in the work.

COURT.—We feel ourselves called upon to convict Bunting, Elliott, the operative glass-blowers, in the penalty of £30 each, at the same time that we are willing to join in a recommendation to mercy, in consideration of its being proved before us, that they were not able to procure work, though having exerted themselves to do so; but must acquit M. McCarthy and Marriott, they not being glass-blowers, nor having any article found on the premises fit for being used by glass-blowers; as also that we believe they had, independently of such fact being proved, no share in the concern whatever.—*Cork Herald.*

THE TRUE SUN—GOVERNMENT PROSECUTIONS.
On Thursday, Mr. Grant and Mr. Bell, the proprietors of the *True Sun*, and Mr. Agar, the printer, were convicted of publishing a libel the tendency of which was to excite the people to resist paying the assessed taxes. When the Solicitor-General was replying, his observations were received with loud hisses from members of the Union, who were in court. When the verdict of guilty was pronounced, the hisses of the auditory were renewed.

POOR LAWS FOR IRELAND.
We have learned upon unquestionable authority, that government is determined to bring in a bill in the ensuing session of parliament, for the purpose of enabling parishes in Ireland to assess a rate upon property for the maintenance of the poor.—*Dublin Register.*

Mr. Lawless arrived in Belfast on Thursday, at Kerr's Hotel, Donegall-place. We congratulate this gentleman on his arrival in a town where he passed a considerable portion of his life, vindicating the rights of his countrymen, of all denominations, to equal privileges and equal laws.—*Northern Herald.*

Colonel Blackier's dismissal from the Commission of the Peace is to be brought before Parliament.

THE LATE LORD NETTERVILLE'S WILL.

On Friday last the great cause of the Earl of Flinall and others, against Edward Blake, Esq., and others, depending in the Irish Court of Chancery, to establish the will and codicils of the late Lord Viscount Netterville, and to carry the trusts thereof into execution, was heard by the Lord Chancellor (Plunkett), and his Lordship has decreed the establishment of the various charities of the said Netterville. The charities are very extensive, and will consist of an institution for widows and orphans, and a public school, to be established on his Lordship's estate at Donagh, in the county of Meath, near Drogheda; for which purpose his Lordship has devised in fee sixty acres of land and a dwelling-house and offices; and a dispensary, to be established in premises bequeathed by him at Blackhall-street and Queen-street, Dublin; and Sunday and daily schools, to be established at Island-bridge, Dublin, and Dallymore, county of Westmeath, on his Lordship's estate.—The funds bequeathed for the purposes of the said several charities amount to £14,000, besides a sum of £1,340 the produce of timber cut and disposed of on the lands in the county of Meath, since his Lordship's decease. The various legacies are to be paid their legacies and costs; and the personal estate being deficient, partly occasioned by the great litigation which has taken place about his Lordship's will and codicils, the deficiency has been decreed to be made up out of the real estates by sale or mortgage. This cause has been eight years in the Court of Chancery, and the gentlemen of the long robe and the officers concerned have had a profitable harvest from it. The most important questions, namely, as to the devise of the real estates, (except the Westmeath estate, which is in possession of the devisee,) yet remain undecided.

LORD BRUDENELL.
The extraordinary sensation excited by the acquittal of Captain Watson, and the dismissal of Lord Brudenell from the command of the 15th Hussars, argues little for the state of our military law. It is made matter of wonder that a commanding officer, and that commanding officer the eldest son of an earl, should be reprimanded and displaced for preferring unfounded charges against an inferior; and for establishing a system of tyrannical espionage against his officers. We are therefore left to doubt, whether, if the case had been a little less gross, and the intended victim a little more unoffending, the result would have been the same. We are conversant with courts martial, and we could cite numerous instances of persecution, quite as gross as that against Captain Watson; and should be at a loss for instances, where we could trace the persecution to the same cause; yet some of the persecuting commanders still hold high rank in the service, and the rest have gone unpunished; while, on the other hand, if the oppressed officer has ventured on the dangerous experiment of bringing his senior to trial, dismissal has been certain if he failed; (of which the chances are always considerable,) and not unfrequently, where he has succeeded, the public too, have an interest in this matter, which appears to be altogether overlooked. Lord Brudenell is next to command the 15th Hussars. For what then is he fit for what is he to be paid? As the master stands, the country is charged with an inefficient Lieutenant-Colonel—he will be a General hereafter, and then we shall pay an increased burden. These matters should be looked to. His Lordship gained his unmerited rank by one of those juggles which the Horse Guards has been so ingenious in contriving, in order to promote wealth and aristocracy, and he will hold his military sinecure to the end of his life, (or, if he sells out, a nominee in his shoes,) unless public attention is drawn to the subject.—*Examiner.*

IRISH PROSPERITY.
The receipts of the Dublin Post office have decreased in the amount of twenty per cent, in the last year. It should be recollected, while it is announced that there has been a decrease of 20 per cent, in the receipts of the Dublin Post-office, there has been a considerable saving in the collecting of the Post-office revenue—a fact, of course, that should have prepared us for a result the opposite of that which takes place.

MURDER, LOVE, AND MADNESS.—A murder occurred in the Lunatic Asylum of Clonmel, on Sunday last, under circumstances at once melancholy and peculiarly interesting. A young man, a miller, named Richard Bonkes, having placed his affections on a young woman of rather an interesting appearance, and his love being requited by a reciprocity of feeling on the part of the object of his choice, when about to lead her to the hyemal altar, was opposed, importuned, and prevailed upon by his friends to marry one of their choice. The marriage was solemnized, and at the lapse of three days, he exhibited symptoms of insanity, which having increased to an alarming extent, it was thought advisable to place him in the lunatic asylum—in his reavings he used to call back with rapture the memory of his former love, and, in frantic fits, imagined he pressed the object to his bosom. On Sunday last he attacked a patient in the same part of the asylum, and the deceased, an old man named George Egan, when about to restrain him, received a kick on the forehead with the iron heel of his shoe, which caused almost instant death. What appears rather singular in this melancholy affair is, that when visited by his former lover he appears perfectly sane, speaks rationally, but extremely dejected in his spirits—immediately on her departure, violent fits of phrensy ensue. Since the above has been put in type, we have been informed that Egan's death was caused by pleurisy, and not by the violence of the lunatic.—*Advertiser.*

MOTIVES FOR "IGNORANCE."—Mr. Henry Grattan, in his speech on Tuesday night, mentioned amongst the motives for ministerial "indignation" relative to Ireland, that according to a late publication by Surgeon White, descriptive of the state of Dublin, there were, in one parish out of a population of 23,000, no less than 17,000 paupers. Dispatches were received on Friday at the Colonial-office from General Bourke, the Governor of New South Wales.—*True Sun.*

CASE OF THE TRUE SUN.

To our great amazement, small as is our faith in juries, the Whig government has obtained a verdict against the *True Sun* for a political libel. The ministry was carried throughout the struggle for the reform bill by the threat of resisting taxation, on the ground that the representation was not real; for recommending recourse to the same expedient, the conductors of the *True Sun* are prosecuted and convicted; and it is put as competent to them to allege that the Commons House is not now representative of the people, as it was to the ministry, their supporters, and the whole body of reformers, to make the same statement before the passing of the reform bill? Whence has come the reform of the corrupt house? from the corrupt house. Men may have their doubts whether a house so extensively corrupted was capable of a thorough and complete reform.—Resistance to taxation, however, we have always regarded as the next step to insurrection, and as an act of revolution; we, therefore, expressed our disapproval of the resistance to the assessed taxes as an extreme expedient resorted to on an occasion insufficient to warrant or to bear it out; but after so much of high example had been given to this step resting on the opinion of the defective authority of parliament, it is harsh and partial in the extreme to pick out one journal for punishment, and to push the prosecution after the danger of resistance to taxation had passed away, and nothing could be apprehended from its suggestions. We regret that the pressure of parliamentary matter already in type will not allow us to enter more fully into the merits of the case. A more distinguished speech than that of the Solicitor-General we do not remember. He is apt for the work, and lauds the power for which he works, and all their doings, like a parasite of the Sun.—*Examiner.*

ALLEGED CHARGE OF BRIBERY AGAINST THE RIGHT HON. G. R. DAWSON.—A correspondent of the *London Journal* states that an information has been filed against the Right Hon. G. R. Dawson for several alleged acts of bribery at the last election for that city. The penalties sought to be recovered amount to a very large sum, and the number of individuals implicated is so great that the declaration runs to the unusual length of sixty-four skins of parchment. The *London Journal* adds, "We can state, without fear of contradiction, that these prosecutions are instituted by those who acted as the friends of the right hon. gentleman at the election, and not by any of those who opposed him."

SPORTING—A NOVEL RACE-COURSE.—Saturday, a considerable number of equestrians and pedestrians were attracted to the vicinity of the Pigeon-house and Irish-town, by an announcement which appeared in a morning paper, that a gentleman had undertaken, for a considerable wage, to ride upon horseback from Beggars-bush barracks to London-bridge, Irish-town, and Mr. Murphy's bathing-bridge, to the Pigeon-house, within five minutes. The distance is probably one mile and a half, and the course so dangerous to a horseman riding at full speed, that we at first thought the hoax was intended; such, however, was not the case, for Mr. Prendergast, of Lacken, county Tipperary, started from the barracks, about four o'clock, and performed the distance (employing two horses) in four minutes and forty-five seconds, thus, of course, winning his wager. We heard that two attempts to perform the same feat had been previously made without success.—*Dublin Paper.*

ROUND TOWER IN THE ISLAND OF DEVENISH, LOUGH ENNA.—This round tower, which is about a mile from Enniskillen, has suffered from the late storms. A seed from one of the trees in the neighbourhood, supposed to be carried to the top by a bird some years since, germinated at the joint of the apex or capping stone, and having grown to a considerable size, has gradually removed the stone from its original position. By the agitation of the tree during the late storms, we hear that the entire top of the tower has been shaken and bent, and may ere long, if not repaired, soon being quite perfect, become a ruin like the churches beside it. We should be glad some spirited individual would undertake to repair it, and we feel assured that the gentry and inhabitants of the neighbourhood would contribute to the expense, which would be little more than that of erecting the scaffolding.—*Erne Packet.*

LORD GRENVILLE'S WILL.—The will of the late Lord Grenville was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on Tuesday last, and the personal estate and effects of the deceased have been sworn to under the value of £25,000, the whole of which sum has been bequeathed to his Lordship's widow during her life, and upon her death it devolves upon his Lordship's brother absolutely. The will is comprised in one sheet of paper. The landed estates, which are of considerable value, pass to the heir at law.

THE FRENCH BAR.—The appeal of the advocates M. Dupont, Pissard, and Michel, against the decree of the Court of assizes, which suspended them from the exercise of their profession for limited periods, on account of their conduct during the trial of the twenty-seven, was rejected on Saturday by the Court of Cassation.

DELIVERY OF LETTERS, &c.—In reply to a communication from Mr. C. Davenport, of this city, a letter has been received from Sir W. Gossett, stating that in consequence of recent regulations in the Post Office, letters and newspapers will in a short time be delivered through the city, without any charge except the postage.—*Cork Constitution.*

The Marquis of Lansdowne has engaged Stanfield, the artist, to produce a series of pictures, which are to be placed in panels in an elegant saloon at Lansdowne House, built on purpose to receive them. Among those completed is a view of Venice.

A very alarming split has lately broken out among the workmen of the extensive calico-printing establishments in the neighbourhood of Glasgow. They are at this moment in a state of open insurrection.—*Courier.*

COMPETITION.—At the door of the Commercial Council-office, Manchester, there is a large placard thus inscribed:—"Beat this who can: inside or outside to Sheffield, what you please!"

COURT OF EXCHEQUER—SATURDAY.

A FEMALE LAWYER.
Mr. Martley, K. C., applied to the court, in a case in which a Mrs. Reynolds was concerned, when, to the surprise of the court, the lady stood up, and addressed their lordships, and produced such an impression upon them by her very clear statement, that Mr. Martley's motion was refused. The lady subsequently applied that Mr. Martley's motion might be discharged with costs.

The Lord Chancellor has been pleased to appoint Patrick O'Connor, Esq. of Enfield, county Roscommon, to the commission of the peace for that county.

which he would receive to... about to put to his Majesty... the right hon. gentleman... admitted that... was brought to a satisfactory... tranquillity, and prosper... id not be secured. He (Mr... agreed with the right hon. g... The Irish members di... subjects, but this was one o... agreed. He hoped that the... would come to the considerat... a fixed determination to settl... would give entire satisfact... of Ireland. He also hoped th... them would not suffer any d... led in this case. There had... in reference to this very que... three (the bills had been... ministers, and yet the matte... far from any settlement of th... of his (Mr. O'Connell's) sta... respecting the number of elect... might have been inaccurate... did not the right hon. gentl... statement, when he admitted... the title-payers still laboure... the old system which this v... was intended to relieve. A... hing short of some... sure of relief would be... ver arrangement that m... ing interests should be receiv... think continuing the impost of... Establishment upon a Catholi... They could not please... to play at a game at which... win and nobody to lose, b... a word, if they wished to t... must be atotal extinction of... Not an extinction merely... extinction in fact. He had a... pose, which he would state... it was not a plan which wou... off the shoulders of the land... to relieve industry from... which it at present laboure... ndford's share, which would... would be fully adequate to... the Irish clergy. There was... of Kerry, which he would... stration of the present tith... could convince every rational... could not be permitted to... of Kilconour there was not... a habitant, and at no period... in no part of Ireland were... and oppressively enforced... fact to familiarize the right h... of the same class, in order... the facility of adopting any... totally extinguish tithes in... re was no portion of the popu... (Hear, hear.) If the right h... an antidote against the Union... tithes. It was such grievanc... to the agitation of that que... tended more to promote the... an the predecessor of the right... in the cabinet, at least no m... to influence the councils of... a settlement of questions re... who was regarded with dis... people of that country. The co... appeared by the public papers... government had been carryi... co with a person, who it was... of the Coercion Bill; this, if... most discredit to the g... statement to which he allude... the honourable member fo... ed that statement to be a ca... the statement was, that it was... all the secret machinery by... obtained by ministers. He... that statement—but it was not... of himself *non meum hic sermo*.... alumnious statement had been... they not a right to demand... itation? It was their right to... that secret machinery. When... had been made they had a right... members the means of refus... he wished to inquire what that... was. The statement made was... a member who spoke violently... every clause of the Coercion... lters and said, "Don't bate... bill, for if you do no person... you." (Hear, hear.) They... you!" His (Mr. O'Connell's)... they would condescend to speak... all. But the calumny went... you." "Yes," said he, "but I... I could not expect to be re... unless from Ireland, and... that opinion in the house. I... see of being returned again... if such did exist, would be no... to that house either. (Hear... O'Connell) thought that the co... had a right to know whether... their representatives any p... g so differently from the opi... and who that person was.—... not believe that any such sta... ed by his Majesty's ministers... statement as respected them to... He believed the statement, as... members, to be perfectly an... He had talked to every man... and they had each individually... ed against it. He knew. It... that his Majesty's ministers... such thing. He declared that... utterly false. However, what... e felt it to be his duty to inqu... e whether it was true that... ery did in reality exist. He... asking the noble lord two di... ch he was sure the noble lord... answer—First, whether the... by the noble lord or any mem... that an Irish member, who... sed against the Irish coercion... such language in private to any... ty's government; and, se... Irish member had used such... tel, to any member of his Ma...

Lord ALTHORP said the hon. and learned gentleman has asked whether I or any other member of the ministry asserted that one of the Irish members had made to us such a statement as that which was alleged. To that question I answer so far as I can, that neither myself nor any other member of his Majesty's ministers, so far as I can ascertain, did make any such statement. With regard to the second question, whether any such member who voted against the Coercion Bill made such a statement to the government, I am free to say that no Irish member made such a statement to my cabinet minister. So far I have directly answered the questions put to me by the hon. and learned gentleman, but I do not think that I would be acting the manly part if I answered the question short, and, therefore, whilst I say that no one of the Irish members made such a statement to any one of the cabinet ministers, I have good reason to understand that more than one of those members who spoke and voted, did in private conversation express very different language, and hold very different opinions. (Great cheering.) Mr. O'CONNELL expressed himself astonished at that cheer. Why that shrieking? Why not name the individual? Perhaps he was wrong in using the word shrieking. He would retract that word. Perhaps he had not put the point sufficiently to the noble lord. He would come to the broad question at once. Who were these individuals who used and expressed those opinions? With regard to the first question he had been sufficiently answered; with regard to the second, he would ask the noble lord to name the individuals? Lord ALTHORP said that in such a case he certainly would feel it a matter of difficulty to name any individuals, he was ready to name them if they called on him.—(Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL—I am authorised by all the Irish members, to call on you to name the party to whom this invective is imputed. Lord ALTHORP would not feel himself justified in naming any individual, unless called on by the individual himself.—(Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL—Then I wish to know, am I the man? Lord ALTHORP—No. Mr. FINN—Am I? Lord ALTHORP—No. Mr. O'DWYER—Am I? Here the SPEAKER interposed, and rose to order. The SPEAKER said that he was unwilling to give personal offence to any person, but thought such discussion quite irregular. A question of far less interest than the present might lead to results which every person should regret. It was not usual for that house to entertain any mere personal questions unless such as were calculated to assume a public character. Mr. O'CONNELL hoped that the house would hear with the Irish members on a question that so deeply interested them. Mr. HUME rose to order, and objected to the discussion, on the ground that the house could not entertain expressions used at a public meeting out of the house. Mr. O'CONNELL contended that they ought to give the Irish members of the house the fullest satisfaction on a question so deeply interesting to their characters. It was due to the people of Ireland, it was due to the character of that house, to know whether any of its members expressed opinions there different from those which he privately entertained. He trusted the noble lord would not stop short; he thought the noble lord was bound to state as much as he respectfully demanded, in order that the parties charged with this gross inconsistency of conduct should be declared guilty or not guilty. To this extent he felt he was justified in requesting the noble lord to make the statement to which he had adverted. He begged again respectfully to urge upon the noble lord the situation in which many individuals were placed in that house, in consequence of the charges made against them; and he was sure that the noble lord would give the explanation which he requested.—(Cries of "Don't name!") Mr. H. GRATTAN thought that the question ought to come before the house in the shape of a breach of privilege, by which means the parties who had made the attack complained of might be brought before that house. The charge in question was made against a member of that house, and consequently cognizance of the matter could be taken by that house in the way that he suggested. He held in his hand an extract which showed that three persons were brought to the bar of that house under very similar circumstances—namely, the Marquis of Suffolk, the Archbishop of Bath, and the Bishop of Lincoln. All the Irish members who spoke or voted against the Irish coercion bill were connected with this charge, and surely he thought that the most positive and direct method ought to be adopted by the house for the purpose of enabling the house to ascertain the truth or falsehood of the charge. (Hear.) The honourable member then adverted to the effect of these imputations upon Irish members as calculated in a great degree to lessen their exertions in the cause of their country, and instanced the fact that although thirty English members had promised to vote with him against the Coercion Bill, yet, owing to the imputations that had been thrown out against the Irish members, only two of those members voted with him upon that occasion. (Loud laughter.) It was evident now from what the noble lord stated to the house that the particular charge made against the Irish members was not true. (Hear, and "No.") The subject, however, required fuller investigation, and if his learned friend the member for Dublin did not follow it up—(Mr. O'Connell—"I am following it up")—he (Mr. Grattan) most assuredly would call upon the house to request the attendance, at their bar, of the editor of the paper in which the attack appeared—("Hear")—or call upon the individual who was reported to have made the charge, to appear personally at the bar of that house to answer any questions which might be put to him on the subject. Mr. SHELL rose, and said that the noble lord (Althorp) had distinctly answered the question put to him by his learned friend, by saying that no Irish member had either personally to a cabinet minister, or by means of a written communication, made the statement which formed the ground of attack upon all the Irish members, so that it was very evident that the direct charge made against the Irish members was borne out. He perceived that a right hon. gentleman opposite seemed to dissent from the statement. He hoped that right hon. gentleman would cease from that mode of dissent until he had concluded.—(Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") Well, then, it appeared that neither personally, nor by means of any writ-

ten communication, had such a declaration as that attributed to an Irish member, been made to a cabinet minister. Lord ALTHORP admitted that neither personally nor by means of any communication, had any Irish member made the statement attributed to him. Mr. SHELL, in continuation, proceeded to say that, although no declaration such as that attributed to an Irish member as having been made to a cabinet minister, yet that a statement in effect had been made by some Irish members, and that he (Lord Althorp) would take upon himself the responsibility of naming who the individuals were, if the question were asked him. He now asked the noble lord if he were one of these individuals.—(Cries of "Hear," and a loud "Name.") Lord ALTHORP—I then declare that the hon. and learned gentleman is one of the individuals alluded to.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. SHELL—I then in the presence of this house—in the face of the country, and in the face also of Heaven, declare that the individual who made that statement to the noble lord, respecting me, has been guilty of a foul and deliberate falsehood.—(Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL said, that, as far as he was concerned, this subject would cease; but before it had closed, he must beg to apologise, in the most humble manner, to the honourable and learned member for Hull, for the attacks which he had made upon him. He had done great injustice to that honourable and learned gentleman, and he was ready, either in that house or out of it, to give the hon. and learned gentleman every reparation possible. There were other members in the same predicament with his hon. friend below him, but he (Mr. O'Connell) had no doubt that they would be able to retrace themselves as his honourable friend, whose slightest word he believed without question. Having stated his views on the subject he would now abstain from dividing the house on the address, and would simply content himself by giving a negative vote.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. HILL, after a few words, which were not audible in the gallery, said that his attention had not been directed to the words said to have been used by him until some time after that in which they were spoken; and that what he said on the occasion alluded to was totally unpremeditated. The hon. member then went on to explain that he could not consistently with his feelings give such explanations as would have removed the personal liability of himself to another, seeing that the affair was made personal with him; and that he would not object to any motion for enquiry, but would second such a motion if made by any hon. member opposite. He would accept the concession made by the hon. member for Dublin. The SPEAKER he could not let the matter subsist without calling on the house to coincide with his opinion, namely, that as the matter had now been brought within the jurisdiction of the house, no measures should be founded upon it, without the jurisdiction of the house. (Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL expressed his concurrence in the sentiments delivered by the Speaker. The house was the fittest tribunal, and he would tomorrow make such a motion for a committee. The SPEAKER put it to the hon. member whether he had not better fall in with the evident views of the house? Mr. SHELL wished to be told if the noble lord would take the responsibility of the affair upon himself, as expressed by the noble lord. "No, no." This was what he had understood the noble lord to have said. The noble lord had stated that the communication had been made by a person in whom he placed so much confidence, that he would take upon himself the responsibility. (Hear.) Lord PALMERSTON said, if he rightly understood his noble friend, what he said was, he held himself responsible for the truth of this, such a statement had been made to him; but he was not responsible for the truth of that statement.—(Hear.) Mr. SHELL said that the noble lord held himself responsible for his informant, and he (Mr. SHELL) distinctly charged that informant with falsehood. Lord ALTHORP did not retract what he had said. Sir R. INGLIS was sure that the noble lord did not use the word responsibility in the conventional sense in which it was used by the hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. SHELL), and which he (Sir R. Inglis) hoped would never be recognised in an English assembly. (Hear.) He hoped the house would interfere. After a few words from Colonel EVANS and Lord JOHN RUSSELL, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT moved that the house do enjoin the hon. member interested in the present discussion from renewing it out of the house. Mr. SHELL said, that the refusal of the noble lord to furnish him with the name of his informant, placed him (Mr. S.) in a peculiar predicament, and left him no alternative. If the noble lord would either give him up the name of his informant, or state that he might be mistaken, then the matter should rest; but as the noble lord had invited him to this course—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—there was no other alternative left for him to adopt. In the statement which the noble lord had made to the house he went beyond the information required from him. He had been asked whether any Irish member had gone to the cabinet and made a communication to ministers to the effect imputed. That was the strict question. (Hear.) But the noble lord went beyond this interrogatory, for he said that though no Irish member had expressly stated this, yet that a communication had been made to him to that effect, by persons on whose truth he placed confidence. A deep wrong had been done him (Mr. S.), as was manifest to the house, when the noble lord refused to give him the name of his informant. Who was this informant of the noble lord? What manner of man was he? Perhaps he was a member of that house, present at that moment, and shrinking from the effects which his malignant representation of a private conversation with him (Mr. S.) had produced.—(Hear, hear, hear.) He had not told the noble lord that by taking the responsibility on himself, he had become a party to the slander. He (Mr. S.) sat down when the noble lord took the responsibility upon himself. Mr. E. STANLEY thought the house should insist on both parties, the noble lord and the hon. and learned member for Tipperary, giving their word to the house that nothing would be done in the matter out of doors.

The SPEAKER said, that he (the Speaker) was sure the hon. and learned member for Tipperary would not better his position by refusing to comply with the wish expressed, that he would pledge himself not to take any proceeding in the matter out of the house. The hon. and learned gentleman, he was certain, would, on cool calculation, see the reasonableness of the view which he (the Speaker) took of the question. If he did not make the suggested pledge voluntarily, the house must do its duty, however reluctantly. Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he thought the hon. and learned gentleman would be making no dishonourable concession to the house, either as a man or as a member of that house, by voluntarily declaring that he would take no further steps in the matter. Mr. SHELL felt himself in a very peculiar and unpleasant position. The noble lord said he believed in the accuracy of the information. ("Hear, hear," from the Irish members.) He said he would not give up the name of his informant, but would vouch for the truth of the communication. (Cries of "No, no.") The noble lord had made a gratuitous statement when he expressed his belief in the truth of the communication made to him. Mr. STANLEY had not communicated either directly or indirectly with his noble friend on the subject; but if he might exercise his own judgment on the matter, the noble lord could never have meant, by the language he made use of, anything offensive to the hon. and learned gentleman. The question which the honourable and learned gentleman put to his noble friend was, whether he (Mr. SHELL) was the individual meant. The noble lord said he was one of the parties; that he had received a communication to that effect, but would not give up the name of his informant, but would take the responsibility on himself. There was no individual on the face of the earth more incapable of giving personal offence than his noble friend. With all the hon. and learned gentleman's sensibility, as a member of that house, and as a man of honour, he thought there could be nothing dishonourable in following the course which had been suggested to him. (Hear, hear.) Lord ALTHORP said that all he meant by the terms he had employed simply was, that he vouched for the respectability of his informant, but that he would not give up the name of that informant. He disclaimed all wish to give offence in making such a statement; but if any hon. gentleman did take offence at his words, he (Lord Althorp) would not shrink from what he had said. (Hear, hear.) Colonel LEITH HAY thought that a more injurious course to himself than that which the hon. and learned gentleman was pursuing, could not be adopted. (Hear, hear.) He would tell the hon. and learned member that, if he wished it, he (Col. Leith Hay) would also take the responsibility upon himself. (Hear, hear.) Mr. RUTHEVEN rose amidst loud cries of "Oh, oh!" He would ask what encouragement Irish members had to speak in that house, when they were assailed with such cries as those he then heard. He wished to know from which of the hon. members those cries proceeded. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He (Mr. Rutheven) had no wish to make matters worse. He was glad the noble lord did not wish to shield himself by saying he spoke in his ministerial character. He (Mr. Rutheven) would interpret the language made use of in the way such language usually was interpreted, and he believed so to say that the hon. and learned member for Tipperary was placed by it in a dishonourable position. He would have expected that the noble lord and his friends would have at once acquiesced in the wish to have the matter investigated. It was due to the hon. and learned gentleman that such inquiry should be instituted. He trusted the Irish members would unite together and demand that the inquiry be made. If it should be refused, it would be a harsh and cruel thing. He (Mr. Rutheven) believed the statement was a calumny, a foul slander on the hon. and learned gentleman. Sir HENRY HARDINGE thought the noble lord was placed in a difficult situation. He thought the parties should be put under temporary restraint, in order that the house might have time to deliberate on what course they ought to adopt in the matter. Mr. COBBETT held the whole matter which had that evening occupied the house to great contempt; but then he must say that he thought that the honourable and learned member for Tipperary had been harshly treated. The state of the case appeared to him (Mr. Cobbett) to be similar to this—one of a company was accused of stealing a horse. An individual gets up and says "I did it!" He is answered by another, "Yes; you are the man." The accused demands the name of the informant; the other says, "Oh, no, I won't give it up; but I myself assume the responsibility." (Laughter.) Mr. O'DWYER did not rise for the purpose of adding to the excitement which already existed on this painful subject; but he felt that he would be guilty of a gross neglect of his duty, if he did not express his conviction that it would be unjust to restrain the hon. and learned gentleman from taking any course his honour suggested, while the noble lord was left at liberty not to retract one word of the expressions he had made use of.—From the explanations which had been made that evening in the course of the present discussion, the communication had been deprived of the harsh features it previously possessed. It was admitted that the hon. member for Hull had told a foul calumny. Nothing of the kind alleged by him had occurred—never had a more gross attack been made on a body of respectable individuals. He hoped the author would yet be given up to receive the reward due to him for so outrageous a calumny. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT moved, that the Speaker put it to both parties whether or not they would voluntarily assure the house that nothing should be done out of the house relative to this matter. Mr. HILL was extremely sorry that anything which he had said should have led to this unpleasant discussion. When he first heard the report alluded to, he believed it to be true—he still believed it to be true—and if a committee was appointed to inquire into the matter, he would use his best exertions to furnish every possible information on the subject; and if it should turn out that the report was unfounded, he would feel it his duty to make reparation for the error into which he had been led. The SPEAKER said, the longer the discussion on this topic was extended, the deeper did they get entangled in differences and misunderstandings on it. He thought the hon. and learned gentleman must be aware that it was now his (the Speak-

er's) duty to call on both parties to assure the house that no proceedings should take place on this subject out of doors. He thought it right to tell them, that the house did not propose harsher terms to them than would be proposed to other members similarly circumstanced. There was no other alternative left, unless the parties, on foreseeing that the decision of the house would be, would anticipate that decision, by giving a voluntary assurance that this matter should not be prosecuted out of doors. It was now his (the Speaker's) duty to call on each of the parties to see whether they would give that assurance or not. The SPEAKER then put the question to Mr. SHELL, who made no answer. Some confusion occurred in the house at this moment. We understood Sir FRANCIS BURDETT to move, before the question was put to Lord Althorp, that both parties be put under restraint. On the question being then put to the noble lord, he said that he had received no offence, and that nothing that had passed that evening should induce him to proceed further. Mr. O'CONNELL said that the noble lord might well say he had received no offence, but he had given offence. The noble lord had not gone far enough in his denial of any intention to proceed further with the matter, because he was, to use his (Mr. O'Connell's) own law terms, defendant, and not plaintiff in the case. He felt that his hon. and learned friend had been harshly used by the house. Lord ALTHORP would not give, but would respond to a call. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) The SPEAKER then put the motion, that they be both taken into custody, which was agreed to without a dissentient voice. Lord Althorp and Mr. SHELL were then removed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. MONROVUS OF CARRICKFERGUS AND WARWICK. Mr. O'CONNELL obtained a further suspension of the issue of a new writ for the borough of Carrickfergus till that day three weeks. Lord Althorp and Mr. SHELL were then removed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. An Hon. MEMBER gave notice of a motion for the 20th March, for an address praying his Majesty to hold his Court and Parliament occasionally in Ireland. LORD ALTHORP'S EXPLANATION. Mr. STANLEY, who had been in communication with Lord Althorp, here entered the house, and, addressing the Speaker, said he would not, in the information he had to communicate, make any observations upon what had previously taken place, nor renew the discussion on the merits of a question which had for so long a time occupied the consideration of the house on that evening.—His noble friend was now ready to give full assurance that he would take no further steps in this business, nor resort to any hostile measures, in consequence of anything which had occurred in the previous proceedings. Having made this statement, which he hoped would prove satisfactory to the house, he (Mr. Stanley) would now move that Lord Althorp be removed from arrest. (Cheers.) Mr. HUME seconded the motion; and added that, under the circumstances, the Speaker had no other alternative than that to which he had resorted—an alternative in which he (Mr. Hume) conformed, as the only means calculated to sustain the dignity and authority of the house. The SPEAKER, before putting the question, said that though he had so often addressed them during the discussion which led to it, he would still, in a very words, express his great satisfaction at this result. After the observations made by the right hon. secretary, there could not be two opinions upon the subject. No one could doubt that, in the course he adopted, the noble lord had greatly added to his private and public character. The motion was then carried, when Mr. RUTHEVEN (as well as we could catch his observations) urged even justice and equal treatment of both parties. Mr. SHAW urged the propriety of the member for Hull making a declaration similar to that of Lord Althorp. Mr. HILL (as well as we could hear, amid the cheers for Lord Althorp, who just then entered) said, that he would, of course, if called on, bow to the decision of the Chamberlain. Mr. SHELL'S LIBERATION. After a lapse of some minutes, Mr. HUME entered the house, and said that, after what had transpired, he and other friends of the hon. member for Tipperary had been with him, and he had the satisfaction to state that the hon. and learned gentleman, being anxious to show his respect to the orders of the house, and without giving any opinion upon the subject which had placed him in his present situation, had determined to submit himself to the wishes. (Hear.) He, with other friends, had stated to the hon. and learned gentleman that in so doing he was confiding that a man of honor, he would place himself in a higher and more estimable situation. The only feeling by which the hon. and learned gentleman was influenced was a disposition to conform to those salutary orders which the house, in its wisdom, had thought proper to enforce. He therefore moved that Richard Lalor Sheil, Esq. should be discharged out of the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, offering, on his part, an assurance that the hon. and learned gentleman would not prosecute out of that house the subject which had occupied so much of their time that evening. Sir E. KNATCHBULL seconded the motion. The SPEAKER, in rising to put the question, begged to express his great satisfaction at the course taken by the honourable and learned gentleman, and he would assure the hon. and learned member, that not only the house, but the country at large, would feel that he had best maintained his own honour, and best consulted his personal dignity, by upholding the dignity and character of that house. (Hear.) The question was then put and carried. Shortly after Mr. SHELL entered the house, accompanied by Mr. FINN. The hon. member was cheered on re-ascending his seat. Colonel EVANS put a question to Lord Althorp concerning his financial statement, which the latter said would be brought on next week or the week after. The house adjourned at ten o'clock. HOUSE OF LORDS—THURSDAY, FEB. 6. The house met at four o'clock. THE KING'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS. THE LORD CHANCELLOR then read to their lordships his Majesty's answer to their address, which was as follows:—

"I think you for your loyal and dutiful address. The assurances which you give me of your fidelity and zeal in the discharge of your important duties, and of your firm resolution to support the established institutions of the state, are such as I expected from you, and are, I am confident, in perfect accordance with the general feeling of my subjects. "On my part you may rest satisfied that I have never been unmindful of the sacred obligations attached to the station to which Divine Providence has called me, and that the power thus vested in me will never be employed but for the safety, honour, and welfare of a brave and loyal people, whose liberties, as the sacred support of our national prosperity and greatness, I shall always hold it to be my first duty to protect and maintain. "On the motion of the Earl of SHAFFESBURY, I have addressed and the answer were ordered to be printed. The house then adjourned till to-morrow, at half-past three o'clock. HOUSE OF COMMONS—FEB. 6. The SPEAKER resumed the chair at five o'clock precisely. THE KING'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS. The SPEAKER acquainted the house that he had received his Majesty's answer to the address of his faithful Commons. The right hon. gentleman then read the answer. It thanked the Commons for their promise of the usual supplies for the business of the country; it expressed the satisfaction with which his Majesty received their assurance of co-operation and support, in his intended endeavours to preserve intact the legislative Union existing between Great Britain and Ireland; and it concluded with an intimation to the house that his Majesty would be always happy to co-operate most cordially with them in all measures which they should propose for a redress of grievances. KING'S INNS—INNS OF COURT. Mr. O'CONNELL gave notice of a motion for the 20th of March, to institute an inquiry into the practice of the King's Inns and Inns of Court, in the cities of Dublin and London, with a view to proposing a plan for their reformation. COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY. On the motion of LORD ALTHORP the order of the day, that the house resolve itself into a committee for the consideration of the subjects proposed in the King's speech, was put from the chair. Mr. HUME—Before this motion, which he was perfectly well aware was a mere formal one, should be put to the house, he would take that opportunity of suggesting a hope that, previous to the house resolving itself into a committee on the supplies, they would insist upon having the estimates of the probable expenditures for the ensuing year, laid entirely and fully before them, and regulate the practice of ministers in laying them on their table piece-meal, a practice which, he trusted would now be abandoned. Mr. O'CONNELL said, that besides this there was another consideration of very great importance to be considered, before the house should resolve itself into committee. It had been admitted by the noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the vigilance and generosity of the King's speech was the effect of design, and that the absence of all details was intended by the framers of it. Now he (Mr. O'C.) complained that the present speech in this particular was worse than even the worst of its predecessors. The old custom of parliament was, that the ministers should state the grievances of the country, and, of course, the remedies they proposed for them first, and then proceeded to talk of the supplies. The present speech had said nothing at all about grievances—that was nothing of any consequence—and still less about relief or remedy. What he (Mr. O'Connell) particularly wished to impress upon the house was, that previous to going into a committee for the purpose of granting supplies for the current year, they should first demand of his Majesty's ministers their plan, or at least a sketch of it, for the relief of the acknowledged existing distress. The motion was then agreed to, that the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole house to-morrow, for the purpose of taking into consideration the King's speech, and granting his Majesty the required supplies. BREACH OF PRIVILEGE. Mr. O'CONNELL rose for the purpose of bringing before the house a matter relating to the subject of its privileges, and the breach of them consequent upon the occurrences of last night. It was a subject which he thought required the fullest investigation. It was exceedingly desirable that a representative of that house should be not only pure but above suspicion. It was due to the constituents of the honourable member for Tipperary to grant the fullest investigation into the charge which had been preferred against him. He was exceedingly anxious, therefore, as was also his honourable friend the member for Coadunty, that this investigation should be conducted in such a manner, consistent with the rules of that house, as would afford the most full and thorough investigation into the whole of this transaction.—He was quite ready to adopt the suggestions of such hon. members as were more experienced than himself with the rules of that house in respect to the course to be pursued in seeking for an enquiry. His feelings, he confessed, were strongly interested in the present question. It would, therefore, in his opinion, be most desirable that the gentlemen who might be selected should be neutral, in order that the investigation should be satisfactorily conducted. The charge which had been brought by the noble lord against his esteemed and valued friend, the honourable member for Tipperary, was one of the most grave and serious character, for it imputed to him deliberate treachery.—(Cries of "Hear, hear.")—and no man would deserve to be for a single hour a member of that house who would remain for a moment under such an imputation, without demanding a full investigation into his conduct. (Hear, hear.)—He threw himself upon the indulgence of the house, if he should be wrong in the course, which he meant to pursue; and he again solicited the advice of hon. members who had more experience than himself in matters of that nature. He would now state the grounds upon which he claimed the present inquiry. He had read last night in a newspaper, an extract from a speech said to have been delivered at Hull by an hon. member of that house. He knew not how he could bring the question before the house unless as a breach of privilege. It was admitted last night that a portion of the speech attached to that hon. member was not uttered by him. In the first place, he did not confine the charge to one Irish member; the hon. member to whom the speech was attributed, had admitted that he referred to more than one Irish member in his speech at Hull. In the next place, he denied that he had spoken of any secret machinery which seats were obtained in that house. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had corroborated Mr. Hill in his denial, because

ten communication, had such a declaration as that attributed to an Irish member, been made to a cabinet minister. Lord ALTHORP admitted that neither personally nor by means of any communication, had any Irish member made the statement attributed to him. Mr. SHELL, in continuation, proceeded to say that, although no declaration such as that attributed to an Irish member as having been made to a cabinet minister, yet that a statement in effect had been made by some Irish members, and that he (Lord Althorp) would take upon himself the responsibility of naming who the individuals were, if the question were asked him. He now asked the noble lord if he were one of these individuals.—(Cries of "Hear," and a loud "Name.") Lord ALTHORP—I then declare that the hon. and learned gentleman is one of the individuals alluded to.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. SHELL—I then in the presence of this house—in the face of the country, and in the face also of Heaven, declare that the individual who made that statement to the noble lord, respecting me, has been guilty of a foul and deliberate falsehood.—(Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL said, that, as far as he was concerned, this subject would cease; but before it had closed, he must beg to apologise, in the most humble manner, to the honourable and learned member for Hull, for the attacks which he had made upon him. He had done great injustice to that honourable and learned gentleman, and he was ready, either in that house or out of it, to give the hon. and learned gentleman every reparation possible. There were other members in the same predicament with his hon. friend below him, but he (Mr. O'Connell) had no doubt that they would be able to retrace themselves as his honourable friend, whose slightest word he believed without question. Having stated his views on the subject he would now abstain from dividing the house on the address, and would simply content himself by giving a negative vote.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. HILL, after a few words, which were not audible in the gallery, said that his attention had not been directed to the words said to have been used by him until some time after that in which they were spoken; and that what he said on the occasion alluded to was totally unpremeditated. The hon. member then went on to explain that he could not consistently with his feelings give such explanations as would have removed the personal liability of himself to another, seeing that the affair was made personal with him; and that he would not object to any motion for enquiry, but would second such a motion if made by any hon. member opposite. He would accept the concession made by the hon. member for Dublin. The SPEAKER he could not let the matter subsist without calling on the house to coincide with his opinion, namely, that as the matter had now been brought within the jurisdiction of the house, no measures should be founded upon it, without the jurisdiction of the house. (Hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL expressed his concurrence in the sentiments delivered by the Speaker. The house was the fittest tribunal, and he would tomorrow make such a motion for a committee. The SPEAKER put it to the hon. member whether he had not better fall in with the evident views of the house? Mr. SHELL wished to be told if the noble lord would take the responsibility of the affair upon himself, as expressed by the noble lord. "No, no." This was what he had understood the noble lord to have said. The noble lord had stated that the communication had been made by a person in whom he placed so much confidence, that he would take upon himself the responsibility. (Hear.) Lord PALMERSTON said, if he rightly understood his noble friend, what he said was, he held himself responsible for the truth of this, such a statement had been made to him; but he was not responsible for the truth of that statement.—(Hear.) Mr. SHELL said that the noble lord held himself responsible for his informant, and he (Mr. SHELL) distinctly charged that informant with falsehood. Lord ALTHORP did not retract what he had said. Sir R. INGLIS was sure that the noble lord did not use the word responsibility in the conventional sense in which it was used by the hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. SHELL), and which he (Sir R. Inglis) hoped would never be recognised in an English assembly. (Hear.) He hoped the house would interfere. After a few words from Colonel EVANS and Lord JOHN RUSSELL, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT moved that the house do enjoin the hon. member interested in the present discussion from renewing it out of the house. Mr. SHELL said, that the refusal of the noble lord to furnish him with the name of his informant, placed him (Mr. S.) in a peculiar predicament, and left him no alternative. If the noble lord would either give him up the name of his informant, or state that he might be mistaken, then the matter should rest; but as the noble lord had invited him to this course—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—there was no other alternative left for him to adopt. In the statement which the noble lord had made to the house he went beyond the information required from him. He had been asked whether any Irish member had gone to the cabinet and made a communication to ministers to the effect imputed. That was the strict question. (Hear.) But the noble lord went beyond this interrogatory, for he said that though no Irish member had expressly stated this, yet that a communication had been made to him to that effect, by persons on whose truth he placed confidence. A deep wrong had been done him (Mr. S.), as was manifest to the house, when the noble lord refused to give him the name of his informant. Who was this informant of the noble lord? What manner of man was he? Perhaps he was a member of that house, present at that moment, and shrinking from the effects which his malignant representation of a private conversation with him (Mr. S.) had produced.—(Hear, hear, hear.) He had not told the noble lord that by taking the responsibility on himself, he had become a party to the slander. He (Mr. S.) sat down when the noble lord took the responsibility upon himself. Mr. E. STANLEY thought the house should insist on both parties, the noble lord and the hon. and learned member for Tipperary, giving their word to the house that nothing would be done in the matter out of doors.

The SPEAKER said, that he (the Speaker) was sure the hon. and learned member for Tipperary would not better his position by refusing to comply with the wish expressed, that he would pledge himself not to take any proceeding in the matter out of the house. The hon. and learned gentleman, he was certain, would, on cool calculation, see the reasonableness of the view which he (the Speaker) took of the question. If he did not make the suggested pledge voluntarily, the house must do its duty, however reluctantly. Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he thought the hon. and learned gentleman would be making no dishonourable concession to the house, either as a man or as a member of that house, by voluntarily declaring that he would take no further steps in the matter. Mr. SHELL felt himself in a very peculiar and unpleasant position. The noble lord said he believed in the accuracy of the information. ("Hear, hear," from the Irish members.) He said he would not give up the name of his informant, but would vouch for the truth of the communication. (Cries of "No, no.") The noble lord had made a gratuitous statement when he expressed his belief in the truth of the communication made to him. Mr. STANLEY had not communicated either directly or indirectly with his noble friend on the subject; but if he might exercise his own judgment on the matter, the noble lord could never have meant, by the language he made use of, anything offensive to the hon. and learned gentleman. The question which the honourable and learned gentleman put to his noble friend was, whether he (Mr. SHELL) was the individual meant. The noble lord said he was one of the parties; that he had received a communication to that effect, but would not give up the name of his informant, but would take the responsibility on himself. There was no individual on the face of the earth more incapable of giving personal offence than his noble friend. With all the hon. and learned gentleman's sensibility, as a member of that house, and as a man of honour, he thought there could be nothing dishonourable in following the course which had been suggested to him. (Hear, hear.) Lord ALTHORP said that all he meant by the terms he had employed simply was, that he vouched for the respectability of his informant, but that he would not give up the name of that informant. He disclaimed all wish to give offence in making such a statement; but if any hon. gentleman did take offence at his words, he (Lord Althorp) would not shrink from what he had said. (Hear, hear.) Colonel LEITH HAY thought that a more injurious course to himself than that which the hon. and learned gentleman was pursuing, could not be adopted. (Hear, hear.) He would tell the hon. and learned member that, if he wished it, he (Col. Leith Hay) would also take the responsibility upon himself. (Hear, hear.) Mr. RUTHEVEN rose amidst loud cries of "Oh, oh!" He would ask what encouragement Irish members had to speak in that house, when they were assailed with such cries as those he then heard. He wished to know from which of the hon. members those cries proceeded. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He (Mr. Rutheven) had no wish to make matters worse. He was glad the noble lord did not wish to shield himself by saying he spoke in his ministerial character. He (Mr. Rutheven) would interpret the language made use of in the way such language usually was interpreted, and he believed so to say that the hon. and learned member for Tipperary was placed by it in a dishonourable position. He would have expected that the noble lord and his friends would have at once acquiesced in the wish to have the matter investigated. It was due to the hon. and learned gentleman that such inquiry should be instituted. He trusted the Irish members would unite together and demand that the inquiry be made. If it should be refused, it would be a harsh and cruel thing. He (Mr. Rutheven) believed the statement was a calumny, a foul slander on the hon. and learned gentleman. Sir HENRY HARDINGE thought the noble lord was placed in a difficult situation. He thought the parties should be put under temporary restraint, in order that the house might have time to deliberate on what course they ought to adopt in the matter. Mr. COBBETT held the whole matter which had that evening occupied the house to great contempt; but then he must say that he thought that the honourable and learned member for Tipperary had been harshly treated. The state of the case appeared to him (Mr. Cobbett) to be similar to this—one of a company was accused of stealing a horse. An individual gets up and says "I did it!" He is answered by another, "Yes; you are the man." The accused demands the name of the informant; the other says, "Oh, no, I won't give it up; but I myself assume the responsibility." (Laughter.) Mr. O'DWYER did not rise for the purpose of adding to the excitement which already existed on this painful subject; but he felt that he would be guilty of a gross neglect of his duty, if he did not express his conviction that it would be unjust to restrain the hon. and learned gentleman from taking any course his honour suggested, while the noble lord was left at liberty not to retract one word of the expressions he had made use of.—From the explanations which had been made that evening in the course of the present discussion, the communication had been deprived of the harsh features it previously possessed. It was admitted that the hon. member for Hull had told a foul calumny. Nothing of the kind alleged by him had occurred—never had a more gross attack been made on a body of respectable individuals. He hoped the author would yet be given up to receive the reward due to him for so outrageous a calumny. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT moved, that the Speaker put it to both parties whether or not they would voluntarily assure the house that nothing should be done out of the house relative to this matter. Mr. HILL was extremely sorry that anything which he had said should have led to this unpleasant discussion. When he first heard the report alluded to, he believed it to be true—he still believed it to be true—and if a committee was appointed to inquire into the matter, he would use his best exertions to furnish every possible information on the subject; and if it should turn out that the report was unfounded, he would feel it his duty to make reparation for the error into which he had been led. The SPEAKER said, the longer the discussion on this topic was extended, the deeper did they get entangled in differences and misunderstandings on it. He thought the hon. and learned gentleman must be aware that it was now his (the Speak-

er's) duty to call on both parties to assure the house that no proceedings should take place on this subject out of doors. He thought it right to tell them, that the house did not propose harsher terms to them than would be proposed to other members similarly circumstanced. There was no other alternative left, unless the parties, on foreseeing that the decision of the house would be, would anticipate that decision, by giving a voluntary assurance that this matter should not be prosecuted out of doors. It was now his (the Speaker's) duty to call on each of the parties to see whether they would give that assurance or not. The SPEAKER then put the question to Mr. SHELL, who made no answer. Some confusion occurred in the house at this moment. We understood Sir FRANCIS BURDETT to move, before the question was put to Lord Althorp, that both parties be put under restraint. On the question being then put to the noble lord, he said that he had received no offence, and that nothing that had passed that evening should induce him to proceed further. Mr. O'CONNELL said that the noble lord might well say he had received no offence, but he had given offence. The noble lord had not gone far enough in his denial of any intention to proceed further with the matter, because he was, to use his (Mr. O'Connell's) own law terms, defendant, and not plaintiff in the case. He felt that his hon. and learned friend had been harshly used by the house. Lord ALTHORP would not give, but would respond to a call. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) The SPEAKER then put the motion, that they be both taken into custody, which was agreed to without a dissentient voice. Lord Althorp and Mr. SHELL were then removed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. MONROVUS OF CARRICKFERGUS AND WARWICK. Mr. O'CONNELL obtained a further suspension of the issue of a new writ for the borough of Carrickfergus till that day three weeks. Lord Althorp and Mr. SHELL were then removed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. An Hon. MEMBER gave notice of a motion for the 20th March, for an address praying his Majesty to hold his Court and Parliament occasionally in Ireland. LORD ALTHORP'S EXPLANATION. Mr. STANLEY, who had been in communication with Lord Althorp, here entered the house, and, addressing the Speaker, said he would not, in the information he had to communicate, make any observations upon what had previously taken place, nor renew the discussion on the merits of a question which had for so long a time occupied the consideration of the house on that evening.—His noble friend was now ready to give full assurance that he would take no further steps in this business, nor resort to any hostile measures, in consequence of anything which had occurred in the previous proceedings. Having made this statement, which he hoped would prove satisfactory to the house, he (Mr. Stanley) would now move that Lord Althorp be removed from arrest. (Cheers.) Mr. HUME seconded the motion; and added that, under the circumstances, the Speaker had no other alternative than that to which he had resorted—an alternative in which he (Mr. Hume) conformed, as the only means calculated to sustain the dignity and authority of the house. The SPEAKER, before putting the question, said that though he had so often addressed them during the discussion which led to it, he would still, in a very words, express his great satisfaction at this result. After the observations made by the right hon. secretary, there could not be two opinions upon the subject. No one could doubt that, in the course he adopted, the noble lord had greatly added to his private and public character. The motion was then carried, when Mr. RUTHEVEN (as well as we could catch his observations) urged even justice and equal treatment of both parties. Mr. SHAW urged the propriety of the member for Hull making a declaration similar to that of Lord Althorp. Mr. HILL (as well as we could hear, amid the cheers for Lord Althorp, who just then entered) said, that he would, of course, if called on, bow to the decision of the Chamberlain. Mr. SHELL'S LIBERATION. After a lapse of some minutes, Mr. HUME entered the house, and said that, after what had transpired, he and other friends of the hon. member for Tipperary had been with him, and he had the satisfaction to state that the hon. and learned gentleman, being anxious to show his respect to the orders of the house, and without giving any opinion upon the subject which had placed him in his present situation, had determined to submit himself to the wishes. (Hear.) He, with other friends, had stated to the hon. and learned gentleman that in so doing he was confiding that a man of honor, he would place himself in a higher and more estimable situation. The only feeling by which the hon. and learned gentleman was influenced was a disposition to conform to those salutary orders which the house, in its wisdom, had thought proper to enforce. He therefore moved that Richard Lalor Sheil, Esq. should be discharged out of the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, offering, on his part, an assurance that the hon. and learned gentleman would not prosecute out of that house the subject which had occupied so much of their time that evening. Sir E. KNATCHBULL seconded the motion. The SPEAKER,

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS—WEDNESDAY, FEB. 5.

The house was opened to-day at one o'clock, for the purpose of their lordships meeting to form a deputation to carry up the address agreed to yesterday in answer to his Majesty's most gracious speech. The deputation, consisting of the Lord Chancellor, the mover and seconder of the address, and several noblemen, afterwards proceeded in state to St. James's Palace.

No other business came before their lordships, and the house adjourned until to-morrow, at half-past three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—WEDNESDAY.

THE CORN LAWS.

Mr. EWART presented a petition from Liverpool against the present system of the corn laws. The hon. member complained that no notice of this important subject had been taken in his Majesty's speech. He strongly supported the prayer of the petition.

Mr. COBBETT said there was no question as to which more opinions had been formed out of as well as within the doors of that house, than those which were advanced upon this important topic. He trusted the house would not yield to the clamour which was raised upon that subject. He could show that if a repeal of these laws were to be granted, the farmers of the country would be an entirely ruined class of men, unless such act were accompanied with a complete change in the present system of commerce in the country. When the question came before the house, he trusted he should be able to prove the fallacy of those opinions.

Mr. FINN observed that the language in the petition was extremely strong, far more so than any used by the people of Ireland, who were found fault with and looked upon with "just indignation" when they petitioned for a repeal of the Union. Indeed no petition which had ever been presented from Ireland to that house had been couched in such strong language as was contained in the document then under consideration. The petitioners, in this instance, "demanded" the abolition of the monopoly. He called on the house to remember the language which had been put into his Majesty's mouth; and, at the same time, to recollect, that no petition with language "demanding" anything had been presented from Ireland. It was, however, the usual way in which Ireland had been treated, and would continue the same until that country had a parliament of her own.

The petition was then laid on the table. Mr. EWART presented a petition from a numerous body of shipwrights at Liverpool, praying for a diminution of the duties upon ship-building timber. The honorable member expressed a hope that this duty would be entirely repealed; as this, he thought, would be the fairest way of equalising it. The petition was laid on the table.

THE UNION.

Mr. O'CONNELL next presented a petition from the inhabitants of Kilmara, in the county of Wexford, praying for a repeal of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. The question to which the petition referred could not be settled by any species of insolent despotism. (Loud cheers.) Any attempt to put it down by violence would only cause a feeling in Ireland towards this country which did not now prevail. (Hear, hear.) Such a mode of preventing its discussion would surely tend to impart disgust, and create dissatisfaction in a country where none at present existed. (Hear.) The threat to do so was the weakest act of the present weak and foolish ministry. (Cheers.) Never had they been so abused as when they thought that, because they were backed by a majority of that house, they could insult the people of Ireland not only with safety, but in triumph. (Loud cheers.) The mistake would be soon found, for the question cannot nor will not be still. (Cries of hear, hear.) The petition was then ordered to be laid on the table.

TITHES IN IRELAND.

Mr. O'CONNELL next presented a petition from the same parish, praying for the total abolition of tithes. Some plan was about to be proposed, he had understood, which was to lead to what was called a final adjustment of that question. If the right hon. secretary for Ireland had descended to attend the house on the present occasion, he might have informed them what that plan was. But he (Mr. O'Connell) supposed that doing so would be considered undignified. Yet he might have sent some deputy, either under or over him—a laugh—who could have developed this intricate plan. It would, indeed, be a miracle, if it performed what it promised, for it was to relieve the present burden, and still to preserve the present incumbents in their incomes. Indeed some magic was required to do this; to mitigate the sufferings of the people, and to secure the sinews of the church. He wished that some one had been here to disclose this plan—this fairy land in Ireland's legislation. (Hear, hear.) Ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'CONNELL next presented two petitions from the city of Dublin and its vicinity—one from the city of Dublin, and the other from the parish of St. Michael's, in that city. The object of these was speedy relief from local taxes. Again he (Mr. O'Connell) should express his conviction that it was impossible to do justice to his constituents in the absence of any responsible member of the Irish government.

ORDERED TO LIE ON THE TABLE.

Mr. HARDY begged to remark that if notice had been given by the hon. and learned gentleman of his intention to present such petitions, doubtless there would have been some one in attendance to answer him anything he might feel disposed to ask. It would be a waste of time for his Majesty's ministers to attend, when, perhaps, nothing was to be done.

Mr. FINN was surprised to hear a representative of the people speaking of his being a waste of ministerial time to attend to the petitions of the people, and when last session there was a pledge that one cabinet minister at least should be present at these morning sittings—no difficult matter, as there was thirteen of them.

Mr. HARDY said, that he did not mean to find any particular minister for being absent, if he had received notice that his presence would be required. As to there being thirteen cabinet ministers, that did not affect the question. Suppose that the Secretary of State for the Home Department, or the Secretary for the Colonies were present, what answer could they make to a question arising out of an Irish petition? They

could only rise to express their regret that the Secretary for Ireland was not present. If his honorable and learned friend had given that minister notice that he intended to present petitions of a public nature of some importance, he would be to blame not to attend; and the house ought in such a case to take some steps to meet the inconvenience it felt. He should, however, be very sorry to see all the ministers, and indeed any very considerable portion of them, waiting in the hall the whole of the morning, when it must be obvious that they had duties in their respective offices which could not but suffer neglect from their habitual absence.

CASE OF JOHN LEARY.

Mr. O'CONNELL said, that having another petition of great importance to present from Ireland, he thought it would be more convenient to make a few observations, notwithstanding the absence of every member of the government. He would state briefly to the house the subject of this petition, and if any man in England or Scotland had undergone such a degree of hardship as the individual here referred to, no one would be quiet for one moment until justice had been done to him. He acknowledged in this case that he firmly believed the unfortunate man would receive no species of redress, if the petition of the eight children of a person of that name, John Leary, at present in New South Wales, (Mr. O'Connell) admitted that he was convicted of the offence, and of an offence for which, if it were possible, death would be his lot. He was convicted of a conspiracy to murder two or three magistrates, in the execution of which conspiracy a lady was wounded in the carriage of a person supposed to be one of the magistrates. A more horrible offence could not be committed. The man was convicted of this offence. If he was really guilty of that offence—if he actually committed it—the government would have been the most culpable to have spared his life; and he should have been the deserved victim of his atrocious guilt. Four men were sworn to have conspired together to have sent out messengers—to collect a party—and to have signalled and with the order for the death of these magistrates. The four men were put upon their trial. Mr. Baron Pennefather did not know anything of the details against him, and so monstrous was this mode of proceeding, that he (Mr. O'Connell) had known a man committed for an offence in February and tried for an offence committed in November. (Hear.) The judge looked over the depositions, handed him (Mr. O'Connell) these depositions, and the consequence was an acquittal. The third of these persons was tried; that person was also acquitted; the fourth was put upon his trial. They were all sworn to have conspired together. The verdict against the fourth was a verdict of conviction. (Hear.) There were three verdicts of acquittal for three respectable farmers, who were now all at home in their dwellings, and restored to their children; and the fourth, Leary, against whom there was the same evidence, had been committed to the crown being in possession of the depositions; and he was knowing that what the witnesses had sworn before the magistrates was contrary to what they stated on the trial. That verdict (the case being the same on both occasions), had been contradicted by three solemn verdicts. If, under these circumstances, a Scotchman had been banished—had been transported from his country—he asked every Scottish gentleman in the house what would have been the feeling of indignation in Scotland? There was not a better trait in the Scottish character than that national affection which the gentlemen of Scotland had towards the middle and poorer classes of society; and he did say that no Scottish gentleman would have resented content in that house for one half-hour if he had such a case—that of a man, of a respectable farmer, of the age of seventy, illegally torn from his family and transported. (Hear.) The government did not leave him for death, as they ought to have done if he had been found guilty. It certainly was understood that one of the ministers would have been there during these discussions; and he thought that when Ireland, as it was every day connected with the government of Ireland, anything of importance to be brought on, and that that was the reason one of the ministers was not present, he should every day bring down to the house petitions which greatly concerned Ireland. He did not come there suddenly with this case, for an application had been made to the Irish government—in the first instance to the government of the Duke of Wellington. The application was accompanied with testimonials of the excellent good character of the man. The judge who tried the case distinctly, in the first instance, recommended that the man should get a free pardon. When the administration was changed, application was again made. A number of documents were sent up by the magistrates in the neighbourhood to the government, but when they contained he did not know, he (Mr. O'Connell), who asked for them, had been refused them, and told that it was not usual for the government to give such documents. The judge (Baron Pennefather) said again, and repeatedly, a more strong recommendation, but the only answer he got was, that they saw no reason to alter the decision. (Hear, hear.) Since the world began, he believed, there had not been greater injustice. If this had been a case in which a verdict had been obtained upon the suppression of evidence—a case where a policy of insurance was in question—and then after a verdict had been so obtained, new facts came to light which completely altered the case—why, if it was consistent with the forms of law a new trial would be granted; but here the verdict of a jury, in three subsequent trials, completely contradicted their former decision, and yet the man is denied the benefit of a new trial, torn from the arms of his family, and transported from his home and his country, notwithstanding the recommendation of the judge, but the speaker should not be carried into effect; and, speaking of Baron Pennefather, he felt it due to him to state, that the honorable crown judge never presided in any court of justice. Before he was raised to the bench he was in the highest business at the bar, and since he commenced exercising the functions of a judge he had always evinced the most determined firmness when the party was properly convicted; but in cases where the contrary was found to be the fact, he was equally determined in upholding the integrity of the bench in the due administration of public justice. (Hear.) He trusted that the observation which he then made would be productive of good results; at all events, the case of

Leary would be brought before the public, and the whole facts properly exposed. If justice was not performed in this instance it was idle to talk of determination in preserving the Union. The hon. member concluded by saying that he intended to move for a copy of the record, and the hon. member who had received from certain magistrates at Doneridge, upon which it appeared, they founded their decision in the case of Leary.

The petition was then read.

Mr. FINN never heard of a case, except the present, in which the recommendation of a judge was disregarded by the government.

Mr. SINCLAIR said, the hon. and learned gentleman opposite had only done the Scotch justice in saying they would never rest satisfied when they found a native of their country, unjustly treated, until they had obtained redress for him. At the same time he was confident that every individual from the other side of the Tweed would be equally anxious to obtain redress for any oppressed native of Ireland. With respect to the Repeal of the Union, the success of which was not very probable, he would just like the honorable and learned gentleman to bring forward a statement of all the measures he thought likely to be brought forward in College green, and probably he would find some of those measures likely to meet success here.

Mr. HARDY said, he made, that the individual statements which had been made, that the individual with certain others; the others were acquitted, therefore, the indictment must have fallen to the ground as regarded the one, and he knew not on what ground it could have been that government refused to grant Leary's liberation.

Mr. O'CONNELL said he had been indicted for a conspiracy, with persons unknown; but, besides that, he was charged with other counts, equally capital, of Whiteboyism.

Mr. Sergeant SPANKIE could not but admit that the hon. and learned gent. had stated a case well meriting investigation, the relation of which could not fail to surprise every one acquainted with the administration of justice in England. (Hear.) The inference to be drawn from the facts would lead to a conclusion of blame in quarters where he would have been to be regretted to find blame attributable. If the facts were as stated, the case ought to have been reviewed long ago. He had never heard of a merry man refused where merry had been recommended by a learned judge. (Hear, hear.) It was surprising, also, that this person should have been tried on an indictment containing various counts, because a judge in England would have sent the prosecutor to his election, and could not have embarrassed a criminal by trying him on many counts. When the subject was brought forward it should have his best assistance.

Mr. O'CONNELL said, all he required was inquiry, and he pledged himself that he would be able to substantiate every fact he had stated. There were many practices in the system of Irish criminal law which would surprise the learned sergeant if he was acquainted with them. (Hear, hear.)

IRISH POOR LAWS.

Mr. N. FITZSIMON presented a petition from the parish of Clara, in the King's County, in Ireland, praying that a system of poor laws might be extended to that country. The hon. member stated that the great body of the people in Ireland were in a state of such intolerable destitution that it would be better for them to be transported, where they would have the certainty of being fed, than to live at home, and ultimately die of starvation.

Ordered to lie on the table.

The Speaker shortly after left the chair, and the house adjourned at a quarter to two o'clock.

ADJOURNED SITTING.

The house resumed at five o'clock.

The SPEAKER informed the house that he had received from the Lord High Chancellor a copy of the new rules and regulations for courts of justice, with a view to more expeditious and cheaper administration of the law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that the documents be printed. He had much pleasure in adding, that these new rules and regulations would have the effect of rendering the administration of the law for more efficient, cheaper, and more accessible to every class of his Majesty's subjects than heretofore. (Hear.)

Mr. O'CONNELL was glad to find so much reason in this measure, and he was peculiarly gratified at finding that by these regulations law would be made cheaper, to the mass of society.

THE ADDRESS.

Mr. S. LEFEVRE brought up the report on the address to his Majesty.

On the motion that it be read being put,

Mr. COBBETT said, he presented this report to be a reiteration of what the house had heard last night—a repetition complimentary of the speech; but before it was formally put, he felt it to be his duty to submit to the house an amendment to a particular part of it.

The SPEAKER suggested, as the hon. member was opposed to a particular portion of the address, that he had better wait until that part of the address was read, and then that part of the address was read, and then a first and second time, but in the progress of the latter reading by the clerk at the table, on his arrival at that part which related to the owners and occupiers of land, Mr. COBBETT again rose and said, that the part of the address to which he objected was that which spoke of the distress under which the proprietors and occupiers of land—the agricultural interest, were laboring. That portion seemed to say that perfect tranquillity reigned throughout the country as regarded agricultural matters. He had no wish to throw impediments in the way of passing the address, but he could not help thinking of the effect of conveying to the country what in that house of a proper feeling as regarded the state of the occupiers of land—he meant by this the distressed state of their condition. In the address it was said that "this house, in common with his Majesty, lamented the continued distress under which the occupiers of land laboured." Now, these words could induce a belief that the state of the country—as regarded the agricultural districts—was one of tranquillity, when in reality it was otherwise, as it was, in fact, very much otherwise, as any honorable member who came from the country would be able to prove. In addition to this testimony, he would refer honorable members to the various public papers, by which they would find that, on an average, there were no fewer than four fire-brands in the agricultural districts. Was that house, then, with the knowledge of such a state of things, to tell his Majesty that tranquillity

reigned in those parts? He would say, no; for in very truth such was not the fact. In his opinion the address ought to point out to his Majesty that tranquillity in those districts did not exist—it ought to point out the causes of a contrary position of affairs, and it ought at the same time to point out or suggest a remedy for the evil. The occupiers of land, as well as the laborers, were laboring under extreme burdens, and he should therefore move an amendment to the effect that "this house, in common with your Majesty, laments the distress which pervades the agricultural districts—the distress under which the occupiers of land labor, and that to effect their relief shall be the object of the anxious consideration of that house." If the house did not do this, they would not do that which they ought. The real intention of the house, as regarded that body of individuals, would be disguised. Had they not the report of the committee of the last session showing—no, the report did not show it, but the evidence produced did—that the present distress prevailed in the agricultural districts? The report was very long—and a shame was it upon thirty-seven members of that house, who sat upon the committee, and yet, in their report, said nothing. (Hear.) The evidence, however, spoke for itself. Well, then, if the house were to disguise their knowledge of the existence of the distress of the agriculturists, they would be doing a most serious injury to that interest. The mover of the address had anticipated much from a proposed amendment in the enactment of tithes, but (Mr. C.) differed from him. That a cause for this distress existed no one could doubt. Who, then, so fit to point out that cause and its remedy as that house? Who could do it if that house could not? They ought, then, to set about discovering, if they had not done so already, that cause, and instantly to propose its abolition—its erasure—by a sound and perfect remedy. Having found out the former, the latter would very readily present itself. He would deny that tithes were a hindrance to the improvement of the land. Gentlemen should consider this fact before they propounded their doctrines upon agricultural subjects. It was all very well to talk of projects about tithes, but he did not believe that any change in them would increase rent. The hon. member (Mr. Morrison) who seconded the address, had talked a great deal about the improvement of trade and manufactures. If, however, support of the existing Irish clergy, was one case in the country of Kerry, which he would just mention in illustration of the present tithes system, and which must convince every rational man that such a system could not be permitted to continue. In the parish of Kilkenny there was not a single Protestant inhabitant, and at no period did it possess one, and yet in no part of Ireland were tithes more rigorously and oppressively enforced. He mentioned this fact to familiarize the right hon. gentleman with cases of the same class, in order that he might see the facility of adopting any system which would not totally extinguish tithes in parishes where there was no portion of the population Protestant. (Hear, hear.) If the right hon. gentleman wanted an antidote against the Union, let him extinguish tithes. It was such a grievance as this that gave rise to the agitation of that question; and he would tender words to promote the cause of Babel than the predecessor of the right honorable gentleman. (Laughter.) No dictate should be allowed in the cabinet, at least no dictate should be permitted to influence the councils of government in the settlement of questions relating to Ireland, who was regarded with distrust by the entire people of that country. The coercion bill had been talked of, and statements had been made, as appeared by the public papers, that his Majesty's government had been carrying on a correspondence with a person, who it was stated, voted against the Coercion Bill; this, it was, was certainly most creditable to the government. The statement to which he alluded was attributed to the honorable member for Hull. He believed that statement to be a calumny. Part of the statement was, that it was impossible to know all the secret machinery by which votes were obtained by ministers. He should not believe that statement—but it was not his. He might say of himself *non meum hic sermo*. But when that calumnious statement had been put forward had they not a right to demand the means of its refutation? It was their right to say such an assertion had been made they had a right to furnish the Irish members the means of refuting that calumny. He wished to inquire what that secret machinery was. The statement made was this—that an Irish member who spoke violently and voted against every clause of the Coercion Bill went to ministers and said, "Don't let one atom of this bill, for if you do no person can live in Ireland." (Hear, hear.) He said "This from you?" His (Mr. O'Connell's) surprise was, that they would condescend to speak to such a person at all. But the calumny went to say, "this from you?" "Yes," said he, "but I dare not say so, for I could not expect to be returned to parliament, unless from Ireland, and if I were to express that opinion in the house, I would have no chance of being returned again."—Such a man, surely, if such did exist, would be no loss to Ireland, nor to that house either. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. O'Connell) thought that the constitution of Ireland had a right to know whether there was amongst their representatives any person capable of acting so differently from the opinions he professed, and who that person was. He (Mr. O'Connell) did not believe that any such statement was sanctioned by his Majesty's ministers. He believed the statement as respected them to be utterly untrue. He believed the statement, as regarded the Irish members, to be perfectly and grossly untrue. He had talked to every man amongst them who might by any means be included in that calumny, and they had each individually indignantly protested against it. He knew it was quite impossible that his Majesty's ministers could have said any such thing. He declared that he believed it to be utterly false. However, whilst he said so much he felt it to be his duty to inquire of the noble Lord opposite whether it was true that this secret machinery did in reality exist. He would conclude by asking the noble Lord two distinct questions, which he was sure the noble Lord would not refuse to answer.—First, whether the assertion was made by the noble Lord or any member of the government that an Irish member, who had voted and spoken against the Irish coercion bill, had ever used such language in private to any member of his Majesty's government; and, secondly, whether any Irish member had used such language as was stated, to any member of his Majesty's government?

upon the answer which he would receive to question which he was about to put to his Majesty's ministers. Now, the right honorable gentleman, the secretary for Ireland, had admitted that less the tithes system was brought to a satisfactory adjustment, the peace, tranquillity, and prosperity of Ireland could not be secured. He (Mr. O'Connell) fully agreed with the right hon. member in that opinion. This Irish member referred upon many subjects, but this was one which they were all agreed. He hoped that his Majesty's government would come to the consideration of this question with a fixed determination to meet it in such a manner as would give entire satisfaction to the people of Ireland. He also hoped that the right hon. gentleman would not suffer any delusion to be practiced in this case. There was no curious work in reference to this very question, no less than three tithes bills had been brought in by the ministers, and yet the same appeared to be as far from any settlement as the present moment as ever. The right hon. gentleman denied the accuracy of his (Mr. O'Connell's) statement last night respecting the number of clergymen who refused to accept money under the Union Act. Now he might have been inaccurate to numbers, but did not the right hon. gentleman confirm his general statement when he admitted that one third of the tithes-payers still abhorred the evils of the old system which this Act of Parliament was intended to relieve. He repeated that nothing short of some very substantial measure of relief would do it. In whatever arrangement that contemplated, existing interests should be considered. It was idle to think continuing the imposition of Protestant Church Establishment upon a Catholic population. (Hear.) They could not place every body, were they to play at a game at which every body was to win and nobody to lose, he would tell them, in a word, if they wished to tranquillize Ireland, there must be a total extinction of tithes. (Hear, hear.) Not an extinction merely in name, but an extinction in fact. He had a plan for that purpose, which he would state in another period. It was not a plan which would throw the burden off the shoulders of the land lords. No; his object was to relieve industry from the burdens under which it at present labored. By his plan the landlord's share, which would be about one-third, would be fully adequate to support of the existing Irish clergy. There was one case in the country of Kerry, which he would just mention in illustration of the present tithes system, and which must convince every rational man that such a system could not be permitted to continue. In the parish of Kilkenny there was not a single Protestant inhabitant, and at no period did it possess one, and yet in no part of Ireland were tithes more rigorously and oppressively enforced. He mentioned this fact to familiarize the right hon. gentleman with cases of the same class, in order that he might see the facility of adopting any system which would not totally extinguish tithes in parishes where there was no portion of the population Protestant. (Hear, hear.) If the right hon. gentleman wanted an antidote against the Union, let him extinguish tithes. It was such a grievance as this that gave rise to the agitation of that question; and he would tender words to promote the cause of Babel than the predecessor of the right honorable gentleman. (Laughter.) No dictate should be allowed in the cabinet, at least no dictate should be permitted to influence the councils of government in the settlement of questions relating to Ireland, who was regarded with distrust by the entire people of that country. The coercion bill had been talked of, and statements had been made, as appeared by the public papers, that his Majesty's government had been carrying on a correspondence with a person, who it was stated, voted against the Coercion Bill; this, it was, was certainly most creditable to the government. The statement to which he alluded was attributed to the honorable member for Hull. He believed that statement to be a calumny. Part of the statement was, that it was impossible to know all the secret machinery by which votes were obtained by ministers. He should not believe that statement—but it was not his. He might say of himself *non meum hic sermo*. But when that calumnious statement had been put forward had they not a right to demand the means of its refutation? It was their right to say such an assertion had been made they had a right to furnish the Irish members the means of refuting that calumny. He wished to inquire what that secret machinery was. The statement made was this—that an Irish member who spoke violently and voted against every clause of the Coercion Bill went to ministers and said, "Don't let one atom of this bill, for if you do no person can live in Ireland." (Hear, hear.) He said "This from you?" His (Mr. O'Connell's) surprise was, that they would condescend to speak to such a person at all. But the calumny went to say, "this from you?" "Yes," said he, "but I dare not say so, for I could not expect to be returned to parliament, unless from Ireland, and if I were to express that opinion in the house, I would have no chance of being returned again."—Such a man, surely, if such did exist, would be no loss to Ireland, nor to that house either. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. O'Connell) thought that the constitution of Ireland had a right to know whether there was amongst their representatives any person capable of acting so differently from the opinions he professed, and who that person was. He (Mr. O'Connell) did not believe that any such statement was sanctioned by his Majesty's ministers. He believed the statement as respected them to be utterly untrue. He believed the statement, as regarded the Irish members, to be perfectly and grossly untrue. He had talked to every man amongst them who might by any means be included in that calumny, and they had each individually indignantly protested against it. He knew it was quite impossible that his Majesty's ministers could have said any such thing. He declared that he believed it to be utterly false. However, whilst he said so much he felt it to be his duty to inquire of the noble Lord opposite whether it was true that this secret machinery did in reality exist. He would conclude by asking the noble Lord two distinct questions, which he was sure the noble Lord would not refuse to answer.—First, whether the assertion was made by the noble Lord or any member of the government that an Irish member, who had voted and spoken against the Irish coercion bill, had ever used such language in private to any member of his Majesty's government; and, secondly, whether any Irish member had used such language as was stated, to any member of his Majesty's government?

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP

Lord ALTHORP