

minutes

The Waterford Chronicle

No. 1015

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1834.

Price 6d.

AUCTION OF DAMAGED HEMP, FLAX, AND LINSEED

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION,
FOR ACCOUNT OF WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,
ON FRIDAY next, February 21st, at the
MARKET-HOUSE, Quay, a quantity of Damaged
HEMP, FLAX, and LINSEED, the cargo of the En-
gine, Captain RICHARDSON, from Riga,
sale to commence at Twelve o'clock.
WM. SHARPE Auctioneer.
Waterford, February 18, 1834.
The above is POSTPONED TO MONDAY NEXT,
February 24th.

IMMENSE SALE, BY AUCTION,

OF CHINA, EARTHENWARE, CUT AND PLAIN
GLASS, &c.
On MONDAY, the 24th FEBRUARY,
At following Days, until the whole is disposed of,
AT PENISTAN'S WAREHOUSE,
ON THE QUAY.

**THE ENTIRE STOCK IN TRADE OF CHINA
AND EARTHENWARE,** consisting of Dinner,
Breakfast, and Tea Sets, in a great variety of Patterns;
of the most modern shapes, &c.; a great variety of Toilet
and Chamber Sets; with an immense Assortment of
every Article in the Trade—which will be sold WITH-
OUT RESERVE, and in such Lots as suit Wishes of
other Purchasers. The Stock of GLASS consists of
every useful Article, both plain and cut.
The FURNITURE to be sold after the Stock is dis-
posed of.
WM. SHARPE, Auctioneer.
Sale to commence each day at TWELVE o'clock,
and to be continued in the Evening at SEVEN.
Waterford, February 6, 1834.

WANTED

A Respectable Family, a good Thorough
SERVANT, who is also acquainted with the man-
agement of a DAIRY—Liberal wages will be given.
Apply at the Office of this Paper.

WATERFORD AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

THE PLOUGHING MATCH will take place at
WHITES TOWN, in the Barony of UPPER
THIRD, on Friday, the 28th of FEBRUARY inst.

BALLYMACAW.

TO BE LET, from the 25th of MARCH, and
immediate Possession given, for Lives and Years,
an excellent roomy COTTAGE, &c., with 34 Statute
Acres of LAND, within a mile and a half of DUN-
MORE, and half a mile of the Cove of BALLYMACAW.
Apply to Mr. G. SPRING, at said Cottage.
Feb. 21st, 1834.

WATERFORD FEVER HOSPITAL.

HEREBY request a GENERAL MEETING
of the GOVERNORS of the FEVER HOSPITAL,
on THURSDAY, the 27th inst., at ONE o'clock, at
the CHAMBER of COMMERCE, for the purpose of
auditing the Yearly Account of Income and Expenditure,
previous to the approaching Annives, and to transact
other business of importance.
WM. HOBBS, Mayor.
Waterford, February 19, 1834.

COUNTY OF WEXFORD.

HOUSES AND FIELDS TO BE SET.
TO BE SET, for such term as may be agreed
upon, that large commodious HOUSE, on the Quay
of BALLYHACK, lately built by Mr. James WALSH,
Publican and Shopkeeper, with Yard, Offices, and fine
Spring Well; also, several other SLATED HOUSES,
with Yards fit for Bathing, Fishermen, or respectable Fa-
milies, opposite to the Town of PASSAGE, in the County
of WEXFORD, and convenient to the City of Waterford,
where market is held daily. Sublet improving
Tenants will meet with good encouragement.
Apply to RICHARD ROACH, of Ballyhack, who will
show the Premises, and treat with persons wanting said
Houses.
Ballyhack, February 22, 1834.

INCREASED COMMUNICATION WITH BRISTOL.

The Public are respectfully informed, that it
is intended to sail the CITY OF BRISTOL, in con-
junction with the NORA CREINA, for Bristol, thereby
affording two departures weekly from and between
each Port.

ORDER OF SAILING.

CITY OF BRISTOL,
JOHN BAYNE—COMMANDEER.

From Waterford, Tuesdays,	From Bristol, Saturdays,
4 Feb. 12 Noon.	8 Feb. 6 Morning.
11 ... 9 Morning.	15 ... 9 Morning.
18 ... 9 Morning.	22 ... 4 Afternoon.
25 ... 12 Noon.	1 March 9 Morning.

NORA CREINA,

From Waterford, Fridays,	From Bristol, Tuesdays,
7 Feb. 12 Noon.	4 Feb. 2 Afternoon.
14 ... 7 Morning.	11 ... 7 Morning.
21 ... 12 Noon.	18 ... 12 Noon.
28 ... 7 Morning.	25 ... 7 Morning.

REFRESHMENTS may be had on Board at moderate rates.
Carriages and Horses carefully Shipped. Berths secured,
and every information given by JOHN BOGAN,
Steam Packet Office, Waterford,
or at the General Steam Packet
Office, Quay, Bristol.

INSOLVENT DEBTORS' COURT.

Wicklow, March 13; Waterford, 17; Waterford, 19;
Clonmel, 21; Cork, 24; Tralee, 31; Limerick, April 4;
Ennis, 7; Galway, 9; Philadelphia, 12; Maryboro-
ugh, 14; Kilkenny, 16; Carlow, 18; Naas, 19.
JOHN LLOYD, Esq., Commissioner.
JOHN THOMAS LLOYD, Esq., Registrar.

MENDICANT ASYLUM.

John Blake, collector to the Mendicity Asylum, ac-
knowledges to have received from the very Rev. Dean Lee,
£2 2s. for the above institution.
The treasurer of the Mendicity Association acknow-
ledges the receipt of £19 19s. 9d. from the Right Rev. Dr.
Arbuthnot, from Mr. Maurice Hayes' workmen.

REMARKABLE EVENTS.

1864—*Callista* born at Pisa.
1718—*Henry the Fourth*, of France reconciled to the
Church of Rome.
1598—*Earl of Essex* struck by Elizabeth for contemp-
tious conduct.
1625—Thanksgiving for the abatement of the plague.
1718—*Lord Rodney* born.
1732—*R. Cumberland*, the dramatic writer, born.
1806—*Lizbeth Carter* died.
The females at Broadford works, Aberdeenshire,
have struck work, and formed themselves into a
Trade Union.—*Spotswan.*

TIMBER AND DEAL YARD.

DANIEL CARRIGAN
BEGS leave to acquaint his Friends and the
Public, that he is well supplied at his TIMBER AND
DEAL YARDS, in PETER-STREET and LADY LANE,
with Prime Red and Yellow Pine, Memel, and Norway
Timber, Hardwood, Deals, &c., and Spars of every de-
scription, Kils Tiles, Slates, Fire Brick, and every arti-
cle in the Building line, which he will engage of Prime
Quality, and will dispose of on moderate terms.
His Friends will be pleased to observe, that in sending
his Orders, that they direct to him, at his CONCRETS,
LADY LANE, as several Orders for him, not so directed,
got into the hands of an Unprincipled Fellow in this
City, who forwarded Goods of a very inferior Quality,
charging a higher Price than D. CARRIGAN would for
the best, evidently with the intention of injuring his Es-
tablishment.
Lady-Lane, Waterford, Feb. 7, 1834.

LONDON NEWSPAPERS BY EXPRESS.

HIS Grace the Post-Master-General having de-
termined on abolishing the "Clerks of Roads" on the
24th of April next,

JOHNSTON AND CO.

EDEN-QUAY, DUBLIN.
In consequence of the opportunity afforded by the custom
of the various News Rooms, Reading Rooms, Libraries,
Clubs, Societies, throughout Ireland, as also the honour
of supplying the individual Customers that deal with
the Post Office Clerks, with their English and Irish News-
papers, which they may depend upon being furnished
with the strictest accuracy and punctuality, and such
such that at all times the very latest news shall be sup-
plied.
JOHNSTON and Co refer with pride and pleasure to
the very great success which has attended their "Express"
System, which is fully acknowledged by the great pres-
sion of the metropolitan and Provincial press; and it is
their determination to continue it henceforward, and to
their customers in Dublin may have the advantage of being
served with their newspapers.
AN HOUR BEFORE THE POST DELIVERY,
and in the Country at the earliest possible moment.
The necessary limits of an advertisement precluded going
further into detail, but at Johnston and Co's Office,
the most satisfactory testimonials can be (daily) seen.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Received for and inserted in all the Newspapers in the
United Kingdom, and papers circulating in Ireland.
JOHNSTON AND CO.
Newspaper and Advertising Agents, 1 Eden-
quay, Sackville-street, Dublin.
N.B.—Agents in all the principal towns in Ireland
shall be shortly appointed, as the Postmasters, by the
new regulations, are prohibited from receiving any
way with Newspapers, further than their official duties
(as letters) require.
JOHNSTON and Co. will be happy to receive applica-
tions for Agencies from respectable persons, with sat-
isfactory reference in Dublin, post paid, when particu-
lars of terms, &c. shall be communicated.

NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS.

PROPOSALS will be received by the Deputy
Commissioner General from Persons willing to con-
tract for the supply of Iron Bedsteads, Blankets, Rugs,
Sheets, Bed and Bolster Ticks, Iron Trivets for Tables,
for the use of the Constabulary, from the 1st of March,
1834, to 30th September, 1836. Patterns may be seen,
and conditions of Contract obtained at this Office, between
the hours of Ten and Four o'clock, until Friday the 28th
February, at Noon, when the Papers will be opened.
Commissionary General's Office.
Custom House, Dublin, 13th Feb., 1834.

SPRING ASSIZES.

LEINSTER CIRCUIT.
County Wicklow, at Wicklow, Monday, 24th Feb.
County Wexford, at Wexford, Tuesday, 27th Feb.
County Waterford, at Waterford, Monday, 27th Feb.
County Kilkenny, at Kilkenny, Monday, 10th March.
County Kilkenny, at Kilkenny, same day.
County Tipperary, at Clonmel, Saturday, 15th March.
Right Hon. the Lord Chief Baron, Justices,
Hon. Justice Johnson,
George Joy, Esq., Registers.
The Grand Jurors of the County of Wicklow, Wex-
ford, and the County of Tipperary will be sworn at
three o'clock. The Grand Jurors of the County and
County of Kilkenny will be sworn at two o'clock, and the
Grand Jury of the County of Tipperary will be sworn at
one o'clock, on the respective Commis on days, and the
Criminal and Civil business immediately after proceeded
on in the several Counties and Cities. All Records and
Appeals, Civil Bills cognizable at the Assizes, and Ap-
peals from the decision of the Assistant Barrister, under
the Statute for Registering Freeholds, must be entered
with the Registers before the commencement of the court in each
County. All Informations and Recognizances must be sent
into the Crown Office previous to the Commission Days.
Such Prosecutors and Witnesses in Criminal Cases as do
not attend at the sitting of the Criminal Court in each
County and City, will forfeit their Recognizance, and will
not obtain orders for their expenses.

MUSSTER CIRCUIT.

Ennis, Feb. 25. Tralee, 8.
Limerick, March 1. Cork, 14.
Chief Justice Doherty and Baron Foster Judges.
NORTH-WEST CIRCUIT.
Longford, Feb. 25. Omagh, 11.
Cavan, March 1. Lifford, 14.
Enniskillen, March 8. Londonderry, 18.
Justice Jebb and Baron Foster, Judges.
NORTH-EAST CIRCUIT.
County of the Town of Drogheda, at Drogheda on Mon-
day, 24th of February.
County Louth, at Dundalk, Wednesday, 26th.
County Monaghan, at Monaghan, Monday, March 3.
County Armagh, at Armagh, Saturday, 8th.
County Antrim, at Carrickfergus, Friday, 14th.
County Down, at Downpatrick, Friday, 21st.
Judges—The Lord Chief Justice, K.C.—Mr. Justice
Moore.

FLASH NOTES—CAUTION.

On Saturday last, a man went into the shop of
Mrs. Gorman, of Nicholas-street, and asked the
shop-boy for the change of a £5 note. The boy
accordingly gave it. Tuesday, the boy, upon
presenting the note at the Bank of Ireland, was
apprehended that it was a flash note, and never intended
for circulation. To a casual observer, the note ap-
peared to be a Bank of Ireland £5 note. Upon
inspecting it, however, the words with which it
was filled up were, "Bank of Comfort, I promise
to serve up dinner as well as any man, or forfit
£5, Dublin, Galway, and London, No. 6401,
7th October, 1833. For the Governor and Com-
pany of the Bank of Comfort, John Kilray." The
person who discovered in the Bank of Ireland that
he had been deceived, immediately repaired
to the Head-office, and in a quarter of an hour
afterwards, Peace-officer Jones had the man ar-
rested who passed the note, and the full amount
restored to the person from whom change of it
had been procured. The person who passed the
note has been held over for further examination.—
Dublin Paper.

There is said to be a project upon the tapis to
petition parliament that a member be returned to
represent Kingstown. Some twenty years ago
there was existing there to croak for the franchise
except curriers and seagulls.—*Steuer's Dispatch.*

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS—MONDAY.

Lord LANSDOWNE moved the third reading
of the Factory Labour Regulation Amendment
Bill.
Read a third time accordingly.

OBSERVANCES OF THE SABBATH.

The Bishop of LONDON presented a petition
from the Archdeacon of the Island of Ely, praying
for some regulation as to the due observance of
the sabbath.
THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH—PROPOSED ALTERA-
TIONS.
The Bishop of LONDON likewise presented an-
other petition from the same individual, alluding
to the suggested arrangements tending to affect
the condition of the established church, and ex-
pressing disapprobation of any alteration which
would be prejudicial to the interests of the estab-
lished church, an establishment which was of such
great benefit to the community at large, by dis-
tributing information in those parts of the coun-
try which would otherwise be without religious
instruction.
Their Lordships then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—MONDAY.

The Speaker entered the house about twelve
o'clock.
CHURCH PATRONAGE IN SCOTLAND.
Lord DALMENY presented a petition from the
burgh of Strirling, in Scotland, upon the subject of
church patronage. The noble lord said he hoped
that when the subject was brought before the house
it would receive that attention which the impor-
tance of the subject deserved.

Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR presented a peti-
tion from Wexford, praying for a repeal of the
Legislative Union. The honourable member said,
whatever might be the opinions of honorable mem-
bers not connected with Ireland, he could assure
the house that the desire for a repeal of the
Union was every day gaining ground in that
country. The hon. member then gave notice that,
on the 24th of April, he should move for leave to
bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relat-
ing to the tenure by which lands were held in Ire-
land.

Mr. HUTT presented a petition from Kingstons-
upon-Hull, praying for a revival of the laws re-
lating to municipal corporations.

Mr. O'CONNELL said, the noble Chancellor of
the Exchequer, when he introduced his financial
statement, alluded to many subjects of minor im-
portance to that of corporation reform, but on this
subject he was perfectly silent. (Hear.) Now he
(Mr. O'Connell) was convinced that there was
not a more important subject, or one which, at
the present time, engaged greater attention in
Ireland, as well as England, than corporation re-
form. He thought, therefore, that noble lord
should have given the house some information.

Mr. PHRYNE was convinced that many evils re-
sulted from corporations, as at present constituted.
He had a decided dislike also to the plan of electing
aldermen for life. He thought, however, mis-
takers acted perfectly right in maintaining silence
on the subject of corporation reform until the com-
missioners had made their report, which the house
was aware they had not yet done.

Mr. O'CONNELL said, the same reason, then,
would justify their silence on the poor law. Yet
the noble lord spoke about the poor laws, although
the commissioners had not made their report.
The petition was then ordered to lie on the table.

COMMUTATION OF TITHES.

Mr. HODGES presented several petitions from
several parishes in the county of Kent, praying for
a commutation of tithes.
Mr. C. FERUSSON supported the prayer of the
petition. The hon. member said he was surprised
that the laws relating to tithes in England had not
long since been altered, so that the land owner
might know the value of the property he possessed.
It was now two hundred years since tithes were
abolished in Scotland, and he was sure if they
were abolished in this country it would be a great
blessing. It was monstrous that no man could
improve his land without being subjected to a
heavy tax. He hoped such a measure would
be introduced as would bring the question to a final
and satisfactory settlement. The hon. member
then said, some misapprehension had gone abroad
relating to the remarks he made the other evening
when speaking of the corn laws. He was made to
appear as having adopted the opinion of Mr. M'Colloch
—that if the corn laws were abolished, it
would throw 500,000 agricultural labourers out
of employment, but that they would not be obliged
to have recourse to the poor laws for support, but
find employment elsewhere. Now he stated this as
the opinion of Mr. M'Colloch, and not as his own
opinion, because he did not agree with it. He gave
Mr. M'Colloch credit for his sincerity and honesty
in the opinion he expressed; but he (Mr. Fergus-
son) totally differed with him as to the probable
effect of a repeal of the corn laws.

Mr. COBBETT thought the house might have
been much better occupied than in having the ar-
guments of Mr. M'Colloch brought again before
it. He thought their attention might have been
far more beneficially employed, particularly when
the gentleman alluded to had stated it as his op-
inion that absenteeism, with regard to Ireland, pro-
duced no harm to that country. (Hear.) After
advocating such a sentiment as that, he could not
but think that the opinions of Mr. M'Colloch
might be discussed elsewhere. (Hear.) With
regard to this petition, for a commutation of
tithes, he observed that it was a very favorite
argument with some hon. members that tithes
were in their very essence injurious to the inter-
ests of agriculture, and therefore it was that
agriculture was suffering so much distress. Now,
did not the honourable member for Kent know
that tithes existed during the war—a period when
farming was in a state of great prosperity? How
came it, then, that this cry against tithes had only
now been raised? It was not opposed to a rea-
sonable commutation of tithes, but what would
produce the benefit numbers of persons anticipated?
No; it would not. Something else must be
done to yield the relief sought after. Some
part of the debt with which the country was loaded
must be got rid of. Let them sweep away the
enormous list of pensioners. The church alone

ought not to be the object of attack. He was as-
tounded that the clergy would be better provided
for were they to be paid by their flocks.

Mr. O'CONNELL considered that there was
no tax more discouraging to the people than
tithes; and he was astonished that the hon. mem-
ber for Oldham, possessing, as he did, such pow-
erful common sense, held the contrary opinion.—
He concluded in the opinion of the hon. member
opposite, and differed with his hon. friend, the
member for Oldham, on this subject. His opinion
was, that tithes operated as a tax upon agricultural
industry. He agreed with the hon. member for
Oldham, that it would be much better if glebes
were provided for the clergy of the people, and
that the remainder of their subsistence depend-
ed upon those for whom they prayed and preached.—
The poorer people in Europe supported a church,
if not in splendour, certainly in pomp. They
kept up a church in all the grades of a hierarchy,
and such an example on the part of the people of
Ireland was sufficient to demonstrate the capabil-
ity of the wealthy people of England to do the
same. The people would be better served if the
clergy were paid in proportion to their services,
and had applied to them the natural stimulus,
that he who worked most should be best rewarded.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY said, he could not agree
with the argument that the clergy would be better
recompensed were they to be left to the volun-
tary contributions of their congregations. At the
same time he would take that opportunity of
saying, that whatever plan was proposed by the
government on the subject of tithes, it could not
have for its object their abolition. He knew that
an idea of that sort had gone abroad, but he
thought it one which ought not to be allowed to
exist. A commutation of tithes only could be ex-
pected.

Mr. HODGES agreed with the hon. member
for Oldham, that husbandry was in a state of pros-
perity during the war; but, in his opinion, that
prosperity was one of unusual and false stability.
The petition was then read, and laid on the table.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented a petition from
Clondra, in the county of Dublin, praying for a
repeal of the Union. The hon. and learned mem-
ber said he should not detain the house further
than to state that the petition was most respect-
ably signed both by Protestants and Catholics.

Mr. FITZSIMON bore testimony to the respect-
ability of the petitioners. He trusted the house
would see the necessity of granting the prayer of
the petitioners, as the repeal of the Union was nec-
essary for the security and prosperity of Ireland.

Mr. RUTHVEN said the petition spoke not only
of the sense of the county of Dublin, but of the
country generally.

Ordered to lie on the table.
Mr. O'CONNELL then presented a great num-
ber of petitions from different parishes in Ireland,
some of which prayed for a repeal of the Union,
and others for the abolition of tithes.

Mr. PLUMTRE said he was sorry to see so
many men labour under delusions respecting the
abolition of tithes and the repeal of the Union.—
He would add, that it was a grievous delusion if
they were serious in their prayer upon those two
points, and he could hardly think that they could
entertain one solid hope that either the one or the
other would be granted. He could never suppose
that a British house of parliament would consent
to a measure which would give up the whole Pro-
testant population into the hands of the Catholics;
for such would be the consequence of the Repeal.
Nor, on the other hand, could he think that a
British house of commons would ever consent to
abolish tithes.

Mr. RUTHVEN said that the hon. member
meant to say that the repeal of the Union would
place the Protestants in the hands of the Catho-
lics. He (Mr. R.) would not only deny that it
would have that effect, but he would contend that
the Protestants would be placed in a better posi-
tion if the repeal were to take place. As to the
question of tithes, he begged the house to look at
the complaints made by the Dissenters at home.—
There was a growing feeling in favour of Repeal,
and there was an impression in Ireland that it
would not much longer be denied. Ireland had
never received any benefit from England, except
in the days of its distress; and he hoped that
England would not too long delay to do her just-
ice, or she might be compelled to resort to such
measures as might extort a separation.

Mr. JOHNSTON said he believed there were
not many intelligent persons who laboured under
the delusion that tithes were a personal tax. If
it could be proved that tithes was a personal tax,
the case would assume a different complexion. He
admitted that the two questions referred to in the
petition were of great importance, and he trusted
that when the repeal of the Union was submitted
to them, that the house would give it full and
impartial consideration; at the same time,
however, he would say, he sincerely hoped that the
preservation of the Protestant religion would ever
be considered as one of its first duties; and as he
at least considered it, he hoped he should never
live to say the day when the repeal of the Union
would be granted.

Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR, in reference to
the recent public meetings which had taken place
in Ireland for the repeal of the Union, said, he
knew that many of the resolutions in his favor
were proposed and seconded by Protestants. After
some further remarks upon the necessity of the
repeal, the honourable member complained that
every exertion had been used to prevent its dis-
cussion. A meeting upon the subject had been
advised to take place at the Crown and Anchor
Tavern, but since the paragraph in the King's
specch, in which persons who formed it had been
charged almost with direct treason, the proprietor
of that tavern had refused to allow the parties to
have the room. An application had subsequently
been made to the proprietor of the London Coffee-
house, who indeed had not refused a room, but
had prevented the meeting in another way, by
asking six times the usual sum, for the use of the
room. If it was supposed that repeal could be
prevented, by adopting such expedients, they were
devised, as no power on earth, no power of virtu-
tarianism, as the learned member for Dublin had
said, could prevent the question from being agitated.

Mr. FINCH thought that there was some re-
spect and forcible influence which induced the hon.
and learned member (Mr. O'Connell) to urge on
the repeal, and trusted that a British house of
parliament would never sanction the separation.
A friend of his (Mr. Finch) was talking to
a respectable person in Ireland, soon after the
passing of the emancipation bill, and he found him
overjoyed at the benefits likely to arise from the
measure. His (Mr. F.'s) friend expressed his
doubts of it giving much relief to the people gen-
erally, and the only advantage he saw in it was,
that it would admit some 40 or 50 Catholic mem-
bers into the House of Commons, adding, and what
can you expect 40 or 50 Catholic members to do,
when opposed to 600 Protestant ones? The gen-
tleman replied, 50 foxes can do a great deal of
harm among 600 geese. (Loud laughter.) He
(Mr. Finch) did not mean to say that the par-
liament which passed the emancipation bill were
geese—(hear)—but he was confident that, until
600 Protestant members were introduced into
the sixteen and a half millions of Protestant
subjects also, the repeal of the legislative Union
would never be obtained. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FINN did not deny that there were in Ire-
land a set of itinerant preachers, who travelled
about, exciting discussion and sowing discord, but
they did not belong to the Catholics. It was from
the conduct of these persons the greatest danger
to the established church was to be apprehended.
(Hear, hear.) As to the repeal of the Union, he
assured hon. members opposite that it was not nec-
essary for them to give themselves as much trouble
to sever the Protestants of Ireland from their
Catholic fellow countrymen. (Hear, hear.) The
Protestants, and even some of these who had been
the most violent in party politics, were beginning
to find out that the interests of all Irishmen were
but one and the same. (Hear, hear.) In the
county of Kilkenny, which he had the honour to
represent, and in which no meeting could be held,
the petition for the repeal of the Union would be
signed by almost every individual, Catholic and
Protestant. It was unjust to argue the case of the
church establishment in Ireland as if it stood on
the same ground as the church establishment in
this country. In the county of Kilkenny the number
of Catholics in that county were not more than 5,000.
(Hear, hear.) That was a point which ought to be kept
in view whenever the question of the Protestant
Irish church establishment was under considera-
tion. (Hear.) In the same county there were ten
parishes lying together, in which there was not one
Protestant—(hear)—and it was impossible to sup-
pose that those ten parishes could be kept up for
ever. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. O'CONNELL having presented the petitions
which had given rise to the present discussion,
could not help making one or two observa-
tions in reply to the honourable gentleman
opposite. That hon. gentleman was one of those
who supposed that the intellects of the people of
Ireland were of a foggy nature, that they would
not discern their own interests; without the aid
of British spectacles. (Oh, oh, and a laugh.) The
individuals who signed the petitions which he (Mr.
O'Connell) had presented respecting tithes, did not
mean that the tithes should go into the landlords'
pockets, but they wished for the abolition of the
two-thirds which fell upon capital and labor. In
the county of Kilkenny, to which his hon. friend
(Mr. Finn) had referred, there were 50 parishes,
in which there was not one Protestant resident, with
many of the proprietors, as well as the tenants, were
Roman Catholics. (Hear, hear.) The petitioners
did certainly hope that the church establishment
could be cut down to the necessities of the Pro-
testant population. But the honourable member
was mistaken—he (Mr. O'Connell) said it without
disrespect—he was mistaken, and he calculated
the Catholics of Ireland, when he said that they
desired an ascendancy for their church. (Hear,
hear.) He (Mr. O'Connell) was as sincere a Catho-
lic as the honourable gentleman opposite was a
Protestant; and he would no more consent to the
establishment of a Catholic ascendancy than he
would to a penal law making it a capital offence
to be a Roman Catholic. (Hear.) The kingdom
of the Redeemer was not of this world; and religion
was degraded by being mixed up with tempo-
ral and political affairs. The hon. gentleman
talked of the opposite interests of Catholic and
Protestant, as if he lived to the times of the
Reformation, when Catholic and Protestant
persecuted each other by turns, as each had the
power. Nay, in that part of the island
(the north) from which the honourable gentleman
came, the Protestants, having early got the power
into their hands, persecuted each other more vio-
lently, perhaps, than in other places Catholic per-
secuted Protestant, or Protestant persecuted Catho-
lic. (Hear.) The repeal of the Union should
not be looked upon as a sectarian question. He
would say for himself that he would reject the re-
peal, if he thought it would give one sect any
power over another. The number of Irish peers
was 103, and of these, no more than seven were
Roman Catholics; and that number could only be
increased by the executive. Talking to the house,
after this, that an Irish parliament would be ex-
clusively Catholic, might be a proof of the ingenu-
ity of those who did so, but was no proof of
respect for the intellects of those who composed the
assembly to whom such language would be ad-
dressed. The hon. gentleman had made a discov-
ery. He had discovered that unity was the best
form of government, inasmuch as it was the most
simple and complete. (Hear, hear.) The hon-
ourable gentleman would be entitled to all
the merit of ingenuity; but that a certain
individual named Bonaparte had made the
same discovery, and with that he also acted
on it. But the hon. gentleman, perhaps, was
not aware of the effects which Bonaparte's getting
his plan into operation produced. Bonaparte
attempted to pursue into the hands of the
the nations of Europe into the hands of the
his attempt ended by himself being swept off the
face of the earth. (Hear.) So would it ever be
with any mobility of legislation which had the
vice for its basis. But, with the God of the
world was not aware that there was such a thing as
a federal union; and that that was all other
descriptions of unity the best. He had come
forward with his epigrams on unity; he had

Hear.) The question whether the practice as that in England?—d in this country, what ce? The hon member to the French war. At nent practised a degree (Cheers.) It was lu at were it not for the ta- innocent men would not (hears.) It was far bet- from entering into any English judges indulged could they be tolerated in ot. He would just take some parts of the poli- mith. He begged to call ra. Such an expression ble. One of the greatest the impartiality. If the partial in England, he saw id not be so in Ireland.— e equally bare in each judge talk of the people as he said before, highly right to make any differ- the King's subjects and be to make any invidious and wealth, and poverty y was to decide between though he was not pre- to vote for the removal bench, yet he would give cordial support. (That the house ought to alned such a grave charge of the land; it was the tect the judges. as free to admit that, in a h held with the honour- man, the member for the he did say that he would had for its object the of the bench, but he that he would oppose a its objects to a simple in- trusted he was completely ge of breach of good faith. the right hon. gentleman, for Ireland, had not stated ration which he held with that the right hon. gentle- he had with him, most e would oppose any motion et the removal of Baron and the right hon. gen- would be obliged to him te the same to the learned y the next post.—(Hear, aid that there was no ma- en him and the hon. and a university. It was true uld not authorise any mo- the learned judge from the omised that he would ab- ear.) ed that the situation of ed baron was one of great ot see what grounds there e therefore would oppose and learned member for an,) addressed the house, e gallery. ard against misconception, .Three or four days since om the learned judge re- part he would take upon to Sir William Smith, ally unacquainted with the charge, and that he would id he heard it brought be thought it was a strong at not one that would jus- tainly one that called for He expressed an opinion per of that house, and not the government. (Loud considered inquiry neces- detrimental to the best in- to grant it. (Cheers.) amidst cries of divide, and ot sit still and allow hou- so state that all the in- respectable portion of the id be opposed to this mo- rary, stated that many of part of the country, and a fors, were in favour of it, political speeches from the they might like politics in gh.) It would be fatal of the people in this house, y. (Hear, hear.) The many occasions indulged in it was absurd to call any occasions the greatest for the conduct of that hoped the house would not mpt to stigmatise the mo- merely political character, nt forward by the hon. and Dublin. He pledged his an and a member of that members totally unconnected o would have brought the e honourable and learned ot alone so. He hoped aken upon its own merits, e as English judge ad- sion such a question as the uld not that provoke their y? In whatever country line characteristic of justice. a reply, said that Ireland e in his Majesty's govern- ment. The question was Importance. There were more than any other country, or indeed all other countries put together. The people were all starving, and yet he was told that in the month of June, 1831, 1,000 hogs passed through one trap in Berkshire, every one of which came from Ireland. The half of Lancashire, and the half of the West Riding of Yorkshire, were led from Ireland. (Hear, hear.) They that must be a good country, and the people must be an industrious people, or how could all that be done? Yet they re- quired all the force to which he had before alluded to keep them in order. It must be a bad govern- ment that Ireland had when such scenes were seen

and when this country's labour was forced to such an enormous extent to keep down such an indus- trious people as the statement he had made proved them to be. Then, he would ask, why not discuss the question of the Repeal of the Legislative Union?—at least, why should the ministers advise his Majesty, much, he was sure, against his Ma- jesty's feelings, to scold his Irish subjects? On a former occasion he had said that he remembered the time when the question of reform was treated in the same way as the ministry did now that of Re- peal. He well remembered the time when a reformer, a late member of that house, had thought it prudent to go across the sea, in order to escape from Sidmouth's dungeons, and yet that man had lived to see a ministry, who called themselves a reform ministry, and a parliament who every day almost boasted that they were a reformed parliament. Still would yet be with the question of repeal, if the ministry pursued their present course, and refused any discussion on the matter. Colonel WILLIAMS, although he fully admitted the statements that had been made by the hon. member for Oldham, as to the deplorable state of Ireland, could by no means agree with him that the repeal of the Union would produce an amended state of things in that country. He recollected perfectly well the period when the Union took place; he thought Mr. Pitt was pursuing, the wrong course, and thought that instead of any Union taking place, his proper course would have been to have reformed the Irish parliament; but the Union having taken place, he doubted very much whether any good could be effected by its repeal. Mr. FINN congratulated the repealers and the people of Ireland at large on the speech that had proceeded from the hon. member opposite (Mr. Macleod), as it had called forth one from the hon. member for Oldham, for which the people of Ireland were greatly indebted. (Hear, hear.)—What he had stated with respect to the people of Ireland was perfectly true. The statement that the reformers had been denounced by the Whigs was equally so, for Mr. Canning himself had called them a low and degraded crew. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Finn was convinced that the repeal of the Union was a measure founded in justice, would be advantageous to both this country and Ireland, and was the only means of producing contentment, peace, and order in Ireland, and giving security to this country. Mr. POTTER should have thought the vote of last night would have convinced the Irish mem- bers of the determination of the house to do justice to Ireland. He understood that the present Secretary for Ireland, in the discharge of his duties connected with that country, gave the greatest and most perfect satisfaction. (Cries of no, no, and hear.)—The hon. member for Oldham had spoken of the great quantity of cattle sent from Ireland to this country; that, in his opinion, showed that Ireland was a great pro- ducing country. There was no doubt that the money from its produce was spent in England, but he (Mr. Potter) was quite convinced, if there was any given, the house would do justice to Ireland, by instituting either an absentee tax or a modified system of poor laws.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. HARDY said he could get up hundreds of such petitions, in different parts of England. He considered too much time was taken up with Irish affairs. Mr. RUTVEN said he could not enter into the sentiment expressed by the hon. gentleman, who pretended to deplore, in so piteous a manner, the waste of the time of the house in receiving Irish petitions. (Cries of "No.") It would be unjust had hypocritical in Irish members if they did not take up the time of the house on this great and important question. (Hear, hear.) Many opportu- nities would arise, and he trusted would be taken advantage of, to discuss that question, for it was only by perseverance in so great an object as the repeal of the Union that they could hope to succeed. They had great prejudices and party feel- ings, and the power of ministers, and men who would be glad to be in their office, to contend with; and they found that even the royal name was abused, for the purpose of denouncing that object, and pointing them out as subjects only to be treated with "just indignation." (Hear, hear, hear.) He was glad to hear that expression, for he knew both its use and its absurdity; for while, on the one hand, it did not deter those who had begun, it had made ten new repealers where only one existed before. It had made the friends of Ireland, standing by, but she was not protected in royal speeches, stand up in her favour. Such expressions only tended to agitate both the people of England and Ireland, until they would, by constitutional means, defeat those who seemed disposed to divert them into rebellion. Indeed, they were not to be diverted from their course until they obtained the freedom of Ireland. It should be remembered that the people of Ireland are eight millions; they ought to have a legislature of their own. Had as the Irish par- liament was, it had not been improved by being transplanted to an English soil. The Irish par- liament, at the period of 1782, had an illustrious leader, who made England submit to them, and England would be obliged to go to succumb to Ire- land. England dared not to go to war at present with eight millions of discontented subjects. Was he to be told, then, that it was wasting the time of the house to receive the petitions of the Irish people? Let them send the Irish members home to their own country, where they could do a great deal of good, which they could not do here. The de- noucement of the repeal of the Union had led to deep thought; but they were told that to petition was a crime in the eyes of the ministers, and a species of agitation to be put down by the name of the King and a ministerial mandate. (Hear, hear, hear.) Was it agitation to ask what the people to do so? It might be called so, but he would be one to advise the people to petition and to continue to petition for that repeal, and the granting of their petition would be the best act of the legislature. Ministerial mandates, royal speeches, and proclamations, might frighten a great deal of them, and they would have no effect except that of exciting the people to petition for their rights. He, with other Irish members, deplored the practice of absenteeism; but the cause of the mischief was, that they were under a species of foreign policy. The Irish members were in this country as foreigners, and treated as foreigners, and though they stood up to do their duty, they found they were prevented from doing so to a great extent. He thought it was unnecessary for him to make any apology for thus attempting to support the rights of the Irish people and the repeal of the legislative Union. (Hear, hear.)

Lord W. LENNIX did not like the expression of foreign parliament. He could assure hon. mem- bers for Ireland that English members sym- pathised with them in every thing that called for their good feeling. (Hear, hear.) He was open to conviction on the topic of repeal; he did not make up his mind on it, but even the member for Oldham, who possessed twice his (Lord Lennox's) experience, and ten times his talent, acknowledged that till last year he had not been satisfied of the necessity of the measure. Therefore he was ex- ceedingly—(hear)—and though at present he did not believe that benefit would result from the carrying on of such a measure, yet his mind was not finally determined. (Hear, hear, hear.) If the Irish members could convince the English of the policy of this measure, no doubt they would support it. He heard with some degree of pain the expression of time being wasted, as used by the hon. member for Bradford; to be sure, a great deal of Irish business was done in the house, and much attention should be given to the affairs of a country which had been trampled on for years. The hon. member for Bradford explained. The house adjourned at twenty minutes past two o'clock. ADJOURNED SITTING. MR. SHEIL'S CASE. Mr. GROTE appeared at the bar of the House with the report of the Committee of privileges.—As soon as the Clerk had received it, a number of voices loudly called "read, read." The clerk then read it as follows:—"The Committee of privileges, to whom the matter of complaint was referred, arising out of a paragraph in the *Examiner* newspaper, dated November 10, 1833, have agreed upon, and do hereby submit to your honourable house the following report:—"The paragraph in question, purporting to form part of the report of a speech publicly deli- vered by Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., member of Parliament for the borough of Hull, is as follows:—"It is impossible for those not actually in the house to know all the secret machinery by which votes are obtained. I happen to know this: (and I could appeal, if necessary, to a person well known and much respected by yourself), that an Irish member who spoke with great violence against every part of that bill, and voted against every clause of it, went to Ministers and said, 'Don't vote against that bill, or it will be impossible for any man to live in Ireland.' What, (said they) this from you, who speak and vote against the bill? 'Yes (he replied), that is necessary, because, if I don't come into Parliament for Ireland, I must be out altogether, and that I don't choose.' (Cries of 'Name,' and 'No.') Consider for a moment: can I do it? (No—Yes.) That is a point for my consideration. I have a great respect for every one here; but if every one in the room was to hold up his hand for it, I would not do it. The secret is not my own; if he had told it to me, I would have said, 'Mark! I'll keep no such secret as this: I will publish it to the world.' But if I name the member, I put it in the power of the individual who made the declaration to know the gentleman who told me." Your committee, in entering on the delicate and embarrassing duty imposed upon them, ascer- tained from Mr. Hill, that though he could not admit the entire accuracy of the above paragraph, as a report of what he had publicly spoken at Hull, he nevertheless recollected to have publicly charged an Irish member of Parliament with con- duct similar to substance to that which the para- graph describes. The Irish member so alluded to was Richard Labor Suell, Esq., member of Par- liament for the county of Tipperary; and Mr. Hill states the charge, so the best of his belief, to have been substantially as follows:—"That Mr. Suell made communications respecting the Irish coercion bill to persons connect- ed with the government and others, with the in- tention thereby of promoting the passing of the coercion bill, and having a direct tendency to pro- duce that effect, whilst his speeches and votes in the house were directed to the defeat of the coercion bill." Such was the substance of the allegation into which your committee proceeded to inquire. Two witnesses were called before them at the sugges- tion of Mr. Hill, and others were about to be examined, when Mr. Hill himself, finding the testi- mony already heard very different from what he had expected, freely and spontaneously made the following communication to the committee:—"That he had come to the conviction that his charge against Mr. Suell, of having directly or indirectly communicated, or intended to communicate to the government any private opinions in opposition to those which he expressed in the House of Commons, had no foundation in fact; that such charge was not merely incapable of formal proof, but was, in his present sincere belief, totally and absolutely unfounded; that he had originally been induced to make mention of it in a hasty and un- premeditated speech, under a firm persuasion that he had received it on undeniable evidence; but that being now satisfied of the mistake into which he had fallen, and convinced that the charge was wholly untrue, he came forward to express his deep and unfeigned sorrow for having ever contrib- uted to give it circulation. Mr. Hill added, that if there were any way consistent with honour, by which he could make reparation to Mr. Suell, he should deem no sacrifice too great to heal the wound which his erroneous statement had in- flicted." It is with the highest gratification that your committee had themselves enabled thus to exonerate an accused member of Parliament from im- putations alike painful and undeserved. The voluntary avowal of an erroneous statement, on the part of Mr. Hill, puts it now in their power to pronounce a decided opinion, and to close the present inquiry. Neither of the witnesses who ap- peared before the committee, deposed to any facts calculated to bear out the allegation against Mr. Suell; nor did their testimony go to impeach his character and honour in any way, or as to any matter whatever. The committee have no hesita- tion in declaring their deliberate conviction that the innuence of Mr. Suell, in respect of the whole matter of complaint referred to their investigation is entire and unquestionable. Your committee feel bound, at the same time, to express their full confidence in Mr. Hill's de- claration, that the statement impeaching Mr. Suell's character, was made by him at Hull, under a sincere, though mistaken, persuasion of its ac- curacy. They derive this confidence as well from the tone of generous regret which characterised

his communication at the close of their proceedings, as from the candid admissions, and the evident anxiety to avoid all exaggeration and mis-statement, which they have exhibited throughout his testimony, as delivered in their presence." After the clerk had finished the perusal of the report, there was a loud call for Lord Althorp. Lord ALTHORP presumed that he was called on to rise in defence of what he had stated, in consequence of the report which had just been presented to that house. In the contents of that report he was sure that the house would rejoice, and no member more than himself. Indeed, with refer- ence to the charge which had come under the consideration of the Committee, which was, that the hon. member for Tipperary had made commu- nications to his Majesty's government, during the discussion on the coercion bill, favourable to that measure, he had in the first instance repudiated it. (Hear, hear.) The charge, which he had repeated, was a distinct one, that the hon. member had used language out of the house, in reference to the coercion bill, very different to that which he held in the house. He then said, he stated that on the authority of a person on whose veracity he placed the strongest reliance, and said that he believed, or rather had reason to believe (these were the words he used), that the hon. and learned member had used such language. After what had taken place, he felt it was now due from him to the house, to state, frankly and openly, why it was that, in answer to the question put by the hon. and learned gentleman opposite, he had not strictly confined himself to the question, but had made the statements which he referred to. (Hear, hear.) He had seen in the public papers many very strong attacks on the hon. member for Hull, in consequence of the speech which he made. He was quite sure that the question which was put to him was put with a view of following up these attacks; and had he stopped in answering merely by the question that had been put to him, it would have been taken as an entire repudiation; he would have been considered as making a statement contrary to that he had reason to believe, and he should thereby have supported and encouraged the attack on the hon. and learned member for Hull. (Hear, hear.) He believed, at the time he made the declaration, and on subsequent consideration he still believed, that in so doing he acted imprudently as a man, and still more imprudently as a minister. (Hear, hear, hear.) He possibly might have acted more wisely if he had refrained from the statement. But he had explained the feeling by which he was actuated in coming forward, and he would rather be found fault with for doing too much than too little. (Hear, hear.) It was true that he had acted imprudently as a Minister, but he was compelled to put his character as a Minister in competition with his character as a man of honour and a gentleman; and how could he but prefer the latter? (Loud cheers.) He was now called on to state his opinion after hearing the report. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the facts to which the report re- ferred, he could have no scruple at all in saying that it met with his entire satisfaction, and he felt perfectly convinced that the hon. genl. had never directly or indirectly communicated with govern- ment, nor intentionally used any such expressions in conversation with others, with a view of their being communicated to the government. He had expressed his belief to this effect at first; and he was placed in this position, that the information which he had received as to what passed in con- versation was from a person on whose veracity he could place the strictest reliance. The hon. member and learned gentleman, in the denial which he (Lord Althorp) made, did not appear to him (Lord Althorp) to deny the particular statement which he made. If, therefore, the hon. member and learned gentleman would say distinctly that he had no doubt so, he should most certainly place full confidence in that declaration. He did not wish to say anything disparaging to any man, when he said any member in that house might very readily, in loose conversation, express senti- ments somewhat different to those which he uttered within doors. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. and learned gentleman asserted distinctly that he had not done so, he would believe that assertion. At present, the case stood thus—the person who had given the information was one on whose veracity he could place the fullest reliance, but he might have been mistaken. If the hon. and learned gentleman would state to him that it was perfectly untrue that he had used language of that de- scription, he would not only say that he fully be- lieved the hon. member and learned member's state- ment, but he would apologise to him in any way in which a gentleman could apologise to another. (Hear, hear, hear.) He would take this oppor- tunity of saying what he should have stated to the committee, had it not suddenly ceased its sitting. Having on the former occasion stated that more than one Irish member had made similar communications to members of his Majesty's government, he (Lord Althorp) conceived it to be his duty to communicate with his informant, and his duty to re-appoint the house, that though his words on that occasion were literally borne out by his informant, the impression which it produced on his mind, had which he might have produced in consequence upon the house, was not borne out. (Hear, hear.) Mr. O'CONNELL—I appeal to the house whether my hon. and learned friend, the member for Tipperary, is bound to make any such declaration as that which the noble lord calls for. I say that he is not. (Hear.) It was not from any wish to gild himself against vague accusation, but in answer to a distinct charge preferred against him by the noble lord, that my hon. and learned friend gave to the house the solemn de- claration which he alluded to. My hon. and learned friend gave that denial flatly and unequivocally, and the noble lord having, when called upon to retract the accusation, repeated it, notwithstanding the cautions of his own friends, he has now no right whatever to call upon my hon. and learned friend to confirm that which wants no confirma- tion—I mean his former denial. (Hear, hear.) I will not presume to suggest to the noble lord what he ought to do upon this occasion, but will leave it entirely to his own feelings. (Hear.) Lord ALTHORP—I am not understanding that the solemn denial which the hon. and learned member for Tipperary gave to the charge preferred against him by my hon. and learned friend the member for Hull, was also meant as a denial to my statement, then I have no hesitation in saying that I cannot disbelieve a denial so solemnly made, and that being the case, I was obliged to the hon. and learned member for Tipperary for the language which I used. (Hear and cheers.)

Mr. COBBETT did not help remarking that the statement made by the noble lord opposite ap- peared to him to apply to the whole body of Irish Members who opposed the coercion bill. Now the assertion which that statement cast upon them, had been completely wiped away by the report of the committee. (Hear, hear.) Of the conduct of the noble lord on this occasion he was no judge; (a laugh)—but as far as he was a judge, he would say that it was just the conduct which the house expected from his lordship. (Hear.) Mr. C. ODWYER, in a speech delivered with great warmth, protested that if the noble lord had expressed himself unequivocally upon the report which had just been read, he would have done that which was his duty. (Cries of "No.") His hon. and learned friend was now most fully and honourably acquitted of the charge which had been preferred against him; but as it appeared to him, the country to which he had the honour to belong was still implicated in it. He could not refrain from expressing his surprise that the de- claration of ministers was not on this occasion more explicit and more exculpatory. (Hear, hear.) The charge, as it was originally brought forward, was designated to prostrate not merely his hon. and learned friend the member for Tipperary, but also every member of the party with which he was connected. (Hear, hear.)—The hon. member was proceeding in this strain, when he was interrupted by The SPEAKER, who reminded him that the case now before the house had been entertained by the house as a question of privilege. It was then left to the judgment of the house how it would proceed in such a case. The house decided that it should be decided in a committee of privileges, and in consequence delivered over the matter to that committee; the committee had decided upon it, and their report had just been read. The con- versation which had since taken place, so far from detracting from, had absolutely given additional weight to that report. (Loud cries of hear.) He, therefore, put it to the feelings of the hon. and learned member, whether there were not many reasons, besides points of order, which ought to induce him to avoid the warmth in which he was then indulging. (Hear.) Mr. C. ODWYER felt it to be his duty to yield upon this occasion, as he would upon all others, to the intimation of the Speaker. He should ab- stain from entering further into the topics to which he had just been alluding; but this he must say, that during the last two or three days the hon. and learned member for Tipperary had been pur- sued with the most unrelenting rigour. (Hear, hear, and cries of no.) That he had been at- tacked by parties, and assailed from quarters which were supposed to be under certain in- fluence. (Loud cries of hear, and loud cries of no.) But that, in spite of all the malignity which had combined to crush him, his character, and with his character, the character of his party, had been fully vindicated. (Hear.) He availed himself of this opportunity to say that the hon. and learned member for Hull had done himself great honor by the manner in which he had conducted this case before the committee; and that he had extorted from the committee the most flattering testimony to the sincerity with which he had acted through- out. (Hear, hear.) Mr. FINN followed on the same side, but most of his observations were inaudible in the gallery. Mr. C. FERGUSSON was sure that the whole house participated in the pleasure which he felt upon hearing that one of its Members had been acquitted of so grievous an accusation as that which had been brought against his hon. and learned friend. (Hear.) There was one fact con- nected with this discussion to which he could speak from his own personal knowledge; during the debates on the Irish coercion bill, he had given his assistance to those members who opposed it. During the many conversations which he held with them, he had never discovered anything which could induce him to suppose that their opposition was not founded in justice and conducted with sincerity. (Hear, hear, hear.) The hon. member concluded by expressing his entire conviction that any impression which had been made by the recent charges, to the disadvantage of his hon. and learned friend the member for Tipperary, would be more than removed by the publication of this re- port. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER was then proceeding to put the question, when there were loud and incessant calls for Mr. Sheil. Mr. SHEIL at last came forward, and addressed the house to the following effect:—That I have been completely exonerated upon one charge at least that was preferred against me, must be evi- dent to every man who heard the evidence submit- ted to the committee. The hon. member and learned member for Hull, after examining two witnesses in the committee—for the committee had left the conduct of this prosecution, if I am permitted to use such an expression, to him and to him alone—the hon. and learned member for Hull had stated to the committee, in the manner the best calculated to make me reparation, that he felt not only that his charge against me was not proved, but also that it was destitute of all foundation. As soon as the hon. member and learned member had come to that conclusion, he turned to me with an expression of emotion, and said that he hoped that I would forgive him for the wrong which he had done me. (Hear.) The very moment those words passed his lips, I told him that resentment was not an ingredient in my character, and that after that acknowledgment I freely and frankly for- gave him. (Hear, I ear, and loud cheers.) That he had put into circulation a grievous charge against me—that he had attempted to establish in the face of the assembled Commons of this great empire—and that he had signally failed in that attempt, is admitted by the hon. and learned gentleman himself, and in a manner that in my mind ap- pears calculated to do him great honour. (Hear, hear.) In reference to what passed between my- self and the noble lord on the other side of the house, I hope that hon. gentleman will do me the justice to recollect that I shrank from no part of this discussion. (Hear.) The house will, I trust, do me the justice to recollect also, that not only I did not object to inquiry, but that I even respect- fully requested it—may more, demanded it—(loud cheers)—in spite of the warnings terrifically but unnecessarily held out to me on the other side. (Hear, hear.) I stood on the verge of the precipice without dismay—(cheers)—and being now removed from it, I trust that I shall show as little exultation as I then showed fear. I courted inquiry by every means in my power. My denial was not limited to the allegation against me made by the hon. and learned member for Hull—that was

7

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—FEB. 13.

CONDUCT OF BARON SMITH.

Mr. SHAW opposed the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. Was there the slightest and least founded charge of injustice in the exercise of Baron Smith's high functions alleged against him? There was not. If there had been even the shadow of a charge of that nature, he (Mr. S.) would have offered no opposition to the motion, as he would have the fullest confidence of his triumphantly acquiescent. But on the frivolous and trifling grounds of the present motion, he could never agree that that learned and distinguished individual should be dragged before that house and the public, as was sought to be done. It was disgraceful to the government to proceed to the proposition of the hon. and learned member for Dublin; but it was only one of the many proofs of the systematic pusillanimity with which they encroached everything in his power; a power, which, whatever they might affect to the contrary, made them quakers in Ireland. (Hear, and laughter.)

Mr. STANLEY trusted that he would not be accused by those who knew him of systematically yielding to the desires of the honorable and learned member for Dublin, or conceding to his power that which was contrary to his view of what was right. (Hear, hear, from Mr. O'Connell.) But the question before the house was not one, and ought not to be one, of politics or party; and as such he was free to say he treated it. He (Mr. Stanley) would confess that whatever were his fixed opinions on the subject of the hon. and learned member for Dublin's motion before he came down to that house, and whatever might have been his belief of the impossibility that honorable gentleman would have to contend with in making out a case to fully substantiate his motion—namely the removal of Mr. Baron Smith from the bench—all had been removed from his mind by the course the question had taken, and the hon. and learned member for Dublin would excuse him for saying, not less by the speech of the hon. and learned member who had opposed the inquiry, than by his. It was quite evident that that hon. gentleman from the commencement argued as though he had a bad case. He wandered from the strict question, and spoke strongly of the excitement, being himself, at the time, no unapt typification of that condition of mind. He said that the government had, in their conduct in Ireland, combined the extremes of violence with those of pusillanimity, and so distract the country more than they pacified it. The learned gentleman would forgive him, if he (Mr. Stanley) said he seemed to know little, or knowing, misrepresented greatly the conduct of the Irish administration. The hon. and learned gentleman had gone into two matters not very relevant to the subject at issue, and which he was pleased to say contained the only symptoms of vigor which had been exhibited in the government of Ireland. But would the honorable and learned gentleman stake his reputation as a lawyer upon the assertion that the government had, in the first case to which he referred, evidence, legal evidence, against the party whom the government was most desirous of crushing, because he was the original author of the offence? If he could establish that the government was in possession of such legal evidence, then he (Mr. Stanley) would admit that he had no charge against the government of having taken the secondary instead of the first offender. But till he (Mr. Stanley) could prove that charge as a lawyer, it would be more consistent with fairness, as a member of that house, to abstain from making charges against the government for not doing that which he knew, as a lawyer it could not do. (Hisses.) With regard to the second point, he (Mr. Stanley) would not discuss it at length, but he could not forbear stating what were the real facts. The hon. and learned gentleman had stated that no charge was made against the individual dismissed and that he was dismissed from the magistracy in consequence of a member of his family—his wife—having exhibited symbols prohibited by law. Certainly such conduct would have been absurd and incredible to a degree; but the fact was, that one of the processions which had been prohibited by the act of Parliament, because they led to violence and bloodshed, came to the house of a magistrate, and instead of being dispersed by him, were received both by him and his family, decorated with all the forbidden symbols. (Hear, hear.) Conduct like this in a magistrate's house, could meet with no other consequences than it did. (Hear, hear.) He would now say a word or two upon the political character of Mr. Baron Smith's charges, and upon the circumstances under which this political charge was delivered? The Dublin calendar was exceedingly light; and for it the hon. and learned gentleman justly took some credit to himself. There was no excitement, no pretence of any kind, for making a political charge. Could the learned gentleman say there was?

Mr. SHAW—No. Mr. STANLEY—The charge was made political then it seems because they had nothing to say. (A laugh.) But did not gentlemen sometimes get into scrapes for talking too much. (A laugh.) Was there any reason, he asked, in a case where there were only seventeen persons to be tried, for the judge who was to try these cases to deliver a political address to the jury? (Hear.) The hon. and learned member for Dublin thought that upon no occasion was a judge justified in making political allusions in his address to the grand jury. (Mr. O'Connell made an observation across the table which did not reach the gallery.) He contended that it was the opinion of the judge going circuit that the country was in a state of insurrection, produced by exciting speeches delivered by agitating orators, it was then not only accusable, but indeed highly proper, that the judge should advert to the circumstances, and point out how far the excitement and the practical disturbances led to the crimes which brought the prisoners before him. The hon. and learned recorder for Dublin adverted to a speech made by Chief Justice Bushe in the Queen's county, in which political allusions were made as a sort of set-off to those delivered by Baron Smith. Why, if ever there was a case where political allusions were justified in an address to a grand jury, it was in that adverted to by the learned recorder. This address was delivered upon the occasion of a special commission, issued for the purpose of trying cases that had sprung out of the political excitement of the county, and the pretrial disturbances caused

thereby. (Hear, hear.) Was Chief Justice Bushe ever charged with making the bench a vehicle of political feeling, when he commented in strong language on the political state of the country when the Insurrection Act was found to be necessary? Did he not point out the instruments of agitation as the cause of the turbulence of the country at that time? Did he not point out to the people—the insubstantial people—the mischief which agitation excited them to? Did the honorable and learned gentleman then denounce Chief Justice Bushe? He (Mr. Stanley) was surprised to hear, and he heard so for the first time, that the judge should not refer in his charge to the causes (be they of political agitation, or be they what they may) that disturbed it or order of social state. As well might it be said that the minister of the crown should not refer to those causes, or that his Majesty in his speech should not do so. As well might a complaint be made in this house of the reference made in the two last speeches from the throne to the political agitation and the pretrial agitation which followed upon it, as the one now made against Mr. Baron Smith for advertent to the agitation which had produced such disastrous and calamitous results in Ireland. Now he (Mr. S.) contended that a judge had as much right, as was as much bound in duty to advert to the state of the country, as his Majesty's ministers were in the speech from the throne, or in their address to the house. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) He would not wish to see the day when a judge on the bench should be restricted from referring to the causes which produced social disturbance. He would instance the present agitation upon the repeal of the Union. Yes, he would ask, a judge to withhold his opinion of that agitation, if he found that it produced, or was likely to produce, disastrous consequences to the country? He admitted that opinions upon political subjects delivered from the bench were foreign to the duty of a judge. But it did not, therefore, follow that they should not advert to political agitation, which tended to a disturbance of the public peace, and to the injury and well being of society. (Hear, hear.) He could not pass over the observation of the hon. and learned gentleman with reference to the attainment of justice in this house towards Ireland. He (Mr. S.) would say, that in this house the Irish did expect, and would obtain justice. He repeated that Ireland would obtain justice in this house. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. secretary then proceeded to comment upon the conduct of Mr. Baron Smith during the trials at Arranmore, and observed that an opinion had gone abroad in Ireland that the same attention was not paid by the British House of Commons to the administration of justice in that country which would be paid to the conduct of the English judges in England, and that Ireland and Irish affairs were not considered of the same importance by a Parliament sitting in London which they would be by a Parliament assembled in Dublin. He trusted that no real substantial grounds would ever be afforded to the people of Ireland for entertaining such an opinion. It was equally the duty of the Irish government, the English government, and the British House of Commons, to eradicate from the minds of the people of Ireland such an opinion, and above all, to convert them of Parliament, and to terminate in watch over and preserve the administration of justice in Ireland pure and uncontaminated. Had such heavy charges as those brought against Baron Smith been preferred against an English judge, he was convinced the house would not have hesitated for a moment to institute the fullest inquiry. He would not say that the charges brought against the learned judge were justified, but he was bound to say, that on a first view of the case there appeared to be full ground for inquiry. He did not make this declaration with any hostile view towards Baron Smith, but he was fully convinced that the most effectual way to preserve unimpaired the reputation of that learned judge, would be to promote the fullest investigation, and that a contrary effect would result from any attempt to throw impediments in the way of enquiry. By adopting enquiry the best proof would be given to the people of Ireland, that their interests were not neglected by Parliament; convinced of that circumstance, and persuaded that such a course would be the most honorable in its result to the learned judge who was most interested, he should support the motion for enquiry.

Sir R. PEEL had listened with the utmost attention to the speech of his right hon. friend, if he would permit him to call him, but he certainly had not been made a convert by his right hon. friend's arguments. One of the charges brought forward against Mr. Baron Smith was, that he was a political judge; he had long had the honor of knowing the learned judge, and he believed that a man more free from political feelings never sat on the Irish bench; such had been his character when in Parliament, and such was the opinion entertained of him by Mr. Burke, to whom in early life the learned baron was well known as a member of the House of Commons, he was always a moderate man, and invariably a supporter of the Catholic claims. During the six years in which he (Sir R. Peel) was Secretary for Ireland, he had frequent intercourse with the learned baron, and he could fearlessly and conscientiously state, that he had never known a more impartial judge, or one more humane towards those upon whom it was his painful duty to sit in judgment. Had a case been made out to the satisfaction of the house to justify its agreeing to the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin? Would they appoint this committee to inquire into the conduct of Mr. Baron Smith? If they once established such a dangerous precedent, they might talk as much as they pleased about the independence of the judges of the crown having no control over them—of their being independent of the fountain of all honour and mercy; but would they, he asked, be independent of the control exercised over them by certain popular parties in that house? (Hear, hear.) There were two suggestions against the learned baron. One was that he had neglected his duty. Why, this was known last session. Why did they not then proceed to consider the learned baron's conduct in respect to this? Were they now, after Baron Smith had administered justice six months subsequent to the statement that he had neglected his duty, to institute an inquiry into the learned baron's conduct in this particular? And could the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanley), who justified the necessity upon some occasions of political allusions being made in addresses to grand juries—who advocated the propriety of such conduct as Chief Justice Bushe, and who, upon one occasion, made use of an address of Baron Smith's, when it answered his purpose—

could that right hon. gentleman be found amongst the supporters of a motion calling for inquiry into Mr. Baron Smith's charge to be a grand jury merely because it occurred? The House of Commons had no control over the judges, except by address to the crown. Would they then be justified in granting a committee to inquire into the conduct of a judge under such circumstances, unless they had good grounds for doing so? (Hear, hear.) Had any complaint been made to the government of the late sittings of Baron Smith? If any complaint of that nature had been made, why there would be some show of reason for the motion before the house. Suppose Baron Smith, on going to an assize town, finding that the calendar is much more heavy than he had at first expected it would be, and suppose he is anxious to try the entire of the prisoners rather than allow them to remain over to the next assizes, no objection being started to this proceeding by the counsel, and no complaint being made of the impartiality of the judge—was that conduct, he asked, such as demanded censure? If they had any charge founded upon good and substantial evidence, why not call the judge to their bar, and tell him before he was charged with, but not send him before a special committee. The right hon. gent. (Mr. Stanley) said that this would show the people of Ireland that justice would be done to them in a British Parliament. Yes, but they should take care that in doing justice to the people of Ireland, they did no injustice to the judges of that country. (Hear.) They should act in the same manner towards the judges of Ireland that they would to the judges of England. (Hear.) They should do this, and be heedless of the clamour that might be raised against them. (Hear.) The charge made against the learned baron, in addition to that brought against him last session, was, that he had made political allusions in his address to a grand jury. The right honorable gentleman (Mr. Stanley) admitted that there were occasions upon which a judge would be justified in making allusions of such a nature. Why, good God, were they to say when these allusions ought to be made, and when they ought to be withheld? At what time was it that Mr. Baron Smith made these political allusions to a grand jury? Why at the very time that that house had proceeded to the bench but necessary measure of passing the correction bill. (Hear, hear.) Now, a construction had been put upon a part of that address of the learned baron by his right hon. friend (Mr. Littleton) which he did not think was warranted by the speech itself. He denied that the learned baron had called the great body of the Catholics of Ireland disaffected or disloyal. It was not likely that Baron Smith, who was all his life a friend to Catholic emancipation, and was descended on one side from Catholics, should stigmatize or insult the great body of the Catholics of Ireland. (Hear.) The right hon. gentleman here read an extract from Baron Smith's charge, in which he expressed his opinion that the late sitting of the grand jury was a failure, and that the result was likely to lead to the loss of life. The object of the learned baron was merely to warn the people against being deluded in respect to this question by dangerous and designing men. (Hear.) Was there anything wrong or improper in this? For the King's speech allusion was made to the efforts of designing men to delude the people of Ireland in respect to this question, and a call was made upon all loyal persons to aid and assist in dispelling the delusion, and in supporting the present state of things. (Hear, hear.) To this speech they had returned an answer that they would do all in their power to assist his Majesty in the object which he had in view. (Hear.) Well, the first practical step which they were about to take in support of their address was to bring Mr. Baron Smith before the house, for doing that which every loyal person was called upon by the King's speech to do, namely, to warn the people of the folly of agitating the repeal of the Union. (Hear, hear.) He would tell them what would be the consequence of their bringing Mr. Baron Smith before that house. It would cause the repeal question to triumph. (Hear.) When the judges of the land found that their endeavours to stem the torrent of agitation on this question was met by a demand that they should submit to an inquiry before the House of Commons, they would cease to use their influence with the people, or in the least exert themselves to point out to them the folly of their conduct, and the consequence would be that the agitator would be enabled to proceed in his vocation without assistance, and without fear of exposure. (Hear.) Mr. PRYME did not think that they should refuse to inquire into the conduct of an individual in 1833 because some twenty or thirty years ago Mr. Edmund Burke thought well of that individual. He thought that the fact of Baron Smith's sitting so late upon every occasion, producing thereby great inconvenience to jurors, witnesses, and others, was in itself a sufficient ground for this inquiry being instituted. Sir R. JENKINS contended that the house was proceeding to interfere in a question without any sufficient evidence. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said that he felt himself bound to support the original motion. He believed Baron Smith to be a very amiable man and a good scholar, but if the charge which had that night been brought against him were true he was a very bad judge. (Hear.) He considered that no English judge would be allowed to remain on the bench if he acted as Baron Smith was stated to have acted. (Hear.) If the charges which were preferred against Mr. Baron Smith were not proved, why no injury could arise to that learned person. He would, on the contrary, have all the advantage of a triumphant vindication, and he would return to his duty and be enabled to exercise an increased degree of usefulness. Sir J. SCARBERRY said that when he first heard the motion which had been made by the honorable and learned member for Dublin, he really did not think there would be one person in the house that would second it. What then must have been his surprise to find it supported by his Majesty's government? The case of Mr. Baron Smith having introduced political allusions into his speech was not without precedent. If the government felt that the charges were true, why not state them at once, and bring the judge before the house to meet them? He contended that the motion ought to be rejected, and be repeated, that it was with astonishment he found it supported by the government. (Hear.) Mr. HALCOMB opposed the motion, and expressed his astonishment at the doctrines that had been propounded in support of it.

Lord ALTHORP said that the doctrine of the hon. and learned gentleman was perfectly constitutional, for it was on the address of the two houses alone to the crown that judges could be removed—but was it because this was the case, that the house was not to inquire into the case? He should not go into the question of the house, not having the power through a select committee to examine witnesses upon oath, because the house could only interfere after an inquiry. The charges against the learned judge were not of corruption, but that he had, by a neglect of his duty, shown himself unfit for the judicial office which he filled. It appeared that the case that occurred at Arranmore was not a solitary one for that the same learned judge was in the habitual practice, for a series of years, of pursuing the same conduct as to late sittings. The greater part, however, of the accusation against him was his political charge to the grand jury. This he (Lord Althorp) considered to be a great evil in the administration of justice. A judge acting thus, might undoubtedly insult the religious and political feelings of those whom he addressed, and political feelings could be more dangerous to the ends of justice than such a course. He greatly disliked political charges from judges, and he feared such charges were much more common in Ireland than in this country. The object of the present motion was not to condemn the judge, but to inquire into his alleged misconduct. He believed the case alleged to be true, and the judge guilty of what was charged against him. He did not think it desirable, except in extreme cases, to bring the conduct of judges before Parliament; but it should be recollected that it was only by Parliament their misconduct could be investigated. He considered it impossible to refrain going into the inquiry now sought for; and although no man valued the independence of judges more than he did, he felt that he could not refuse to go into the present inquiry and accede to the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. He hoped the right hon. gentleman would be able to justify his conduct, but if he could not, he (Lord Althorp) was sure that under those circumstances an English judge would be suffered to remain on the bench, and he thought it would be most advantageous to assimilate the administration of justice as much as possible in both countries, and cement that good-will so essential to the interests of both, by showing that the house was disposed to inquire equally into all abuses. (Hear.) Mr. PLUMFRE considered it most undesirable being at the present moment to bring the judges of Ireland into dispute, as this motion was calculated to do, and he should therefore vote against it. Mr. FINN said that his Majesty's government could not take any step better calculated to give confidence to the people of Ireland than by instituting the inquiry called for by this motion. He thought that judicial officers of all sorts were too highly paid, and although he was not disposed to a change by economy, he had been said of the honorable member for Middlesex—a laugh—he should wish to see those salaries reduced. Mr. SERJEANT SPANKIE said that he saw no grounds whatever for the prosecution, for if it was not that, it was something very like it. (Hear.) Colonel VERNER said that he was bound, as one of the members for the county of Arranmore, to state, that having been present on the grand jury on the occasion alluded to, he saw nothing improper in the conduct of the learned judge, and as for the late hour to which on one night the judge sat to try prisoners, that was done with the concurrence of the counsel on both sides, and to prevent the persons who could not find bail being detained in prison to the next assizes. Mr. F. YOUNG, viewing the present motion as an evil precedent, could not give his support. Mr. HARDY said that he should give his vote against the present motion. Sir J. GHAMM said that he should do his conscientious duty by voting against the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. (Loud cheers.) Mr. RUME never heard a more unconstitutional or Tory speech than that which had just been delivered by Mr. Spankie. He was greatly surprised at the resolution taken by the right hon. baronet. Upon what principle of honour or justice could he, as one of the ministers of the crown, advise the King to denounce Daniel O'Connell in his speech.—(Cries of "Order.") He begged pardon for naming the hon. and learned member for Dublin, but how could such advice be given to the King, while the same adviser refused to inquire into the conduct of a party political judge in the same country. If the government wished to put down agitation, they must do so on both sides, and not partially. He should support the motion. Lord SANDON said that it was most discreditable to his Majesty's ministers to give their sanction to a motion which they avowed they had come down to the house to oppose. Was it proper to pass a censure now on a venerable judge, for conduct which he had been suffered to pursue for thirty years? He should give his decided negative to the motion. Lord J. RUSSELL said that he did not intend to say one word upon the subject; but after what had passed, he felt himself under the painful necessity of stating the grounds upon which he intended to vote. It had been said that it was discreditable to the government to change their opinions upon this question; but he did not conceive that they had at all changed their opinion. The truth was, they had come down to the house determined to oppose the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin, as it had been originally worded; but they found that it was now entirely altered, for instead of being a motion, as originally, for an address to the crown to remove the judge, it was reduced to a motion merely for inquiry into some parts of his conduct, which, if even proved to the fullest extent, would not, in his mind, be sufficient ground for the learned judge's removal. He would ask the house, was a judge in the discharge of his sacred duties to be permitted to deliver political disquisitions? (Cheers.) Could any circumstances justify such a practice? Was there to be no blame attached to it? Would the House of Commons not pronounce a most decided opinion against such a practice, or were they to pass it by, and move the previous question? (Cheers.) If such a practice was tolerated, might not a judge indulge in any degree of vituperative violence his partiality distorted? (Hear.) He did not wish to press the case against Baron Smith so far as his removal from the bench; but this he would say, that he saw that the best case had been made out for enquiry. (Cheers.) It was a most painful question, but it was one of

warning importance. (Hear.) The question solved itself into this—whether the practice of Ireland was to be the same as that in England?—If such a practice existed in this country, what would be the consequence? The hon. member for Norwich had alluded to the French war. At that period the government prescribed a degree of disgusting persecution. (Cheers.) It was in the memory of many, that were it not for the talents of Erling, many innocent men would not have escaped death. (Cheers.) It was far better for judges to refrain from entering into any political disquisition. If English judges indulged in political language, would they be tolerated in any court? Certainly not. He would just take the liberty of alluding to some parts of the political effusion of Baron Smith. He begged to call the attention of the house, when he talked of the people in vulgar numbers. Such an expression was particularly censurable. One of the greatest attributes of a judge was his impartiality. If the judges were good and impartial in England, he saw no reasons why they should not be so in Ireland. He thought they should be equally pure in each country. But to hear a judge talk of the people in vulgar numbers was, as he said before, highly censurable. He had no right to make any difference with the humbles of the King's subjects and the greatest; nor ought he to make any invidious comparison between rank and wealth, and poverty and ignorance. His duty was to decide between guilt and innocence. Though he was not prepared to go the lengths to vote for the removal of Baron Smith from the bench, yet he would give the present motion his most cordial support. Mr. BARING said that the house ought to pause before they entertained such a grave charge against one of the judges of the land; it was the duty of the house to protect the judges. Mr. LITTLETON was free to admit that, in a casual conversation which he held with the honorable and learned gentleman, the member for the University of Dublin, he did say that he would oppose any motion which had for its object the removal of Baron Smith from the bench, but he never pledged himself that he would oppose a motion which limited its objects to a simple inquiry, and therefore he trusted he was completely absolved from any charge of breach of good faith. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SHAW said, that the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State for Ireland, had not stated the entire of the conversation which he held with him; but he would say that the right hon. gentleman, in the conversation which he had with him, most distinctly stated that he would oppose any motion which had for its object the removal of Baron Smith from the bench; and the right hon. gentleman told him that he would be obliged to him if he would communicate the same to the learned judge, which he did by this next post.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. LITTLETON said that there was no material difference between him and the hon. and learned member for the university. It was true that he said that he would not authorize any motion for the removal of the learned judge from the bench, but he never promised that he would abstain from enquiry.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. BARING observed that the situation of the venerable and learned baron was one of great hardship. He could not see what grounds there were for an inquiry. He therefore would oppose the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. Mr. YOUNG (of Cavan), addressed the house, but was inaudible in the gallery. Mr. STANLEY, to guard against misconception, would say a few words. Three or four days since he received a letter from the learned judge requesting to know what part he would take upon the occasion. He wrote to Sir William Smith, stating that he was totally unacquainted with the case and ignorant of the charge, and that he would reserve his opinion until he heard it brought before the house. He now thought it was a strong case—(hear, hear)—but not one that would justify a removal, but certainly one that called for inquiry. (Loud cheers.) He expressed an opinion abstractedly as a member of that house, and not in his connection with the government. (Loud cries of "hear.") He considered inquiry necessary, and it would be detrimental to the best interests of the country not to grant it. (Cheers.) Mr. BARRON rose amidst cries of divide, and stated that he could not sit still and allow hon. members from Ireland to state that all the magistrates, jurors, and respectable portion of the people of Ireland would be opposed to this motion. He, on the contrary, stated that many of the magistrates in his part of the country, and a decided majority of jurors, were in favour of it, and totally opposed to political speeches from the judgment seat, however they might like politics in other places. (A laugh.) It would be a fatal blow to the confidence of the people in this house, if they refused enquiry. (Hear, hear.) The learned judge had on many occasions indulged in these political speeches—it was absurd to call them charges. Upon many occasions the greatest disgust had been felt for the conduct of that learned judge. He hoped the house would not be led away by the attempt to stigmatize the motion with a fictitious and merely political character, because it was brought forward by the hon. and learned member for Dublin. He pledged his honour as a gentleman and a member of that house, that there were members totally unconnected with party politics who would have brought the subject forward if the honorable and learned member for Dublin had not done so. He hoped the question would be taken upon its own merits. Let hon. gentlemen imagine an English judge addressing a grand jury upon such a question as the repeal of the Union, would not that provoke their censure? And, if so, why not when such a course was pursued in Ireland? In whatever country impartiality ought to be the characteristic of justice. Mr. O'CONNELL, in reply, said that Ireland would have no confidence in his Majesty's government if inquiry were refused. The question was one of the most vital importance. There were two parties in Ireland. The hon. member for the University was at the head of one, and it was said that he (Mr. O'Connell) was at the head of the other; but he was not named, or that Ireland wanted, was a fair arbiter between them. Could the arbiter be a political judge? If the inquiry was granted it would be productive of the best effects. He was glad to find that the interests of Ireland were not altogether neglected, for it appeared that the present question had produced a motley array of his Majesty's ministers. (Loud cries of "No, no," from the ministerial benches.) The hon. and learned member concluded by pressing the house to grant the inquiry.

Lord TULLAMORE rose. The question was, "Question, question?" rose. He defeated the clause judge, and alluded to a clause of 1814, by the late Judge Fitz of a political character than the house then divided. For the motion Against it. Majority Sir R. FERGUSON stated a bill to prevent bribery and a bill of Warwick. Mr. BENNETT obtained leave to deprive the freedom of the city of London of the right of voting at elections for the city. The bill was brought forward to be read a second time. The house then adjourned. HOUSE OF COMMONS—The Speaker took the chair. Mr. FITZSIMON brought Kingstown railway bill, which second time. REPEAL OF THE Mr. FIELDEN presented a petition in favor of the late Union from England. Mr. F. O'CONNOR had the house was accordingly cut number was present. Mr. FIELDEN bore testimony to the ability of the petition on the part of the Union. It was signed persons. Mr. F. O'CONNOR was so numerous and respectfully had been presented to the house interest to Ireland as that of the Union. He was glad to find ascribed the vice of the Irish source—namely, the misrule of the affairs of Ireland; and not characteristic of Irishness the insolent denunciations of Majesty's ministers, and their resist it to the death, yet it was progressing fast in England the Impression regarding it he the conduct of ministers, during the recess, and this session a marked by an act of the great was commenced by insular which had for its object the removal of Baron Smith from the bench; and the right hon. gentleman told him that he would be obliged to him if he would communicate the same to the learned judge, which he did by this next post.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. LITTLETON said that there was no material difference between him and the hon. and learned member for the university. It was true that he said that he would not authorize any motion for the removal of the learned judge from the bench, but he never promised that he would abstain from enquiry.—(Hear, hear.) Mr. BARING observed that the situation of the venerable and learned baron was one of great hardship. He could not see what grounds there were for an inquiry. He therefore would oppose the motion of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. Mr. YOUNG (of Cavan), addressed the house, but was inaudible in the gallery. Mr. STANLEY, to guard against misconception, would say a few words. Three or four days since he received a letter from the learned judge requesting to know what part he would take upon the occasion. He wrote to Sir William Smith, stating that he was totally unacquainted with the case and ignorant of the charge, and that he would reserve his opinion until he heard it brought before the house. He now thought it was a strong case—(hear, hear)—but not one that would justify a removal, but certainly one that called for inquiry. (Loud cheers.) He expressed an opinion abstractedly as a member of that house, and not in his connection with the government. (Loud cries of "hear.") He considered inquiry necessary, and it would be detrimental to the best interests of the country not to grant it. (Cheers.) Mr. BARRON rose amidst cries of divide, and stated that he could not sit still and allow hon. members from Ireland to state that all the magistrates, jurors, and respectable portion of the people of Ireland would be opposed to this motion. He, on the contrary, stated that many of the magistrates in his part of the country, and a decided majority of jurors, were in favour of it, and totally opposed to political speeches from the judgment seat, however they might like politics in other places. (A laugh.) It would be a fatal blow to the confidence of the people in this house, if they refused enquiry. (Hear, hear.) The learned judge had on many occasions indulged in these political speeches—it was absurd to call them charges. Upon many occasions the greatest disgust had been felt for the conduct of that learned judge. He hoped the house would not be led away by the attempt to stigmatize the motion with a fictitious and merely political character, because it was brought forward by the hon. and learned member for Dublin. He pledged his honour as a gentleman and a member of that house, that there were members totally unconnected with party politics who would have brought the subject forward if the honorable and learned member for Dublin had not done so. He hoped the question would be taken upon its own merits. Let hon. gentlemen imagine an English judge addressing a grand jury upon such a question as the repeal of the Union, would not that provoke their censure? And, if so, why not when such a course was pursued in Ireland? In whatever country impartiality ought to be the characteristic of justice. Mr. O'CONNELL, in reply, said that Ireland would have no confidence in his Majesty's government if inquiry were refused. The question was one of the most vital importance. There were two parties in Ireland. The hon. member for the University was at the head of one, and it was said that he (Mr. O'Connell) was at the head of the other; but he was not named, or that Ireland wanted, was a fair arbiter between them. Could the arbiter be a political judge? If the inquiry was granted it would be productive of the best effects. He was glad to find that the interests of Ireland were not altogether neglected, for it appeared that the present question had produced a motley array of his Majesty's ministers. (Loud cries of "No, no," from the ministerial benches.) The hon. and learned member concluded by pressing the house to grant the inquiry.