

consisted of 360 members, 220 of whom were by individuals. Several borough returns, and, in a word, the whole returned by 100 individuals. At the present time there were 92,283—there were the whole population was left to exercise of the choice of the people. (Mr. J.) This was the contrast between the representation before the Union, and what present, but it was a contrast carefully repeated in discussing the question of ought not to be omitted by the gentlemen, who so ably and powerfully represented under that bill. He would attend the attention of the house to a subject the greatest interest and importance, and was at great variance with pursued in England in reference to (Hear, hear, hear.) He alluded to regulating fever hospitals. If in- scribe a certain sum to an institution, a contribution from the Treasury, officers. That is not the case in as to the making of public roads, let them reflect that if roads are to be one county to another, instead of the rough which it passes advancing the set the expenses of it, government ad- necessary amount, to be paid back by limits. If a prison is to be built in county in which it is to be built hor- ary amount, and repays it by in- Not so in England, where the riots rely complained of. When public be carried on, the sum advanced is to England into the Consolidated Fund; Ireland it is advanced permanently. of the surveys now going on in Scot- the expense of government, and would than 300 thousand pounds. The man then referred to the relative state between the two countries, and con- was no greater mistake than to judge, deal of a tax to one country, that in- was done to the other. It was had no taxes in Ireland injurious to the Union. Was not the hearth lected from the cottages of the poor ion? That was the only tax that rely upon the poor, in the opinion of because, as he said, they were so e unable to consume articles that e with the exception of soap, d tobacco, no direct taxes were m. The enormous bulk of the aid by Great Britain, and Ireland ed at all. The amount of duty on &c., showed that Ireland was not y, as honorable gentlemen might see to the documents and papers he had table. In Ireland the stamps on 50 per cent. less than in England; ices, 120 per cent. less; and on pappers, and advertisements, much as paid in Great Britain. It was and unjust to say that the taxation of ies was unequally proportioned.— t bon. gentleman read from papers stement of the amount of taxation Ireland and England, which went to former was much less taxed than the next referred to the expenditure on to show the attention paid by the ment to the interests of Ireland.— ion of great harbours, large sums e laid out. For Howth harbour, 132,000; for Kingstown harbour, 132,000; for Port- 5,000; and for Danmore, 275,000. less a sum than £1,100,000 was the Imperial Parliament for the pub- lication. For charitable institutions, £20,000 was laid out. The com- mercial Parliament, with respect to ed, showed the interest taken by it Ireland. It was said by the hon. gentleman that the portion of the imposed upon Ireland (2-17ths) at the Union was unfair, and beyond all justly have been taken with. They were called upon, if not to repeal, least to revise the conditions of that other that was right or wrong, it is vary how to argue, for it no longer ex- variation has since taken place, it is of Ireland. In 1817, at the time dation of the Exchequer, the pro- cealed was to receive from the Union t repealed, and the whole property was mortgaged to pay the national the contrary, contrived, that if ad not taken place Ireland would row 13 millions of money in order of the debt. In trade and Ireland had increased, her exports ad advanced; for 14 years before exports amounted to 37 millions; ad afterwards they amounted to 92 e excess of 33 millions. These e demonstrated on reference to the table of the house on the motion port, Bart. His (Mr. S. Rice's) mple. Suppose a county that had ten quarters of wheat, and an- thousand—and the first increase to twenty quarters and the latter in that case was the better in- erty, the one which increases a ot, or that which increases only. But to take and put the case of a hoghead of wine by one and party to consume one hundred during the ordinary year the for- eheads and the latter uses one , which is it that has the more u- increasing prosperity? Surely, quibbled its consumption of the ar- ticle which merely increases it by 50 g to the subject of navigation in read from the report of 1830. fit- worth's letters, it appeared that e confined for the space of seven s of duty; and during the years d 1833, it progressively advanced, mentioned year, it absolutely 456,602 in the port of Liverpool as a proof of Irish prosperity.— e diminution of the consump- tion of prosperity. Now, it was e consumption denoted poverty, ed consumption offered the same Irish were resolved to be pro- as a sort of doli with them—

they cultivated it. (Hear.) The great increase which he (Mr. S. Rice) had spoken of as regarded exports was to be attributed to the agency of them. The two countries were known to each other—the spirit of enterprise was imported—the desire of im- course in trade was created by the approximation that stein carried between the kingdoms. A piece of cloth may be sent from Manchester to Belfast to go through some part of the process that rendered it fit for use. It was said that the grass was growing in the streets of Limerick, so great was the diminution of trade there; but he (Mr. S. Rice) could relieve their doubts on that point, by assuring them that the shipping interest was greatly advanced in that port.— In 1820 there were only 332 vessels and 35,000 tonnage entered there; in 1833 there were 500 vessels and tonnage to the extent of 35,000 tons. Trade was advancing rapidly in Ireland; only give a little tranquillity—(Hear and long cheers)—to that country, and prosperity will quickly follow it. Trade was increasing in Dub- lin, witness the exportation of porter; the several sea port towns in Ireland were increasing in their navigation interest. Before the introduction of steam into Ireland merchants and large traders were able to keep large stores of goods, and small shopkeepers had obtained the necessary supplies for their business from them; but now a man of small capital got £21,000 worth, and when that was exhausted got another, all from the country where the goods were manufactured, in cross- ing the channel. It may be injurious to the large capitalists, but it was beneficial and convenient to the smaller one. It was commonly said in Ire- land, that manufactures were in a flourishing con- dition before the Union, and had gone back since then. That was not the case. At the period of 1787, and about then, the greatest distress prevail- ing amongst the manufacturing interests; petitions were poured in from the cities of Dublin and Cork to the Irish parliament from the woollen trade, the shoemakers, the cotton manufacturers, the bookbinders, and even from the builders, pray- ing for a repeal of the act for the prevention of damage by fire—(great laughter)—and certainly a more insane and absurd was the present petition for the repeal of the Union at present, than even that which prayed for the destruction of houses to improve the building trade. A great source of appeal to the interests of the people of Ireland, was in the hope and promise that, in the event of the Union being repealed, all protecting duties would be removed, and consequently that prices would be raised commensurately. It was a delusion that such would benefit the country. Trade was improving in Ireland, but, if protecting duties were laid on, it would speedily retrograde. The north of Ireland had increased in its number of factories; and what was the cause? Nothing but the abolition of protecting duties. The cotton silk, and tablet trades were advancing—the manufacture of leather was also increased—machinery of greater importance than any other thing, and it may be attributed the improvement in the north of Ireland. Give the rest of Ireland tranquillity, and nothing can stop the same im- provement to the same extent. But what gen- tleman was there for property then? (Loud cheers.) What protection for life? The great capitalist could not embark his money, though the advan- tages of doing so may be wanting, in a country where no tranquillity exists. A man who has no stake in society, because of scanty means, may em- bark in business; but none other can; and it is the apprehension of insecurity that prevents cap- ital from being employed and comfort being dif- fused throughout Ireland. The woollen trade has much improved in Dublin. In the vicinity of that city looms were dying to the number of 300, and 2,400 men were employed. He made the assertion on the ground of a communication he had received from a respectable gentleman.

Mr. GRATTAN desired the name of that gen- tleman.

Mr. S. RICE continued. He would not give the name, and though it may be said that he was act- ing on anonymous authority, still he could not con- sider to give the name; his reason was that it was the habit to hold up any one who differed from hon. members on the repeal question to the reproaches and odium of society in Ireland. He himself (Mr. S. Rice) was represented, on that account merely, as the worst of bad men—(Hear)—and it was even said that as long as he was re- ceived in the administration, no good could be expected for Ireland. (Cheers.) That was his reason. Excretion and vulgar names were the means resorted to, to lower the character of any one who had happened to differ on one question. Epithets unjust and untrue were employed to vilify the character of any man who conscientiously dissented from the agitation of a principle, and such was the reward of exercising opinion; he did not think it prudent to give the name of any gen- tleman, in order that he may be denounced and held up to public contempt and hatred. (Hear, hear.) It should not be supposed that he (Mr. S. Rice) was giving imperfect information, because he did not disclose the name of his informant; the information was of the best sort; it was, he well knew, correct, and he did not resort to any plan of giving himself an argument unless on the surest ground.

Mr. GRATTAN wished to hear the fact at least.

Mr. S. RICE would certainly give the fact. The letter he held in his hand, which he received from the gentleman to whom he alluded stated, that 300 looms were in full operation, and 2,000 were constantly employed; it depreciated the duty on coals; the abolition of wine duties gave a new im- pulse to trade, and cloth manufactures were being established in the vicinity of Dublin; such were the contents of the letter, and he was sure that facts bore on every assertion it contained.— Kilkenny had at present eleven water mills at work; coarse cloths were manufactured there.— He knew that the honorable member for Kil- kenny would contradict him; but he (Mr. R.) would account for whatever decline trade may have suffered in that city. He would give the house a very competent authority as his evidence, to whatever he was going to state. The testimony, which he alluded was Dr. Doyle. What did he say concerning that city? That the artisans of Kilkenny were the victims of combination. When any contract was about to be entered into by a proprietor, the workmen, especially the tenants, re- fused to work unless at a higher rate of wages, and the consequence was, that the contract would be abandoned, or extravagant wages be given. Of course the trade must diminish while such combi- nation existed to the detriment of both the em- ployer and the employed. Any one who was not blind to the progress of trade must at once acknow- ledge that the appearance of wealth and the in- creasing establishment of manufactories, have a good criterion to judge of the prospects of the country. The bulk of Ireland was free from those disturbing causes which were an impediment to trade, and that accounted for its rapid advance in manufactures and comfort. The freedom of prin- ciple established since the Union was one of the main causes why Ireland had progressed so very much. If confidence could be reposed in that country by English capitalists, and English prop- erty transferred there, no obstacle could be op- posed to the general improvement of Ireland, and a satisfactory understanding would exist between both countries. It was said that great distress existed in Dublin, but it was chiefly confined to the liberties. There was one description which he would read for the honour of the state of Cork be- fore the Union. It was by Mr. Whitelaw, to show exertions the poor of Ireland, and particu- larly those of Dublin, were much benefited at that period. Mr. Whitelaw went to a house in Clon- tier-lane, in the West part of the City of Cork, to ascertain the population of a single house.— In his approach to it he was compelled to wade above his ankles in fluid filth, and occasionally, when it was deeper, to step from stone to stone, or on a plank, here and there laid down by the civility of the inhabitants. It rained violently; and when he entered the house he found the water like torrents falling through the crevices in the floors and the roof. In a garret in this house, or rather hole, he found the entire family of a poor workman, seven in number, lying sick of a malignant fever, without a soul to look after them, or a single rag to cover them, the whole of their covering having been seized the preceding Satur- day by the landlord for a trifling arrear of rent.— The house itself contained thirty-seven individuals in all—not one of whom were better circum- stanced, with the exception that they were not in ill health, than the wretched beings already de- scribed, and from whom the landlord, with the most heartless rigour, weekly exacted rent for a tenement which should have been raised to the ground, so unfit was it for human habitation.— Yet all this took place before the Union, and therefore could not be taken as one of its conse- quences. When he should show that the man- ufacturers of that country were at the same period in distress far greater than they had ever been in since, he thought it would not be saying too much to say that the present distress of the country was not caused by the Union. (Cheers.) But what has occurred in Dublin? What indication of de- cay had it exhibited? What were the proofs of its desertion?—when was the abandonment of its commerce. He had a calculation of the number of houses built in Dublin since the Union, and these might be thus classed:—

Within the Circular Road	2,213
Road	1,600
Making, in all, about	3,813

It might be said that these houses were of a splendid description. To this he would answer that Merrion square, Fitzwilliam-street, Mount- street, Leeson-street, and others of the same de- scription were among the number. But he would as- sert, for the sake of the argument, that these houses were not of the best description. He had, however, a valuation of the annual rental of the houses built since the Union, and he found that they amounted to £17,304, the annual valuation of the entire city being £128,520. Was it a proof of poverty— new built houses and an increased rental; but the increase was not confined to Dublin; it ran through all the towns of Ireland. For instance, the increase was,

In Limerick	1,840
In Belfast	1,400
Cork	2,280

It had been urged by the advocates of repeal, that Ireland contributed her quota to works she never enjoyed, such as the erection of Regent-street, and the erection of the National gallery. Before that argument was urged, these gentlemen should have recollected the great numbers of Irish were em- ployed on those works, and consider whether in- arguing them they were not cutting the ground from under their own feet rather than serving the cause they espoused. (Cheers.) But setting this aside, they should consider the amount con- tributed by the people of England to the beautify- ing of Dublin, and then say whether what had been done in London at the joint expense of both countries counterbalanced it? If not, would Ire- land repay the difference?

Mr. RUTHVEN—Never.

Mr. S. RICE—The honorable member for Dublin said never. (Laughter.) In that case he had no hesitation in stating the amount. It was £261,960, and the great bulk of its expenditure was on the poor of the city. It had been said in the argument of the hon. and learned member for Dublin last night, that injustice was done to Ireland two ways; first, by taxation, and second by reduction in her expenditure. It had, for in- stance, been complained of as a grievance, that the establishment of the Lord Lieutenant was to be reduced, and a burthen thrown on the shoulders of the country. Ireland had a right to Irish gentlemen to say that Ireland should keep up establishments for establishments sake, was too absurd to be for a moment listened to. (Hear.) But before he concluded this part of his subject, he wished to call the attention of the house to the un- reasonableness of the hon. and learned gentleman's arguments in Ireland. Immediately after the present hon. member had taken office, that hon. member had asked in the house whether the offices of Postmaster General and Vice Treasurer of Ireland were to be continued or abolished? and the govern- ment having made up their minds on the matter, the justice, the candour, the common honesty, he would wish, of putting this question to the govern- ment back to Ireland and complaining of them for reducing the useless establishments?—It was a course of conduct not to be justified on any grounds whatever. (Hear.) He (Mr. R.) now approach- ed the end of his observations, and he expressed his gratitude to the house for the patience with which it had heard him. He was not vain enough, however, to attribute it to anything he could say, but to the cause for which he was pleading; the cause of his country, for which he was counsel; the cause of Ireland, of whose best interests he was the

humble advocate. (Cheers.) He would be lauded, no doubt, in and out of that house with the course he had pursued. He would be called cold blooded, and designated as the denier of dis- tress; and he knew no character could be more unpopular than such a one. He did not, how- ever, doubt the existence of distress; but he de- nied the power of repeal to relieve it. (Cheers.) He had a few other documents, to which he should briefly refer before he closed; one was a MS. dated 1748, a most curious production, by an English gentleman. In reference to Ireland, he said—

"The land of Ireland is so miserable, that there is never any redundancy in it, and scarcely any grain. So that in their resolution it cost them fully £5,000,000 for less a sum than £300,000, on all of which they have to pay a duty. The consequence is that every third year there is a famine in the land."

Here was testimony undoubted, to a periodical famine, poverty of agriculture, and tax on im- ported grain, and all before the Union too. The next he should refer to was the description given by Arthur Young, in his Tour in 1772. It was so well known that he need only say it referred to the tyrannical conduct of the rich to the poor, and would not, if known, be tolerated. In the state of society before the Union the horsering of the rich man was applied without any to the back of the poor man and those village humpbacks—the black curries—as the Lord Chancellor of Ireland designat- ed them, not being at that time so ready to act impartially as at present. In the county of Cork, in particular, instances of this nature were com- mon occurrences, and the honorable member for that county might make what use of it he could as an argument for a repeal of the Union, which produced results so opposite. If more proofs were wanting of its goal, he would refer to the evidence of Sir R. Musgrave, Mr. Williams, &c. on the subject; which were conclusive as to the improvements in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce which had taken place since the Union. (Cheers.) But he had few more docu- ments, with which he should trouble the house, in further confirmation of the benefits of the Union to Ireland. In 1825 a poor law was part of the United Kingdom to another? What was the result? Since 1835, sixteen millions of funded property had been transferred to the account of persons living in Ireland, the annual revenue of which was £562,000. That, perhaps, he would be told, was evidence of the proofs of the injuries brought by "the repealed Union"—another in- stance of "the neglect of Ireland and Irish in- terests." Another fact he would cite was the amount of property passing under the probates of wills in Ireland:—

In 1810, amount	£2,811,000
In 1835, amount	3,612,000
Excess	799,000

It was but a small item, no doubt, but it was an additional one. These had been political circum- stances when the savings of the poor were put in peril by agitation—(cheers)—in proof of which, he referred to the draws on the savings' bank of Kil- keney and Waterford, on a late occasion. But since the agitation had subsided in that quarter, additions had been daily making to the deposits in the savings' banks all over the country. Last year, for instance, there had been an increase on the former year of £349,000, and only a sum of £15,000 drawn from them. It had been said that the upper class were ruined in Ireland. Now he had no returns to show the amount paid to the assessed taxes by the gentry of Ireland, because they paid no assessed taxes at all; but he thought the return on one item alone, though only he could find, would prove the contrary of that assertion. On the article of wrought plate, for instance, from 1800 to 1807, the increase of consumption was 65 per cent; from 1827 to 1829, inclusive (three years) 107 per cent; and last year it was 161 per cent; all, too, since the Union. This, it could be remembered, was an article of luxury, and used only by the "ruined gentry and impoverished upper classes of Ireland" (cheers)—while in Great Britain, for the several periods enumerated, the increase had only been 57, 93, and 59 per cent respectively. Another proof of the prosperity of Ireland was the number and magnificence of Roman Catholic chapels, all built, it should be borne in mind, by voluntary contributions. Before the Union there had been but four chapels of this worship in Dublin; there were now eight or nine, and one of them cost £80,000 in its erection. (Hear.) He reced- ed these to show that that country was not quite so wretched as it was sought to make the house believe. One more fact he would allude was the increase of canals and the commensurate increase of canal property in value. He found by the returns of the Grand Canal Company, that from 1821, 1822 and 1823, to 1831, 1832, and 1833, there had been an increase of 62 per cent. on that property. On the royal Canal, during the same period, 61 per cent., and on the Barrow 41 per cent. This, combined with the increase in the exports of the country, afford- ed such a proof of the growing prosperity of Ire- land that more was hardly needed. As a last proof he should barely allude to the increased facility of transit by means of good roads through the entire country. Before he drew his observa- tions to a close he had one or two words to say.— He was aware that the indulgence of his obser- vations was extended to the subject he dealt with rather than to himself, and therefore, at the risk of bringing it, he chose sooner to go at length into the subject than leave any part untouched. The question was no ordinary one. The night's in- terests were at stake on its issue. The conse- quences which might result from it were awful to contemplate. Therefore it was that he brought hon. members to merge all private and personal feelings into one—the good of the country; and to look to the interests of the empire at large, rather than to those of a single class—their countrymen or constituents. He brought honorable members from Ireland to consider, likewise, the benefits which they had derived from England; and not by their conduct incur the censure of rank indigni- ty. Where would the Catholics of Ireland be if it had not been for the aid of English—British—agency of British members of Parliament, who had moral courage to vote for the Relief Bill, on the face of the reconstrance of their constituents, of men who had sacrificed the ties of blood even—son voting against father—to reduce those Cy- thians—their Irish fellow-subjects—from religious bondage? The question was an instructive, and he hoped would be a useful one, inasmuch as he trusted he would cause the Irish Catholics to

remember the good offices which had been done them on that occasion, and afford the house a precedent for doing their duty, as ably and manfully as this. (Cheers.) On the government of Ireland, there would be no compromise. (Cheers.) He had a series of resolutions to propose to the house, as an amendment on the motion of the honorable and learned member for Dublin. He would do so for the permanent interest of Ireland; for he despised the tumpety interest sought to be palmed on the house. Before he did so, however, he should, take leave to quote the words of that great and good man Henry Grattan, which were read in the house as his dying request to his country. This advice he (Mr. R.) most sincerely hoped they would follow. That great man advised neither agitation nor re- peal; but he said—"I strongly recommend that the two countries shall never be separated." (Cheers.) I beseech you never to seek for con- vention with any other country than England.— Would any hon. gentleman tell him (Mr. R.), that in the event of a repeal of the legislative Union the connection with Great Britain could be preserved for a single moment, but by the incessant exercise of brute force? (Cheers.) He believed from his soul that the moment repeal was effected the con- nection would go. That gone, a fierce democratic republic would succeed. (Vehement cheering.)— A fierce democratic republic, which some honorable members might hail as a blessing, but which he, a loyal subject of the King, and firmly attached to the law and constitution, could not hail as ought else than the direst curse which could be inflicted on this country. (Roused cheering.) That the object aimed at by the advocates of repeal and the fomenters of agitation was desperation, need he allude proofs from their own pens? (Cheers.) What else meant the continual reference to South America and to Bolivar. What else was meant by the expressive denials—"I am now on the shores of the broad Atlantic, and I feel on my cheek the fresh breeze from the shores of freedom." (Cheers and laughter.) What else was signified by language such as this—"The unparalled convicts of Buniny Bay have a local legislature—the half foreign inhabitants of the Canadas have a local legislature—the insig- nificant population of Nova Scotia have a local legis- lature, and the slave drivers of the West Indies have a local legislature. We are eight millions." (Laughter.) "The United States of America were twice as large as we. Their liberties were invaded, so we were. They threw off the yoke by the aid of the sword.—We are eight millions."—What, setting all these aside, was meant by the appeals to the spirit of democratic liberty which had been so profusely made within the last few days? If separation was not meant, they meant nothing. (Cheers.) He (Mr. R.) worshipped constitutional liberty as warmly and as devoutly as any man could do; but democratic liberty he should oppose by all the means in his power. He should defend her temples, and destroy the idol, and leave no vestige of her nobly worship in these realms. He had said, and he would repeat it, that repeal led to separation. (Hear, hear.)— He would close in the words of Grattan:—"Let me advise the people of Ireland not to choose a domestic legislature; they are not yet fit for it." (Cheers.) He (Mr. R.) did not wish to speak ill of his own country, but he could not help echoing the observations of the mighty dead. He would, therefore, ask the house whether they were pre- pared, even in point of humanity, to hand Ire- land over to the tender mercies of a local legis- lature—to the blessings of self-government? If they did, civil war of the most deadly descrip- tion, and the entire subversion of all law and order, would be the consequence. (Cheers.)— The right honorable gentleman then proposed the following amendment:—

"We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons, in parliament assembled, feel it our duty humbly to approach your Majesty's throne, to record in the most solemn manner our final determination to maintain unimpaird and undisturbed the legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, which we consider to be essential to the strength and stability of the two countries, and to the peace and security and happiness of all classes of your Majesty's subjects. We feel this our determination to be as much jus- tified by our views of the general interests of the state, as by the maintenance of the legislative Union mere- ly as subjects of the Majesty of Ireland themselves. We humbly represent to your Majesty that the im- portance of the legislative Union to the welfare of the two countries, and to the peace and security and happiness of all classes of your Majesty's subjects, has been taken into the most serious consideration, and that various salutary laws have been enacted since the Union, for the advancement of the most important interests of Ireland, and of the empire at large. In expressing your Majesty our resolution to maintain the legislative Union inviolate, we humbly beg leave to assure your Majesty, and to we shall persevere in apply- ing our best attention to the removal of all well-considered measures of improvement."

Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR rose and moved the adjournment of the debate.

The SPEAKER said the amendment had not been seconded.

Mr. EMERSON TENNANT seconded the amendment, and moved the adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to amidst a good deal of merriment, Mr. O'CONNOR being thus defeated in his intention of addressing the house immedi- ately after Mr. S. Rice.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—THURSDAY.

The House sat from twelve until three, when a great number of petitions were presented, principally in reference to Repeal, the Dissenters' grievances, and the Dorchester Unionists.

Mr. GALWY presented petitions from Tramore and Cobh, in the county of Waterford, against tithes and for a repeal of the union; also a petition from Killybeg, in the county of Waterford, against tithes and for a repeal of the union. The hon. gentleman begged to take the opportunity of observing, from his knowledge, and he might daily intercourse with the people of Ireland, he could assure the House that peace could not be established in his unfortunate country as long as the Tithes existed; he was, however, happy in thinking they now had a Secretary for Ireland who was taking more pains to regulate the tithes system than any Secretary who ever before pre- ceded him. (Hear, hear.)

REPEAL OF THE UNION.

At five o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair. Mr. E. TENNANT rose to second the amendment of the right honorable secretary to the Treasury. The honorable gentleman entered into a series of state- ments for the purpose of showing that during the period of Irish independence, as it was called, from 1782 to the Union, his country's prosperity was represented to be so great, it was on a par of fact stationary compared with England and Scotland during the same period. Her independence would not make an additional blade of grass spring up, and would only enable her to take advantage of exten-

circumstances—of foreign trade. The repeal of the Union would not put an end to the disturbances of Ireland.— During her independence, what was the state of her domestic tranquillity? In 1785 they had the Whiteboys; in 1790, disturbances in the county of Armagh, under the eyes of the independent government in 1793-94 not break- ing in Lincolns, Monaghan, Louth, and indeed perpetual risings, and disturbances; and lastly, in 1798, the rebel- lion. The necessity of the Union between England and Ireland was manifest, and the consequence of that was the union on the one hand, and a submission on the other. The hon. member then adverted to the case of the Agency, to show the impossibility of two independent legislatures acting in union upon certain questions. Ireland was the first to discover the necessity of a Union, and sought for it frequently, but England and constantly rejected the application. It was said that this Union exhibited the identity of Ireland; but by the same reasoning Scotland had lost its identity. But the argument was too absurd to require comment. But he asked, had an Irishman lost any thing being admitted to the citizenship of the most important country in the world. (Hear, hear.) Was it a degree of satisfaction to an Irishman that he could be a member of the Legislature of the most important country in Europe? For himself, he must say that it was but, in the course of the Union, the satisfaction of ac- quiring in giving freedom to the slaves of the West India colonies. (Hear.) The honorable gentleman then entered into calculations to show that in commerce, manu- factures, and trade Ireland had improved considerably since the Union. He contended that the trade between England and Ireland was sound in its constitution, and beneficial in its effects, and he was satisfied that this was the view that was taken of it by the rational, thinking, and enlightened portion of the people of Ireland.— But the question which they had to consider was, not how the Union had been effected, or what had been its results—that which they had to consider was this—was it wise to abolish it. (Hear, hear.) The hono- rable gentleman, then adverted to his having been a friend to Roman Catholic emancipation; but by the con- duct of the Roman Catholics of this, he he could be- lieve that he had been guilty of a mistake in giving his humble support to their emancipation, and he believed that this was the feeling of the majority of the liberal Protestants of Ireland. If the Protestants of Ireland were less liberal to day than they were twelve months ago, it was owing to the conduct of the hono- rable and learned gentleman and those who acted with him. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman con- sidered that the effect of a repeal of the Union would be to place one party entirely in the hands of the other, and that would be the Catholic and democratic portion of the people of Ireland. The honorable and learned member of Dublin said that he had always sought for em- anipation, not as an end, but as a means to an end. He should be glad to know the real end meant by the hon. and learned gentleman. (Hear.) If the end was the repeal of the Union, the power of the priests would be trian- gular, and that these priests present exercised a power which no man ought to possess was proved by the circum- stance of the hon. and learned gentleman being in the streets of Clare fallen prostrate before one of these men. (Hear.) Was it fit to increase the power possessed by these persons? The Union was said to have been purchased by money—but did not money in fact purchase it? (Hear.) Was not the Hon. and Learned gentleman liable to something like an imputation of this kind?— He was afraid that the Hon. and Learned gentleman would pass down to posterity with his memory tainted with avarice and his motives with the just reproach of avarice. (Hear.) It was said that the repeal of the Union would prevent absenteeism; but was not Ireland afflicted with the curse of absenteeism before the Union? Why, several efforts were made in the Irish Parliament to prevent absenteeism, but without success; and he contended that it was not the absence of a domestic Parliament which produced absenteeism in Ireland, but the want of domestic peace.

Mr. F. O'CONNOR said, the question to be discussed was no factions or party question—it was the question whether a great and noble coun- try should continue any longer the enslaved and oppressed nation it had been—should be longer allowed to remain a drag upon England, a blemish on her dress. (Hear, hear.) In the momentous contest which he, and those who thought with him, had engaged upon, they would have to con- tend with long fixed national prejudices, suspicions, and bigoted intolerance. But nothing could deter them from boldly persevering in their noble, though a severe course. (Hear, hear.) Against all opposition would they undoubtedly and fixedly insist upon the right of Ireland to become again a country? He was not going to tell over to the house the twice told tale of the Irish oppressions and miseries for the last several years. No, he would rightly follow, not the example, but the advice of the right hon. gentleman. He would forget that he had a constituency, but he could not forget, like that right hon. gentleman, that he had a country. (Hear.) His business was to show that the had been wronged by the Union—(hear)—and to show that he could meet the right hon. gentleman on his details, and that they were so many fallacies got up for the occasion. Although he was very glad they had selected the honorable member who had just sat down to second the amendment, he deemed cheering, in which Mr. Sheil's voice was particu- larly distinguishable—the only pity was that the hon. gentleman appeared to have written his speech before he heard the details of the right hon. gentleman's (A loud laugh.) It was said that the two had not been in notes first, for as it was, there was a terrible discrepancy between them as to their details. Last night the right hon. member of the amendment stated that before the Union the importation of corn from England had cost Ireland many millions; to night, however, he brought forward the amendment made a different statement.— (Hear, hear, hear.) The authority of Chief Justice Bushy, Lord Garry, and Lord Plunkett, had been held up to the house last night as "reliable"; the opi- nions cited by the right honorable secretary were any rate not any better. He could not but look upon the manner in which the motion had been met by the amend- ment as most despotic and arbitrary. It appeared to him an attempt on the part of the mover of the amend- ment to induce the house to give up their feelings and judg- ment into his keeping. But did the right honorable secretary think that with this parchment amendment of his he could successfully oppose a whole nation? (Hear, hear, hear.) No, the feeling, the determination to effect this cherished object, was too deeply fixed in the minds of the Irish nation ever to be eradicated. The right hon. secretary had talked very ostentatiously of the sums of money granted to Ireland. How were those sums expended? In galls, in bribes, and in bridges, to enrich the Aristocracy.— (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) The question was, had Ireland been benefited by the Union? He denied that it had, he asserted that Ireland had lost much by the Union, and he was prepared with his proof. He would first consider the history of Ireland since 1783; he would consider the condition of Ireland at the time of the Union—what its prospects—and what was its condition at the present time. The right hon. member had set forth that Ire- land had prospered beyond measure since the Union; he was increasing, now that it was exempt from taxes. As to the taxes, taxes were laid on to suit Irish wealth, not Irish poverty. The Irish had no money, while the English were increasing. Yes, those exports were the food which went to feed the cultivators of the soil. The im- ports were increased, solely on account of the ruin and fall of home manufactures. The right hon. gentleman said that £105,000,000 had been sent over to Ireland; the poor since the Union there had been a deprivation in fact in Ireland of a great deal more than the £103 million. The Irish tenantry had formerly some little money in their pockets, but it had been wrested from them by the system pursued towards Ireland. The sheep wools had been broken up, and it was well known that had been broken up that the stock would be taken off another. Did not this account for the appearance of the e- prosperity which had been inferred from the fact of the e- being an increase in the sale of stock? How was it that since the Union, Ireland had become a poorer coun- try, the price of land had sensibly risen? Land, estimating it according to the value of money in 1811, would not now sell for one-third of the price that it would have done. The right hon. gentleman had referred to the increase of houses and other property, but he would find in his pocket report a ure to cross right in- ditions of people to a number of houses built to hold only four millions? The right hon. gentleman would, perhaps,

