The Waterford Mail.

"This is not the Cause of Faction, or of Party, or of any Individual; but the Common Interest of every Man in Ireland."

Vol. VI.—No. 586. WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1829. Price 6d.

FOR QUEBEC,

TO Sail on the TENTH DAY OF APRIL, the First Class, Copper-fastened, New Ship BOLIVAR, Thomas Bellord, Master.

ALSO,

To Sail on the same day, the First Class, Coppered and Copper-fastened, New Ship, OCEAN, Joseph Hearn, Master.

These large and commodious Ships, between Seven and Eight Hundred Tons Burden each, have excellent Accommodations for Passengers, to whose health and comfort on the voyage the strictest attention shall be paid by their respective Captains, to whom Application for Passage may be made, or to

JOHN CARIGAN.

Waterford, March 17.

MURDER AND REWARD.

WHEREAS on Monday the nineteenth day of January instant, James Benson, late of Ballinabull, was followed on the road leading from Ballymote to Collooney, by three men, who brutally assaulted and maltreated him, on the lands of Derroon, within half a mile of Ballymote, and of which beating the said James Benson died on the following day.

Now we, the undersigned, holding in abhorrence such barbarous Murder, do hereby offer the several sums annexed to our respective names, as a Reward for the prosecution to conviction of the person or persons, or any of them who committed said Murder, within six calendar months from the date hereof; or the Sum of

TWENTY POUNDS,

for such private information as may lead to the discovery of same.—Given under our hands, this 27th day of Jan., 1829.

Here follows a List of Subscriptions, amounting to £92 5s.

DUBLIN CASTLE,
5th March, 1829.

The Lords Justices, for the better discovering and bringing to justice the Persons concerned in the Murder of James Benson, mentioned in the foregoing Advertisement, are pleased hereby to promise his Majesty's most gracious Pardon to any one of the persons concerned (excepting the Person who actually committed the Murder), who shall, within six months from the date hereof, discover his accomplices, so that they, or any of them, may be apprehended and convicted of said offence.

By their Excellencies Command,
W. GREGORY.

THE MARKETS.

Waterford, March 25.—We had yesterday but a small supply of all kinds of country produce—wheat, 27s to 35s per barrel; barley, 10s to 16s; oats, 6s to 8s for light—12s to 14s for heavy. Bacon pigs, 33s to 34s; scalded, 24s to 28s. New butter from 83s per cwt. down—there were about 30 firkins of new at market. In flour or oatmeal no alteration. Newport coals, 3s to 3s 4d; Swansea, 2s 10d to 3s 2d per barrel.

Dublin Corn Exchange, March 21.—The following are the quotations:—Wheat, red, 35s to 39s 6d; do. white, 40s to 43s; oats 10s to 14s; barley, 18s to 20s.

London Corn Exchange, March 20.—The duty on Foreign wheat being now 10s 8d per quarter, such kind must of course go under the King's lock; and the supplies during the week being uncommonly small, the factors demanded high prices this morning, which in a great measure checked the buyers in purchasing; still what sales were made in fine wheat, barley, and oats, were at Monday's prices.

Irish Provisions.—Butter rather lower; Beef and Pork unvaried.

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE.

ARRIVED.—21st, Kingstown (steamer), Soy, Cork, m. goods—Ruby, Eagan, Swansea, culm—Olive Branch, Angel, do. do. (for Ross)—Hero, Evans, Cork, ballast (for Carmarthen)—New Mary, Young, Wicklow, copper ore, [for Swansea].—Put back, Two Brothers, Hughes.—22d, Sir John Newport, Nicholls, London, m. goods—Mary and Margaret, Barge, Milford, culm—Joseph, Harris—Brothers, Morgan—and Sion Hill, Thomas, Cardiff, coals—Four Brothers, Booth—Rose, Macroom, Jacob—and Expedition, Davies, Newport, coals—Louisa, Williams, Bury, do—Gleanor, Rosser, Swansea, do—Providence, Jones—Gratitude, Jones—Peace, Lowther—and Devonshire, Lowther, Swansea, culm—Curwen and Bradyll, Parrot, Belfast, ballast—May Flower, Martin, Plymouth, cordage and raisins.—23d, Selsey, Lancaster, Plymouth, ballast—Tom Pipes, Evans, Neath, coals—Dispatch Jones, and Ladies' Adventure, Davison, Liverpool, salt—Thistle, Neville, and Wellington, Hoare, Newport, coals—Gipsy, [steamer], Owen, Liverpool, m. goods.—24th, Helen, Upham, do. do.; Liverpool, Ross, Dublin, ballast [for Newport].

SAILED.

20th, Nassau [from New Orleans], Fairfoul, Liverpool, cotton—Mary, Stafford, Newport, ballast—Brothers, Lewis, do. do.—Murre [from Kinsale], Donovan, Newport, ballast—21st, Nora Creina [steamer], Stacey, Bristol, m. goods and passengers—Waterloo, Brown, Milford, ballast.—22d, none—23d, none—24th, Kingstown, Soy, Dublin, gen. cargo.

Wind S. E.

Arrived from Waterford—At Southampton, 18th, Liberty, Blanchard. At London, 19th, Menapia, Moyse. At Bristol, 18th, New Blessing, Tedball. At Weymouth, 18th, Betsey, Couch.

SHIP NEWS.

The Lord Nelson, Bowen, on shore off Duncannon, was floated off on Sunday. She has not received very material injury.

MARRIED,

On the 12th instant, at Kilmenaugh, county Wexford, Capt Warren, of the 65th regiment, to Emily Thomazine, eldest daughter of the late Charles Elgee, Esq., County of Wexford.

DIED,

On Saturday last, in this city, aged 100 years, Edward Stokes This eccentric individual, though very poor, was remarkable for his attachment to the rearing of dogs, birds, &c.; and to such a length did this amusement carry him, that he had in his possession at one time, 16 game cocks, 75 pigeons, 6 bull dogs, 16 bull pups, 14 black birds, 12 thrushes, 36 canaries, 28 linnets, and several others of various descriptions.

At Milan, Louis Von Esch, the distinguished and elegant musical composer.

In the Irishtown, Clonmel, the wife of Mr. Wm. M'Guire, generally and deservedly regretted.

Friday, at Limerick, Thomas Quin, Esq., K.C., Father of the Munster Bar.

A curious election took place at Launceston. There are 19 voters in the borough, but in consequence of the candidate being a pro-Catholic, only four attended, and voted for the Duke of Northumberland's candidate. John King Lethbridge, the duke's own steward, refused to attend the election, and also the mayor, and the rest of the aldermen and freemen declined the honour of dining with the new member. The new member was hailed with such contempt, that he left the town in the middle of the night. An opinion prevails, that if an anti-Catholic member had offered himself, that he would have been returned. In vain did Mr. Wilson request their attendance; like honest men they one and all declared that they would show the contempt for the new light which had broken in upon their old patron. We wish that other boroughs had followed their example. The four that voted are suspected of being bribed.—*London Paper.*

Lord Plunket sat under the gallery of the house of Commons, during the debate on Tuesday night, and being observed to bestow the most anxious attention upon the magnificent speech of Mr. Sadler, was asked his opinion of it by Mr. Doherty? The reply of his Lordship was creditable alike to his discernment and his candour—"This (said he) is a first-rate man—he has not had his equal in this house for twenty-five years."

The Royal Dublin Society propose to establish an annual exhibition of Irish Manufactures similar to that lately established in London. The first exhibition will take place in May next.

LONDON—SATURDAY, MARCH 21.

The important intelligence has just been received of the determination of the Emperor Don Pedro to attempt the recovery of the throne of Portugal for his daughter, Donna Maria, and to come to no terms with his brother, unless the abdication of the usurped authority form the preliminary basis of adjustment. The accounts in the Rio de Janeiro Papers, which are, to the 3d of January, are confirmed by despatches of the 7th from Lord Ponsonby, the British Ambassador at Brazil, and also from Lord Strangford, who is at Rio on a special mission. The Portuguese deputation, who left this country about four months since, to explain to the Emperor the facts connected with the seizure of the Portuguese throne by Don Miguel, had an audience on the 31st December. To their representations in behalf of the youthful Queen, the Emperor replied in the following decisive terms:—"Consulting the interests of the two nations of Brazil and Portugal, in order not to endanger their mutual independence, which I shall firmly maintain, I have resolved to act in such a manner as shall show to the whole world my resolution to fight for the rights of my daughter, your Queen, and to enter into no compromise with the usurper of the Portuguese throne."

Letters just received from Oporto state, that intelligence had reached that place from the Brazils, of a very considerable force being prepared at Rio, are nearly ready for sailing, for the express purpose of a descent on the coast of Portugal.

The blockade of Terceira was officially notified by the British Government to the Committee at Lloyd's on Thursday morning.

Mr. Austin, the late Deputy Treasurer of Greenwich Hospital, was the first prisoner who appeared at the bar of the Maidstone assizes, on Tuesday. Mr. Brodrick, as counsel for the prosecution, addressed the jury, and said he was instructed by the parties who had instituted this prosecution, now to state, that there was no evidence to be laid before them in support of the indictments.—Under these circumstances the prisoner was acquitted.

Captain Garth, according to the *Morning Journal*, is the son of Gen. Garth, who was privately married to the princess Amelia. The General is said to be still living somewhere near Dorchester, and is in his eightieth year. He was made a full General in 1814, and is Colonel of the 1st Dragoons. The Princess, according to this statement, lay-in at a seat of Colonel Goldsworthy, in Wiltshire, having come thither for the purpose from Weymouth, where the Royal Family were then residing. Captain Garth, who is in his thirty-second year, is now residing near Boulogne, in a cottage, with his paramour, Lady Astley. The *Morning Chronicle* and *Times*, however, declare that Capt. Garth is not the son of the General; but it seems to be admitted on all hands that his mother is one of the Princesses.

The following members paired off on the 18th—Lord Belfast with Sir E. Denney; Mr. A. O'Neil with Sir John Newport.

A complaint was made to the Lord Mayor on Tuesday against the Irish apple and orange women in the city, who congregate every day in the immediate vicinity of Alderman Birch's pastry shop, and where a petition lies for signatures in favour of the claims of the Catholics. His Lordship was informed that the apple and orange women thought themselves quite at liberty now, since the Minister brought down his measure to the House of Commons, to stand wherever they pleased—sell whatever they pleased—and, in fact, do whatever they pleased. The moment they were desired to move away, "No," said they, "the Duke of Wellington has *towld* us we are as good as yourselves now. He has done for us, and the d——l a fig we care for you or the Lord Mayor." The officers did not like to interfere with this feeling, but they expostulated with the women, and told them all they were required to do was to allow people to pass without being molested.

WINDSOR, MARCH 20.

Lord Kenyon arrived at the White Hart Inn this morning, for the purpose of obtaining an interview with his Majesty at the Castle. His lordship shortly after his arrival forwarded a letter by his servant to the Earl of Fife, as Lord in Waiting. Upon his receiving an answer, the noble lord went to the Castle and had an interview with the Earl, and was informed that his Majesty would give him an audience at four o'clock. His lordship has a number of petitions, which he will present to his Majesty in person.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

With the exception of some recent proceedings of a sanguinary nature in Portugal, and a revelation of the Royal intention from the lips of the Emperor of the Brazils, our foreign news is destitute of interest. This seems by universal consent to be the season for settling the private accounts of all Christian nations. France is pondering over her budget, and wondering how she has contrived to spend so much money during the last year; but Portugal, having no money to spend, and, therefore, no budget to discuss, is occupied in the wholesome pursuit of hanging, drawing, and quartering—Don Miguel's arithmetic being confined to division and subtraction. Happening to discover a plot against his august person, he determined to crush the treason by the annihilation of the traitors. Accordingly a special commission was appointed to try the leaders of the abortive rebellion; but there is an instinct in humanity that is forced into operation by voilent occasions, and that instinct prompted the commissioners, who could discover no crime but that of *thinking* that liberty was better than slavery, to utter the lenient sentence of transportation for life upon the principals, and for ten years upon the inferior offenders, acquitting all the remainder. Don Miguel's doctrine of recompense, however, was of a more peremptory kind; he reversed the sentence, and insisted on hanging five, transporting two for life, and the remainder for ten years. The father of his people was gratified, and his disobedient children were, agreeably to his parental desire, executed the next morning in the great square facing the Tagus.

The tragedy at Lisbon is likely to receive an accession both in its plot and its performers, that may help to produce in the catastrophe what dramatists call poetical justice—that is, punishment for the wicked, and rewards for the virtuous. Don Pedro has at last spoken out. He has declared to the Portuguese Deputation, Conde de Sabugal and Don Antonio de Magalhaes, that he is determined to maintain the mutual independence of the two nations, and resolved to show his determination to fight for the rights of his daughter, and to enter into no compromise with the usurper of the crown of Portugal. This language is considered decisive, and may be esteemed as preliminary to an open declaration of war.

A LIST OF THE SEVENTEEN,

Who, on the 19th instant, voted against the second reading of the bill for disfranchising the forty-shilling freeholders in Ireland:—

Bankes, Henry—Bentinck, Lord George—Bryan, Thomas—Dawson, Alexander—Dickenson, W.—Estcourt, T. G. B.—Fane, John—French, Arthur—Grattan, Henry—Hume, Joseph—Lambert, J. S.—O'Neill, Hon. John—Palmerston, Lord—Townshend, Lord C.—Uxbridge, Earl—Warrender, Sir G.—Westenra, Hon. G.—Lennox, Lord—Trant, W. H.

NUMBERS

OF THOSE WHO VOTED AGAINST THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

On the 18th	173
Tellers	2
Paired off	6
In the minority on the 6th, absent the 18th	17
Paired off against the bill on the 6th, absent the 18th	3
In the majority on the 6th, but in the minority on the 18th	1
	202

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

In continuation from Supplement.

though both diffidence and pride equally prompt me to be silent. I add my humble vote to that faithful band who have resigned the countenance of those whom they have hitherto respected so deeply, and to whom they have adhered so faithfully; who have surrendered, in the language of many, all pretensions to a share of common sense or of general information; who submit to be branded as a lessening class of intolerants and bigots, from which the ministers themselves have just happily escaped; and, what is still more painful to generous minds, who are ranked amongst those that are as devoid of true liberality and benevolence, as they are of reason and intelligence, (hear, hear.) Short as has been the time in which I have had the honour of a seat in this house, I have been here long enough to perceive the spirit by which a part of it, and, unhappily, too large a one, is actuated; and I am prepared to share in this treatment. The spirit of popery, when dominant (I beg pardon for any thing so obsolete and illiberal as an allusion to history), dragged the objects of its resentment to the stake—its spirit still survives—its advocates at this moment would willingly inflict on its conscientious opponents a martyrdom still more grievous to generous minds, in aiming at the moral and intellectual character and attainments of those whom they mark out as their victims. All these things, however, move us not. In a cause like that of the Protestant constitution of England, now placed for the first time since its existence in a situation of imminent peril, an humble part in its triumph would indeed give me a share of that immeasurable joy which its rescue would diffuse throughout the nation; but to be numbered as one of those who, faithful to the end, made a last, though ineffectual struggle in its defence, will afford a melancholy satisfaction which I would not exchange for all the pride, and power, and honours which may await a contrary course (cheers). Bear with me, sir, in thus expressing my feelings; they are those of the vast mass of the British people—not a besotted, ignorant, bigotted people, as some discribed their countrymen to be; but of an intelligent, a well principled and a religious people, the people of England—men who, intellectually, are as competent to entertain this question as those who attempt to stultify them, and who, morally speaking, are far better qualified to decide upon it than those who malign them, inasmuch as they bring to it the lights of common sense—(a laugh from the opposition)—what has lately become a rare virtue—disinterested principle, and above all religious feeling—(loud cheers)—and who, moreover, are far more removed from that bitterness and intolerance in discussing it than those who are perpetually accusing them of being so actuated (cheers). It is these views and feelings, sir, which I would rather present to this house than weary it with any long and laboured arguments on the general question. But, before I attempt to do either, let me attend for a moment to what is made the apology for this fearful inroad on the constitution, namely, the condition of Ireland. This, sir, I have heard stated again and again as the sole reason for the meditated change; and it has been asked, as in a tone of triumph, what other remedy can be proposed? I deny, sir, that the proposition is a remedy—I deny that the reason is substantial. Protestant ascendancy the source of the disasters in Ireland! Why, sir, any man who knows any thing of the history of that unhappy country, and I speak in the hearing of many who will correct me if I err, must be well aware that the state of things now sought to be remedied, and the turbulence and the misery which it occasions, existed, and in a far greater degree, and produced far more lamentable consequences, before the reformation than at present, when consequently there was only one religion in the country (hear, hear.) Need I go over its history, reign by reign, in proof of this? No! the fact is too notorious to admit contradiction. Again, if it should be said that the causes of discontent are now changed, I still deny the assertion; and in so doing, I appeal to the authority of a late right honourable secretary for Ireland, one who, though no longer in his Majesty's government, is friendly to the measure now before us; who, in a speech delivered in this House, and afterwards deliberately given to the public, said, immediately after a recent and sanguinary disturbance there, that "all the commotions which for the last 60 years have tormented and desolated Ireland have all sprung"—From what? From Protestantism, or Protestant Ascendancy! No; "immediately from local oppression" (hear, hear.) Sir, the mischief regarding Ireland is this; Ireland as it respects its connexion with England, was a conquered country—that was her misfortune; but it has been our crime that she has continued to be treated as such. Her lands have been given away from time to time to strangers, on condition that they should reside in the country, and support the Protestant religion; and they have deserted both—absentees, who, owning much of the surface of the island, cruelly desert the people by whom they live, and persecute and oppress them by proxy, but who, many of them, think to make atonement for their turpitude by a few cheap votes and declarations, sincere or otherwise, in favour of Roman Catholic emancipation. Of all the delusions which have been so much descanted upon on the opposite side of the house, can any equal this? They consign a population to poverty and idleness, where, to the disgrace of humanity, civilization, and Christianity, there is no provision whatever for the wretched victims of poverty. Into this subject I am prepared to go whenever it shall gain the attention of this house. In the mean time I assert, and will repeat again and again, that the miseries of Ireland, aye, and of turbulency, do not spring from its Protestant constitution. Why, it is only a few years ago since the manufacturing and labouring classes of this country wanted employment and bread, and demagogues told them to seek parliamentary reform. In Ireland there is equal distress, and agitators tell the people what they want is Roman Catholic Emancipation. Both are untrue. The people in both instances wanted employment and bread; and, wrought upon in their distress by designing men, they firmly attributed their distresses to causes, the removal of which it is my honest conviction would only perpetuate them. The difference has been that in one case you put the agitators down, in the other you have connived at, if not secretly supported them (loud cheers.) But, sir, I see in Roman Catholic emancipation nothing whatever proposed in favour of the mass of the Irish community—that brave, that generous, that long-suffering class, which have been alike the dupes of the great in both countries. On the contrary, I see a proposition unblushingly made, to rob the cottage of its long-exercised privilege, in order to add new splendour to the Catholic coronet; and this, forsooth, is to calm the country at present, and ensure its future tranquillity. It would do irreparable mischief if it were to effect this: that country never will, never ought to be calm and contented till the blessings of civilization, and the rights of humanity, are extended and secured to the lowest ranks of its society. What are we to do with Ireland? Legislate on her behalf, in the spirit of philanthropy, and with the lights of wisdom and experience develop her immense internal resources hitherto unexplored, almost untouched—introduce in behalf of her distressed population a moderate system of poor laws, the machinery of which the very attempt would create—diffuse, in spite of priestly domination, the benefits of christian education—employ the starving people which are and must be fed, but whose labours you now lose as well as destroy their characters by consigning them to involuntary idleness and mendicancy—and finally, while you legislate about and against the poor, dare to touch the culpable and heartless rich, the deserters and enemies of their country, and if they are dead to other and worthier motives, compel them by pecuniary mulcts to repay some of their duties to that society to which they owe their all—duties which they are disposed to pay by words only (cheers.) Let them thus afford employment and bread to a population never adequately employed, always suffering from want, and pushed to the utmost verge of human endurance. These, sir, are the means, simple and obvious, though ridiculed by theoretic folly (hear, hear,) and rejected by inveterate selfishness, which would, and in no long time, regenerate Ireland and repay the wrongs of many generations. But, sir, Ireland—degraded, deserted, oppressed, pillaged—is turbulent; and you listen to the selfish recommendations of her agitators. You seek not to know, or knowing you wilfully neglect, her real distresses. If you can calm the agitated surface of society, you heed not that fathomless depth of misery, sorrow, and distress, whose troubled waves may still heave and swell unseen and disregarded; and this forsooth is patriotism. Ireland asks of you a fish, and you give her a serpent; bread, you proffer her Roman Catholic emancipation. And this, sir, I presume is construed to be the taking into our consideration the whole situation of Ireland (loud cheering).—Turning then from the consideration of Ireland, where the sacrifice of Protestantism would be a curse instead of a remedy, let us see what is the nature of the proposition, and what its effects as it regards the empire at large. It amounts, sir, to this—an inroad on the constitution of the country, and a preparatory movement towards its final destruction.—All the rights the constitution creates are conditional; if this implies disabilities and exclusions, the constitution of England is founded upon them. But they are such as are imposed for the general good, and they have hitherto promoted and secured it. The meditated alteration militates against the letter, and destroys the spirit of that constitution. It demands qualifications, or, if you please, imposes disabilities of a twofold nature on all whom it calls to serve the public in the legislative or judicial functions, or allows, to be qualified for that purpose. And first, it demands a pecuniary qualification. From the freeholders of England who elect—from the members of parliament who are elected—from the legislature who make our laws—from our magistrates who administer them, and even from our juries who finally determine as to their application, it still demands a pecuniary qualification; and it does so, as I conceive, on very intelligible grounds, because it appeared expedient to identify the authorities of the country with its permanent interests; and again, and more emphatically, because the possession of property was deemed the most general though certainly not the infallible evidence of that information and knowledge which are so essential to the due discharge of those important functions which exist only for the benefit of all. It is thus our constitution seeks to embody not the ignorance and passions, but the wisdom and intelligence of the community. Political radicals seek to do away with this pecuniary qualification, and for reasons which will acquire tenfold force if the measure before us is suffered to pass. For, sir, the constitution of England assumes a still more sacred character in demanding and hitherto with far greater certainty and scrupulosity, a moral qualification from all who make or administer, in the higher functions of the state, the laws of this realm. It has not only made christianity part and parcel of the law of the land, but it has constituted its pure and reformed profession an essential ingredient in the established government; and as long as I am permitted to think that principles are the springs of practice—that christianity is better than infidelity—that its purest and most liberal form is preferable to its most bigotted and corrupt one—so long, in spite of the liberalism of the day, which is only another term for that spirit which strikes at the root of christianity, aye, and in a neighbouring country soon hewed down the tree—I presume to think it has done so most wisely. I am aware, sir, of the hackneyed assertion first put forth by Mr. Paine, that we have nothing to do with religion as being a matter between man and his God, and I subscribe to it. But that we have nothing to do with religion as between man and man I utterly deny. To do otherwise would be to disclaim the doctrines of the scripture, the dictates of common sense, the experience of the christian world—the utility of any religion whatsoever. If, sir, the profession of christianity in its purest form be the best guarantee of the faithful discharge of the private and social duties, it is much more so of those high and important functions on which the character and happiness of millions depend—and it was thus our ancestors judged and acted in founding and establishing our constitution. Nor was it with a view merely to secure to the country the full advantage of Protestant principles, the best and most efficient form of christianity upon earth, but to exclude Popish ones—undoubtedly the worst—that they thus decided, identifying the latter, as they had abundant reason to do, with cruelty, tyranny, and arbitrary power—believing it to be detrimental to the interests and morals of the community, and having had full experience as to its tendency greatly to weaken, if not to withdraw, that allegiance which is due to the sovereign power of this Protestant Empire. But the moral qualification now termed disabilities, is, it seems, to be sacrificed; and yet these lawyers in abundance, statesmen without number tell us it is in perfect accordance with the spirit of the constitution. I have already said, that our political radicals seek to do away with the pecuniary qualification; our religious radicals, for such they are, whatever they denominate themselves, wish to destroy the moral one. They allege that the superior light and information which has dawned upon the Romish church has changed its character, and [illegible] alliance for a Protestant king and parliament. But has not the same amelioration been asserted, and far more truly, regarding the unrepresented part of the British community, and yet they were dispersed and put down, their agitators were never listened to; they were, on the contrary, forcibly apprehended, tried, and punished. But, sir, the popish agitators were tolerated in infinitely more seditious practices, if not actually encouraged by those who had the power to put them down, in order, as many think, to make out a case for putting down the constitution. Hitherto the very principle that our ancestors thus happily established, which has produced such inestimable benefits to this hitherto prosperous country, is now it seems, to be annihilated—all our securities are to be destroyed

At one fell swoop!

The time is come, we are told, when the question must be adjusted. Sir, the adjustment of a disquieted question generally terminates in some mutual concessions, some reciprocal advantages; but here the reciprocity is clearly all on one side. Will the authors of the measure point out its equivalents actually given in before the house?—There are none, unless their promises and professions may be regarded as such, which some of us have learnt now to estimate at their just value. The Protestant faith surrenders every thing, receiving nothing. Even the securities so much talked of vanish at last into mere shadows. The measure, we are told, is satisfactory; but to whom? To the most zealous and devoted of the adherents of the popish cause, in all the pride of its growing demands and insatiable pretensions; and it is moreover accepted as the certain presage of better things to come. But securities. The lord lieutenancy, an office of pageantry, is, it seems, to be continued Protestant. But what Protestant cares an iota about that, surrounded as the individual holding it will certainly be by Popish advisers? The office of Lord Chancellor is similarly reserved; but a Roman Catholic may be First Lord of the Treasury, exercising, therefore, a far greater patronage. The place of the King, as a learned lord expressed it, must, it appears, still remain Protestant; but some bigotted devotee of Rome may conquer his way to the royal presence, be his prime minister, and become viceroy over him. But, sir, this last reservation I confess heightens the objection I have to the measure into abhorrence and disgust.—What! sir, after having established by a solemn act the doctrine that conscience ought to be left free and unrestrained—that disabilities of the nature sought to be removed inflict a disgrace upon the feelings of those whom they affect intolerable to good and generous minds, worse than persecution, nay than death itself—how do you apply it? Why, sir, you propose to sear this brand high upon the forehead, deep into the heart of your prince—you render the scar more visible, the insult the more poignant—by making him the solitary individual whose hereditary rank must be so held and transmitted. Freedom of conscience to all subjects, but none to your King! Throw open wide the portals of legislation that a Duke of Norfolk may take his seat in your senate, but hurl from his loftiest seat there the throne of this realm, a Duke of Lancaster, if he exercise the same privilege—if he presume to have a conscience! Hitherto, sir, the British Constitution is uniform, fair, equal. It demands the same moral qualification, as I have already observed, from us all. The liberal school have long proclaimed that these essential securities imply slavery; and the ministers who have adopted their political creed, nevertheless, are content, nay propose, that the King should be the only proclaimed slave in his dominions. But if the bill should pass, which God avert! if no other and fitter individual should stand up in favour of the then insulted feelings of his Sovereign, I will. Whether the exception is introduced to blind the eyes of some under the guise of a security, or however intended, I will propose that, amidst this general emancipation, the King shall not be bound—that in the very acme of liberal legislation the King should not receive a marked insult—that his future religious profession shall be delivered from the taint of this solitary dictation, that his conscience shall be free. I will move, sir, an amendment omitting that clause. It may be said the monarch will have still a choice. Certainly. And have those in whose favour you are about to throw down the ramparts of the Constitution, have they at present less? But, sir, this measure does not merely affect the feelings and the character—I say it touches the title of the King! Reverse the attainder upon popery, and the natural consequences are obvious. Proclaim the equal right and eligibility of all religions to all offices of state amongst us, ye emancipators, and remind us of the millions of subjects who demand the declaration and concession, and allude to the scores of millions who back their demands elsewhere, and the moment the King shall sign such a bill, in what position will you have placed him? While the constitution of the country stands as our revered and not hitherto rivalled ancestors framed it and transmitted it down to us, namely, strictly Protestant, excluding from power (and from power only) the devoted adherents of a cruel, tyrannous, and superstitious church, nothing can be more clear, consistent, and indisputable than the royal title; take away that Protestant character, nothing less so. The privileges of Protestantism, as hitherto maintained, constitute the royal title deeds of his august family, that which became the actual transfer of the estate which he holds in parliament and in the country; and in what attitude do his legal and constitutional advisers place themselves who recommend their surrender? No surrender! Who dares urge him to sign an instrument to that effect? It was the very ascendancy, now a by word of abuse, and which I observe Mr. O'Connell exults in saying is gone for ever, I say, which first introduced into these realms the illustrious and patriotic line which now governs us; which still forms at once the pillar and foundation of the throne, which combines its title with the very elements of our constitution; which identifies it with our liberties; which consecrates it with the sanctities of our religion; in a word, which proclaims, by the unanimous suffrages of your institutions as well as in all our hearts, George IV. as the rightful king of the first Protestant empire upon earth. It is true that the Act of settlement is yet, I believe, to remain; an act which was with difficulty passed, and passed at last by a majority of one only; by a parliament exclusively Protestant; but it will be, of course, more zealously supported, both as to its letter and spirit, by one partly Papist! But, sir, I am adverse to my own particular party as a matter of taste as well as principle, from resting the royal title, which has hitherto been placed upon the broad foundation of national principle, and supported by all the analogies of the constitution, upon a mere act of parliament, rather upon a reservation in that act, [illegible] instead of the firm foundation of [illegible] Protestant constitution.

tion. I feel persuaded, therefore, that whatever becomes of the legal, the proposed measure touches the moral title of the King. I feel confident, circumstanced as the succession is in reference to other heirs, whose claims the celebrated Mr. Buller has so plainly traced, that he whom the bill would chiefly affect would feel his generous heart wounded by the circumstances in which he would then find himself placed in reference to rights that must morally survive, however weakly they might be maintained. For these reasons I will, as an humble individual, resist the present measure to the last. I am aware that it is said that there is no danger where the population is, generally speaking, Protestant. I differ in this assurance inasmuch as I am certain this house no longer attends to the voice of the people on this important point; but, danger or none, I am adverse from insulting a high minded and generous prince by practically showing him that the principle which seated him on the throne is unjustifiable, and no longer worthy of preservation, is worthy of remembrance only as an obsolete and ridiculous piece of past bigotry, though we will condescend, nevertheless, to support him now he is there. I am opposed, sir, to this change in the character of the royal title. In one word, instead of resting it upon the universal spirit of the constitution, and folding the royal robe round the throne and the altar, you hang it on the peg of a solitary legal exception or two, ridiculous in themselves, and insulting in their nature and effects. The right hon. secretary has indeed said that the petitions poured into this house, numerous and respectable beyond all former example since there was a house to receive them, afford the best security on this occasion. But he has heard his new friends, night after night, scrutinize those petitions as emanating from poverty, folly, ignorance, and bigotry. Liberal conduct! Where, then, will be the security when this national feeling shall have been successfully insulted, damped, cried down, when it shall therefore expire in disgust, at the manner in which it has been disregarded, deserted, and betrayed? Other reasons, powerful as I think in themselves, and far more important in reference to their results, press for utterance. But I will not trespass on the patience of the house by adducing them. I would rather recal to its memory those which have been delivered by the right hon. secretary of state, accompanied with the consequences with which he so often and so ably connected them—delivered, I say, from his place, which he still keeps, I regret to say, much more tenaciously than his principles. Those, however, have not lost their weight in the country, and he has now the hard task of answering them himself. No talents inferior to his own, I speak it sincerely, would be competent to such a task. He can, however, like Hudibras, "Confute, change sides, and still confute;" and his new friends assure him that this is the true, consistent, dignified, and patriotic course. But, if I waive any further arguments on this important subject, I will nevertheless make a solitary remark on the extraordinary nature of those reasonings which are urged in defence and support of the present fatal measure. As those arguments evidently spring from the most opposite views and motives, so are they of the most contradictory nature. Yet still they are all allowed to carry weight, though, if they were pressed from one and the same quarter, they would plainly balance and negative each other. It is thus that, in this most extraordinary argument, contradiction itself is allowed to cumulate the demonstration. Thus, one party asserts, and is heard and believed, that popery has lost its power, that it has become quite nerveless, despicable, and inert, and may therefore be trusted; another, on the contrary, says that its adherents are now so formidable in numbers and so overwhelming in power, that its claims must be yielded. They, too, have full credit for their assertions. One maintains that its spirit is changed and meliorated; another that it is unchanged and unchangeable. One that the conduct of its possessors is excellent, peaceable, and loyal, that they merit to be admitted into power; another that they are so united, turbulent, and factious, that it is unsafe to keep them out. Both opinions are gospel. One assures us that its admission into the citadel of the constitution will strengthen the established church; another (and it is far stronger than it chooses to avow itself at present) hopes that such admission will lead to that union with other bodies unfriendly to it which will effect its final downfall. One would think, I say, that arguments so opposite would neutralize each other. But, no! so long as they are urged from different mouths they are all held irrefragable. In this general attack the arrows may be shot from different quarters, but while they are all aimed at one central mark—Protestantism—they are the more certain the more varied the position from whence they are discharged. Into these various arguments, I say, I shall not enter at present.—One, however, distinct from them all, and so degrading to the character of the country and the feelings of Englishmen, I shall just allude to.—It is this:—that England ought to take her lessons of liberality from the surrounding nations. In none of these countries, I am prepared to prove, is liberty so well understood or so largely exercised as in this happy country; and yet England, the birth-place of freedom, its asserter, its defender, and its avenger—the model of all the free institutions upon earth—and where as abundant a degree of liberty is experienced as is anyways consistent with its perpetuity—I say England is by these gentlemen sent abroad on a sort of Ulyssean tour to learn the rudiments, and imbibe the spirit of freedom; to pick up the crumbs of liberality which fall from the tables where tyranny and superstition have been feasting for generations. But I will not dwell on this degrading consideration, but proceed to observe that if we object to this change in the constitution of our country in itself, we resist it yet more strenuously in consideration of its certain consequences—consequences which are already but ill-disguised by not a few of those who zealously support this measure. That the real liberties of the people will be put in jeopardy, I feel confident; that the united church of England and Ireland will be placed in peril the moment this bill is passed, is certain; it will and must lead to those measures as sure as consequences result from causes, which will complete its fall. This individual act may, indeed, recognise its rights; what may the next do, when you have reinforced the ranks of legislation by a number of its implacable and conscientious enemies? The next object of attack, sir, as has been often asserted here, is the establishment, or rather its privileges and immunities. The war is commenced, and it is commenced in this place. The first parallel is nearly completed—it may point diagonally—another will be marked out in an opposite direction, till the whole will be completed, till the gates of the constitution will have been approached, the breach effected, and its ancient ramparts levelled with the dust; and the final triumph will be over the most tolerant, the most learned, and the most efficient religious establishment which any country has ever yet been blessed with. And, sir, can any man flatter himself that even when this is destroyed, a long and uninterrupted reign of quietness and peace is to ensue. No! When this victim has been hunted down, the same pack, which are even now upon her haunches, will scent fresh game, and the cry against our remaining institutions will be renewed with redoubled vigour, till nothing be left worth either attack or defence, if indeed any thing will after this fatal measure is carried, till all be liberalised. I see, indeed, an oath is to be taken that verbally forbids Roman Catholics who take it from harming the establishment; but such must be more or less than men to be enabled to keep such an oath. Totally inefficient as a security, it is immoral to present it to them; it establishes a war between words and principles, and oaths and conscience, and which will finally prevail needs no explanation. When a number of Roman Catholics, then, shall have become seated in this house, that they shall not feel disposed to lessen the influence, and finally to destroy a church which they conscientiously abhor, is absurd. That they should not make common cause for a similar purpose with other parties, inspired by similar views and feelings, is impossible; and, though I have heard honourable members inveigh strongly against the supposition, the sure operation of adequate motives will bring about this union, and will direct its energies and its efforts against the common object of their hostility—the establishment. Much, indeed, has been said about the weakness of such a party in point of numbers; but a party acting invariably in unison on this point will, as has been well urged, ultimately carry it, and with it all others of vital importance. They will form the nucleus of a growing party, to whom the measures of the crown must always be rendered palatable, and who, consequently, will so far dictate the future policy of the country. Such has been the case in past times; the most important events that have ever occurred in our history have been carried by far smaller majorities than these could form acting together, and, consequently holding the balance between the other different parties in the state—such, especially that of the revolution and act of settlement—deliverances, which, if they could have been accomplished at all, could have been secured only by wading to the liberty of England through seas of blood had not popery been expelled from the legislature of the country. But some apologies are made, some reasons given for these portentous changes, which I shall briefly notice. And, first, it is said the time is come when this question ought to be adjusted. This the time! Of all the times in which this measure has been proposed, this is undeniably the worst, because the latest. On many former occasions, sir, when the present ministers opposed this measure, the concession would have been accepted as a boon: it will be now sullenly taken as the recovery of a just but long disputed debt; one insultingly withheld and at last reluctantly granted. Then it would have dissolved millions into gratitude, and made a deep and lasting impression on their hearts; now it is regarded as an extorted right, conceded as a choice of evils, and it will be estimated accordingly. It will, I know, be accepted, but it will receive its chief value as being the certain means of extorting fresh concessions, all of which might now be named, and none of them, I am persuaded, will be long withheld, notwithstanding the new pledges of those who have so nobly redeemed their old ones. I say, Sir, the present is the worst of all the times in which the measure has been hitherto proposed for granting this bill of relief as it is called. If it be a measure within itself, and safe in its consequences, it ought to have been granted from the first, and ministers are deeply responsible for not conceding sooner if they meant to surrender at all. Aye, but we are now told that there was previously a divided cabinet on this particular measure, and that it could not, therefore, be carried. Here, however, the reply is still plainer and more forcible. Never was there so superficial an excuse put forth. Divided Cabinet! Who were they that caused the division in the preceding Cabinet but those who now complain of it, and who, as it now appears, will suffer none to serve their King or country, but such as approve their altered plans, and change at the word of command? Good God! and is it for ministers to talk to us about the government being previously divided upon this question as the only obstacle to its adjustment; those who, less than two short years ago, were so strictly and conscientiously devoted to the cause for which I now humbly contend as to refuse to serve with one who was even favourable to emancipation, and who therefore deserted the King in a body, painful as it no doubt was to them, rather than to do so. But, sir, are all the long and laboured explanations by which this fact is attempted to be concealed or evaded worth a straw? Long-winded orations, passages, as Gray has it, which lead to nothing, can never set this matter in an honest light before the people of England. They can comprehend it as little as the question of emancipation on which they are declared to be so ignorant and besotted. They were, however, beguiled by these explanations. I was one of them. I thought the conduct of the noble and right honourable individuals concerned a sacrifice to principle and consistency; what it was it is now not worth while to inquire, since it was any thing rather than that. It is now too late to rectify the error; all that remains is to regret most deeply, that faithfully following those who have so secretly, suddenly and unceremoniously deserted us, we were taught to regard a highly-gifted individual, unhappily now no more, as one who ought not to serve his King and country as the head of the government, because he was favourable to the measures now so indecently forced upon the country. I do heartily repent of my share in the too successful attempt of hunting down so noble a victim;—a man whom England and the world could not fail to recognise as its ornament, whose eloquence was in these days at least, unrivalled—the energies of whose capacious mind, stored with knowledge and elevated by genius, were devoted to the service of his country. As to the qualities of his generous heart, let those speak to them who felt the warmth of his friendship, which, I believe, could only be equalled by its stability. This was the man with whom the present ministers could not act, and for a reason which vitiates their present doings. Coupling, therefore, that transaction with the present, if the annals of our country furnish so disgraceful a page, I have very imperfectly consulted them. But peace to his memory! My humble tribute is paid when it can be no longer heard nor regarded—when it is drowned by the voice of interested adulation now poured only into the ears of the living. He fell; but his character is rescued—it rises and triumphs over that of his surviving—what shall I call them? Let their own consciences supply the hiatus (hear, hear.) One thing I cannot but deeply regret as the inevitable consequence of those strange changes, however they may terminate, namely, the degradation of the character of public men in the estimation of the people of England. Nothing can equal the astonishment with which these sudden changes have been regarded, but the disgust they have occasioned; nay, even where they have been hailed as accessions of strength, they have, nevertheless, been accompanied by feeling of secret contempt. Much has been said as to the question having been long before the people of England so as to render delay unnecessary; had it been a shorter time before the consideration of the present ministers when they rejected it, so sudden, total, and unanimous a change in a matter so long considered seems not a little singular and supicious. These simultaneous conversions are really disgusting—they argue not so much a change of principle as a total want of principle. I have nothing to do with the motives of men; their actions, however are open to animadversion; and I think I speak the language of plain English honesty when I say, that no power, however formidable—no promises, however alluring—no rewards, however great—should tempt me to such a course. Were I to accept a proffered robe of nobility on such conditions, I would take a hint from the church whose interests I should then have to espouse, and wear, in the way of a penance, a shirt of hair next my recreant skin for the remainder of my life. There is, I admit, such a thing as a conscientious conversion, and I honour it. It is however of very rare occurrence where opinions have been previously well weighed and long and perseveringly maintained. There is, sir, a much more common thing—apostacy—(hear)—and can the people of England forbear to suspect this to be the case, when they view with dismay these infectious conversions, and behold whole ranks of men face about at the word of command? They will, I am persuaded, look no more to the summits of society for their guides on those sacred matters—the gilded weathercocks who may face to-day the pole star of truth and consistency, and turn their backs upon it to-morrow. No, they have learnt to respect themselves—to know and to feel that true, consistent, conscientious principle is not to be looked for at the summit, but in the solid base of the social structure, which stands unshaken and unmoved; and keeps its just front facing all the cardinal virtues of existence. Such, taking their principles, as all true Protestants do, from a translated Bible, are not likely to be shaken, and are immovable amidst those infectious political conversions, which are the scandal of the age and the disgrace of the country. As an instance how deeply these political tergiversations have offended the honest principles of the people, and shaken their confidence in public men, I will just mention what occurred to me during my recent contested election. I solicited one whose principles I learnt were precisely the same as my own; and especially on this vital point. My surprise was great when he peremptorily refused me his vote, and with some heat. He declared, indeed, his warm devotion to the Protestant interest which I assumed as a fair ground for his support, and I expressed my principles accordingly, and my determination to adhere to them. But he cut me short. I have done, said he, with the pledges or principles, or promises of public men; they have apostatised—so will you. I will give no vote. David said in his haste—I say deliberately, "all men are liars" (loud laughter, and cries of hear, hear, hear.) But, sir, it is these sudden conversions, apostacies—call them what you will, which have made up this so much boasted majority, influenced by every variety of motive, and formed of the most discordant materials. The new accessaries to ministers may perhaps however ultimately embarrass them, otherwise those coalitions must ensue, which, notwithstanding their luminous apologists, Englishmen instinctively abhor; and they feel rightly in so doing. Meantime nothing can be more ludicrous than the figure some cut in this political melée. Misery, says Shakspeare, makes men acquainted with strange bed-fellows, so does political delinquency (loud laughter and cheers.) Who, for instance, would have thought the hon. member for Somersetshire and his late talented and astute opponent, Mr. H. Hunt, would have been so soon yoke fellows in the glorious cause of Roman Catholic emancipation—and so of the rest. They, however, do agree; and I may add in the words of Sheridan's Critic, when they do agree their unanimity is wonderful. I make no personal allusions here, the leaders in this wheeling phalanx I have no doubt are honourable men—so are they all, "all honourable men." One thing I am, however, bound to admit—those who have long, constantly, and conscientiously supported this question, however mistakenly as I judge, them I cannot but respect—the triumph at this moment is all their own. They have evidently been the leaders, and far in advance, in this march of intellect—they it is who have taught the late converts, like Moliere's Gentilhomme, their political vowels at 40. I arraign neither the principles nor the consistency of the opposition; it is to the new, sudden, and simultaneous converts that I allude, who, moreover, have the warmth of all new converts and their hatred of all those who remain consistent. Their zeal, indeed, is of so agitating and intense a nature that, like the ingredients of a boiling cauldron, it is perpetually overflowing, and scalding all within its reach (hear, hear.) But I am perhaps presenting principles and feelings rather than arguments to this house. I meant, I promised so to do when I was sent hither, and I have kept and mean to keep my word (hear.) I know how dear this sacred, this deserted cause is to the hearts and to the understandings of Englishmen. The principle may be indeed weak in this house, but abroad it marches in more than all its wonted might, headed, in spite of the aspersions of its enemies, by the intelligence, the religion, the loyalty of the country; and if the honest zeal, nay, even the cherished prejudices of the people, swell its train, thank God for the accession. Here, sir, that cause may be, like those wasting tapers, melting away, there it burns unextinguishably. It lives abroad, though this house, which was its cradle, may be now preparing its grave (hear, hear!) To their representatives the people committed their dearest birthright, the Protestant constitution. They have not deserted it, whoever has. If it must perish, then, I call God to witness that the people are guiltless! Let it then expire, I say, in this spot—the place of its birth, the scene of its long triumphs—betrayed, deserted in the house of its pretended friends, who while they smile are at it preparing to smite—let it here, while it receives blow after blow from those who have hitherto been its associates and supporters, fold itself up in its mantle, and hiding its sorrow and disgrace, fall when it feels the last vital stab at its heart from the hand of one whom it had armed in its defence, and advanced to its highest honours (cheers.) Sir, I am misconstrued if my last expressions imply any thing but regret in reference to the illustrious individual to whom I have alluded. None ever admired, none still admire the hero of his country more than I do. My heart partook of his first glories, and my humble adherence accompanied him in every subsequent period of his career, even when those who now profess to adulate him heaped upon him the coarsest insults. To triumph over him, were it in my power, would inflict upon any feelings a pang which could only be exceeded by the downfall of the constitution of a country, whose fame he has so gloriously augmented, and whose greatness if not, existence, he has so nobly achieved—(hear, hear, hear). But, sir, the name of that constitution again raises my mind far above all personal considerations, and I will waive them. I will detain the house but a few moments longer, but I cannot help adding, that of all the circumstances attending this momentous measure nothing has so strongly excited the resentment of the people, especially that large and loyal part of them who have hitherto supported government, as the studied concealment, not to say intentional misleading, with which it has been attended throughout. This may, and doubtless is, the proper policy when a general has to manœuvre upon an army of enemies; when, however, a great measure has to be carried with the concurrence of the friends of their country, it strikes me that openness, candour, and confidence would have been found to be a better and more creditable policy—(hear, hear). But the last and most important consideration I shall present to this house affects its competency to entertain this question. This house, I say, has no right to proceed in this work of counter-revolution without consulting the people. On preceding elections the question has, by common consent, been kept from their particular consideration, as to have mentioned it would have been stigmatized the "No popery cry;" and, moreover, they confided in this particular, in the express declarations of his Majesty's government, and determined their choice therefore by other grounds of political or local preference. The Protestant constitution, now endangered, was first established in a convention, called for that special purpose; and without as full an appeal and with equal formality, the people have no right to be robbed of it—(hear and laughter). I am fully aware of the legal fiction that parliament is omnipotent, but it is nevertheless a fiction. The parliament is neither called to, nor competent, to alter the original frame work, if I may so speak, of the constitution. Supposing, for instance, this house in conjunction with the other branches of the legislature were to enact that our seats should be perpetual, and not only for life, but hereditary—where is the man that will assert that we have a right or a power given to us so to legislate? (hear). Suppose we were to agree to abolish the representative system altogether, or take away trial by jury (hear, hear). I repeat the question, where is the man that dares to assert that the power of parliament extends thus far? But as to the Protestantism of the constitution, it is certain that our powers to change this in any degree are still more clearly and intentionally limited. We make a solemn declaration to this effect at taking our seats here, and mine has been taken too lately to be forgotten, however it may be by others. Under these circumstances neither the established constitution of the country, nor the oaths and declarations taken by us, permit us to assume the right which is now so eagerly sought to be exercised, namely, the right of throwing open the doors of this house to the admission of popery, to the scandal, disgrace, and danger of the Protestant establishment in church and state. Sir, we have no lawful power for doing this; the people of England sent us not hither for any such purpose. They interdicted us by solemn oaths and declarations from daring to attempt such a course (cheers). Their voice is heard in their numerous and correct petitions, which cleanse their consciences from the stain of participating in so foul a transaction! I am persuaded that they will resent it deeply and permanently if we proceed (hear, hear), let the house, then, beware (cheers). I should be sorry if it went abroad that I am hostile to the Roman Catholics. I respect the talents and courage of my Roman Catholic fellow subjects, and there is not one man of that body I would injure; but still I will protect the character of the Protestant constitution. The hon. gentleman concluded by thanking the house for the attention with which he had been heard, and sat down amid loud and general cheering.

Sir G. WARRENDER opposed the arguments of the hon. member for Corfe Castle, and expressed himself favourable to emancipation.

Mr. FANE said that the bill was forced upon the people of England with threats.

Mr. BANKES rose amidst the cry of "Go on! go on!" and moved that the debate be adjourned to this day.

Mr. PEEL said he did not rise to resist the adjournment moved by the hon. gentleman, but he thought it would be necessary to enter into some arrangement. Four hours had been occupied, and little progress made, because so much time had been previously occupied in presenting petitions.

Sir R. INGLIS thought it going too far when the right hon. gentleman proposed to cut short the time required for the presentation of petitions.

Lord MILTON rose, amidst the cries of "Go on! Adjourn!" It was not usual to adjourn such a question at half-past 12 o'clock.

Mr. PEEL was sure those who wished this question satisfactorily discussed, must be convinced that six or seven hours were not enough for that dicussion. Night after night they had been detained by petitions. The right hon. gentleman knew that attempts had been made to convince the people that these petitions were not attentively received, but he knew the attempt would fail (hear, hear). He thought the debate could not be pursued with advantage, and he was not unwilling to adjourn upon an understanding that it be renewed at an early hour.

Lord HOWICK expressed a hope that the hon. baronet, the member for Oxford, would have the manliness to say whether he would consent to the arrangement.

Sir R. INGLIS rose with an expression of warmth, and asked by what authority the noble lord had questioned him. He would not be a party to any arrangement he did not approve.

Lord MILTON could not think the hon. baronet was right in the warmth he had shown.

Mr. PEEL expressed a hope that his hon. friend the member for the university would present his petitions at an early hour. In that case the debate would proceed in proper time, and he trusted it would be conducted with temper.

Sir R. INGLIS said the appeal of his right hon friend was unnecessary. He should yield to his hon. friend and the sense of the house, but not to the lecture of the noble lord.

Lord HOWICK explained.

The debate was then adjourned.

The other orders of the day were disposed of, and the house adjourned at half-past twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, March 18.

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION—(PETITIONS.)

Sir R. H. INGLIS presented petitions from the provost and inhabitants of Edinburgh, signed by 13,000 persons; from Blackburn, by 3,500; another by 2,139; another by 2,348; another by 600; and another by 550, against concession.

The Marquis of CHANDOS presented a similar petition from the dissenters of Buckingham. It was his intention to move that the office of prime minister and also those of privy councillors be excepted from the provisions of the bill; and 12 similar petitions, nine from places in Buckinghamshire, one from Leominster, one from a burgh in Dumfriesshire, and one from Westbury.

Numerous other petitions were presented.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL presented petitions from Oldham, and from Bethnals-green, county of Kent, in favour of Catholic emancipation.

The petitions were severally ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE CATHOLIC BILL.

At ten minutes before six o'clock, Mr. PEEL moved the order of the day for resuming the debate on the Roman Catholic relief bill.

This order being read accordingly, the SPEAKER put the question that this bill be read a second time.

Mr. BANKES said, he would sooner have a Popish King and a Protestant cabinet, than a Protestant King and a Popish cabinet. He would read an extract from the speech of a right hon. gentleman, delivered on a former occasion, a description of it conveyed in much better terms than he could employ for that purpose—"I always look to the admission of Roman Catholics into parliament, as conveying to them a political power in the highest degree dangerous to our constitution." And he afterwards said, that "the consequence of such admission would be, to bring into collision the Catholic and the Protestant religion in such a way as to set aside the supremacy of the latter. A great deal had been said in the course of these debates of the principles which governed the revolution of 1688, and of the specific views of King William and his government. And it was said, how strange is it to find, that if the exclusion of Catholics were intended to be permanent, how came it that the act of settlement alone provided that the person wearing the crown should be always a Protestant? Why, for this obvious reason—that that was the only proviso then required, for Catholics had been previously excluded from places of power and trust in the most effectual manner. The toleration act comprehended all classes of his Majesty's subjects; but the Papists were specially excepted from its operation (hear). Even Mr. Locke stated that the doctrines of the Roman Catholics were of such a kind, that they must be excluded from the benefits and advantages of toleration. A writer at that period said—"His Majesty gives every day some mark or other of his gracious intention to preserve the established church; and of his wishes to convince the bishops of it, in the first place, he ordered that several of them should be sent for, to Court, and after a conference, they were all of them dismissed, very well satisfied." How well satisfied the Bishops were, the articles which they presented to King James, a few days after these gracious conferences sufficiently proved. What would be the conduct of the Bishops at the present time with respect to this question, before long we should have an opportunity of seeing (hear, hear). In his opinion our modern Bishops would follow the glorious example of their great predecessors in their endeavours to maintain and support the Protestant Constitution as established in Church and State—they would neither surrender it to power, nor sacrifice it to expediency—(hear, hear).

Mr. W. HORTON. The House would recollect that the proposition made by him (Mr. W. H.) on the subject of securities was, that Roman Catholics should not be allowed to vote on any questions involving the interests of the established church.—Were a security of that kind adopted there would be obviously no risk to the Established Church from the admission of Roman Catholics to political power. Though when he suggested the security to the house already adverted to, he thought it might be advantageous on the means of conciliation, yet, now that there was a hope of accomplishing the great object without what in present circumstances was a drawback, he rejoiced that his own measure had not been adopted. He was well pleased that the measure did not touch the question of ecclesiastical securities at all.

Sir H. PARNELL denied that the influence of the Catholic Priests would for the future be directed to the Protestant Church, or that they would, in any degree, interfere with it. The state of the law in Ireland was so bad, that the Catholics could no longer live under it; but he trusted, that after the proposed measure would pass, peace and prosperity would be the portion of Ireland.

Lord TULLAMORE. The right hon. Secretary now said that he saw no danger in granting Catholic Emancipation, but he should like to hear him answer his own speech delivered so lately as the month of June in the last year? The Roman Catholic Church was not desirous of toleration; she did not want equality, but universality. Ireland had always been the chosen place from whence the See of Rome had directed its machinations against the Protestant Church and the Constitution of England. He was convinced that these measures would enable the enemies of the Constitution ultimately to accomplish their purpose; and he should say, in the words of the great Lord Burleigh—"England can only be destroyed by her own Parliament."

Mr. R. GRANT contended that those who advocated the Anti-Catholic side of the question, as well as the petitioners who had approached the house, had been treated with the respect they unquestionably deserved. He had listened with great attention to a speech delivered by the new member for Newark, and which was a speech of distinguished ability; and although he agreed in many of the positions laid down by that hon. member, yet he differed from most of the inferences which he drew from them. An hon. member had expressed himself willing to admit Catholics to all civil offices except seats in the houses of Parliament. If he thought the Catholic leaders capable of listening to such a compromise, he would abandon their cause at once (hear.) It would be an acknowledgment that they were fit recipients of the favours and patronage of the Crown, but unfit to share in the privilege of the Constitution, or to be the representatives of the people. The hon. member for Newark had attributed the evils of Ireland to local oppression and principally to the influence of absenteeism upon the habits and condition of the population. The only remedy he had heard proposed for those evils by the hon. member was the introduction of the Poor Laws. He contended that such a remedy would only be a palliative, while the disease would remain uncured. The principle of the Constitution was an equality of civil rights (hear, hear, hear)—and if they took their stand upon that ground in any future defence of their Protestant Institutions, they should then be engaged not in a struggle for a miserable exception to the Constitution, but for the rule of the Constitution. The Test Oath, as had been observed by Lord Plunket, was purely one of negation. The party was not required to say that he was a Protestant, but that he was not a Catholic; so that a man might take the oath and be no Christian, or be of no religion at all. And he was not now speaking of an imaginary case, for a great deal of Unitarianism had already got within their walls (hear, hear.) The hon. member for Newark had said, that Protestantism was one of the qualifications required by the Constitution. If so, he called upon the hon. gentleman to point out the test which required that those who participated in its privileges should declare themselves [illegible] upon sitting down.

Mr. TRANT stated that if he [illegible] of the argument [illegible] speech of the hon. and learned [illegible] wholly upon the necessity of [illegible] mour of those who were called [illegible] He entertained the same opinion of [illegible] tholic religion and its followers which [illegible] framers of our Constitution afraid to entrust them with its privileges. King William, who had been called

Gentleman's Journal.

tholics, will be tell me, I say, why he will let Roman Catholics fill those offices in Ireland, and yet exclude them from seats in parliament—(hear, hear).—What then, becomes of the honbart.'s argument about the intimidation produced by factious demagogues on government? Why, if he fears so much to be thought afraid, why should he yield any thing—[hear.]—"But then," says the hon. member for Newark, "this is the most unfit time of all others to consider this question;" and why?—because, forsooth, it is the latest—[laughter]—an objection, which if it is worth any thing, will continue to acquire accumulated energy every additional time that the question comes before parliament—[hear].—If we do not settle it now, every year, according to the doctrine of the hon. member for Newark, will furnish us with new and accumulated obstacles—[hear].—But to return to the hon. baronet. If he will admit Roman Catholics to every office but those which he has stated, will he tell me, why, when he is ready to go so far, I may not be permitted to go a little further? and if I think my plan better calculated to promote Protestant interests than his, why I may not be permitted to adopt it? "But" says the hon. baronet, "the Constitution of 1688 forbids." I say, that if the constitution of 1688 prevents me from proceeding in my mode of settling the question, it equally prevents him; for the exclusion from office is sealed by exactly the same bonds as the exclusion from Parliament (hear) In the bill of rights it is expressly stated that the new oath of supremacy, and the new oath of allegiance, shall be administered to every officer under the crown, to whom the former oath of supremacy was applied on his admission into office; when upon a former occasion I used the phrase of breaking in upon the Constitution, I meant that we should only have occasion to alter the words of that bill.—What!, have we never altered them before? If the alteration of them be a breaking in upon the Constitution, we broke in upon it some years ago, when we admitted Roman Catholics to have the commands in the army and the navy—(hear, hear). On other occasions, too, we have repealed the arrangements of the year 1688. Lord Liverpool, I say, broke in upon the Constitution—nay, more, Lord Eldon himself—[loud cries of hear and laughter], broke in upon the Constitution, when he admitted Roman Catholics to hold offices in the collection of the revenue; for the bill of rights required that every officer who received the King's wages should, on his admission to office, make the declaration against transubstantiation [loud cries of hear, hear]. There was no use in giving the Roman Catholics fresh powers, unless you gave them powers to the extent of their demand. He had therefore given them a full and fair participation in the advantages of the Constitution and his proposition now rested, as he had stated on a former night, on the integrity of the Protestant Church, and the Protestant institutions of the country, and on the perfect equality of Protestants and Roman Catholics, as far as regarded every civil privilege—[hear, hear]. It was his conviction that if you once broke in upon the exclusive system in Ireland, as was done in 1793, there was no intermediate system, at which they could stop, but you must go on and establish a perfect equality of civil rights. One hon. gentleman who had taken share in the debate, had said, "if there is one thing which I detest, it is yielding to considerations of expediency either in morals or in politics." Now, as to the impropriety of yielding to considerations of expediency, in regard to moral obligations, he would say, that he fully concurred with the hon. member, but if the hon. member meant to class political emergencies with moral obligations, and to exclude the consideration of expediency from the management of public affairs, all that he would say was this—that he hoped that the hon. gentleman, and those who thought with him, might never have any influence in the direction of the affairs of this country [cheers]. How can public affairs, he asked, be conducted, except on the principle of expediency? [hear]. To class political emergencies with moral obligations, and to exclude all considerations of expediency from the administration of a great country, is an absurdity which he was not prepared to expect from a gentleman who had shown so much tact and discernment on other topics (hear and laughter). It had been said that government had taken the country by surprise on this question. Surprise was inevitable upon this question. If government had told the country, "We think of settling the Catholic question," it would have told the country nothing, unless it had also stated the plan on which it was to be settled. If we had given notice beforehand that we intended, previous to the settlement of it, to suppress the Catholic Association, and to accompany the bill of relief with a bill for disfranchising the forty-shilling freeholders, should we not have made declarations which of themselves would have precluded all conciliatory settlement? [hear, hear]. Men would have been provoked into declarations, from which they would have afterwards felt that they could not recede, and preliminary obstacles would have been raised to our proceeding which it would have been almost impossible to overcome [cheers]. The call that had been made to dissolve the parliament was in his opinion, perfectly unconstitutional. The present parliament was as competent as any that could be elected to settle the Catholic question; and, to use a phrase often introduced into the present debate, they should not so stultify themselves as to acknowledge their own incompetency. In support of these opinions he referred to the Acts of Union, Scotch and Irish. On both occasions attempts had been made to render permanent those oaths and declarations which exclude Catholics, and in each case Parliament refused to limit its own powers of afterwards dispensing with them. Would they, then, have that present Parliament of 1829 set the fatal example of declaring its own incompetency? He then passed to the present tranquil state of Ireland—that there was on the part of the Roman Catholics no vulgar triumph; and, on the part of the Protestants opposed to them their disappointment had been marked by the most becoming forbearance and submission. Things had, however, arrived at such a crisis, that the loss of the measure would be pregnant with the most alarming consequences to Ireland. He then disclaimed the praises for bringing forward the present measure, which had been so liberally bestowed on him by hon. members on the other side. He would not take to himself the credit of that great work; it was due to Mr. Fox, to Mr. Grattan, to Mr. Plunket, and its other distinguished advocates in that house, still more the credit of it was due to his right hon. friend, now no more. By their efforts, in spite of my opposition, said Mr. Peel, it has proved triumphant and victorious.—(cheers).—I will not conceal from the house, that in the course of this debate allusions have been made to the memory of my right hon. friend now no more, which have been most painful to my feelings. An hon. baronet has spoken of the cruel manner in which my right hon. friend was hunted down. Whether the hon. baronet was one of those who hunted him down, I know not; but this I know, that whoever joined in the inhuman cry which was raised against him, I was not one—[cheers].—I was on terms of the most friendly intimacy with that illustrious statesman down even to the day of his death; and I say with as much sincerity of heart as man can speak, that I wish he was now alive among us to reap the harvest which he sowed, and to enjoy the triumph which his exertions gained. I would say of him, as he said in his own eloquent language of the late Mr. Perceval—"Would that he were here to take a part in our debates"—

"*Tuque tuis armis; nos te poteremur Achille.*"

[loud cheering.]

I am well aware that the fate of this measure cannot now be altered; if it succeed, the credit will redound to others; if it fail, the responsibility will devolve upon me, and upon those with whom I have acted. These chances, with the loss of private friendship and the alienation of public confidence, I must have foreseen and calculated before I ventured to recommend these measures—[cheers]. I assure the House, that in conducting them I have met with the severest blow which it has ever been my lot to experience in my life; but I am convinced the time will come, though I may not live to see it, when full justice may be done by men of all parties, to the motives on which I have acted—when this question will be fully settled, and when others will see that I had no other alternative than to act as I have acted [cheers]. They will then admit that the course which I have followed, and which I am still prepared to follow, whatever imputation it may expose me to, is the only course, which is necessary for the diminution of the undue, illegitimate, and dangerous power of the Roman Catholics, and for the maintenance and security of the Protestant religion. The right hon. gentleman then sat down amid loud cheering, which lasted for some time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, that the right hon. secretary, in the early part of his speech, had charged him with having betrayed the confidential communications of the cabinet. "I say," continued the learned gentleman, "it is not true, I believe that no one out of the cabinet knew of their intention to propose those measures seven days before the meeting of parliament" (cries of "hear"). That's my "hear" too: I say, "hear," (loud cries of "spoke"). I have not stated to the house what was communicated to me by the right hon. gentleman, I have not disclosed any part of what the right hon. gentlemen stated to me. I flatly, positively, and directly deny the assertion.

Mr. PEEL.—Every gentleman will at once perceive, that it may be extremely inconvenient for an officer of the government to take upon himself to state the precise moment at which a communication was officially made.

The gallery was then cleared, and the house divided when there appeared,

Ayes....333—Noes....173 | Majority....180.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be committed on Monday next.

The other orders of the day were then disposed of, and the house adjourned at a quarter-past three o'clock.

The Mail.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25.

The Roman Catholic Relief Bill has been read a second time in the Commons, and has been carried a second time in that branch of the legislature by a signal majority. No minute discussion has yet occurred on the particular clauses of the bill; every thing of that kind, we presume, being reserved for the occasion of its being submitted to the Committee of the House, which was to take place on last Monday; then will be the time for either side to canvass its precise enactments and to propose alterations. The disfranchisement bill has scarcely met with any opposition, and the debates to which it gave rise, were peculiarly dull and uninteresting. The thing was manifestly indefensible. We know but of one party who have any right to be dissatisfied, and that, by the bye, a party which it has not been thought worth while by our dignified representatives ever even once to take notice of—we allude to the *Protestants* who are entitled to vote by reason of such a freehold, and will now be deprived of the elective franchise for no fault whatsoever of theirs. The Roman Catholics have no right to complain. We think an exception ought decidedly to be made in favour of Forty-shilling freeholders *being Protestants*. The following are some alterations in the bill which Mr. Peel announced on Friday evening that it was his intention to propose in the committee:—At present the right of voting from freeholds was limited to those who had "a legal title," thus excluding those who might be equally possessed of the right by an equitable title—he would therefore omit those words "legal title." As the bill now stood, it was said that the freehold should be "free from all incumbrances." Now this, in Ireland, where judgment-debts affected real property, might tend to make inconvenient disclosures—he purposed, therefore, to omit those words—"free from all incumbrances," and to let the bill stand, "a freehold clear of parochial and other assessments." Another alteration he intended was, to allow an appeal where the value of the freehold was disputed, and where the case was decided by the assistant barrister—not to the same barrister and a jury, but to a jury presided over by a judge of assize. These were the principal alterations. As to debates upon either question, the world is heartily sick of them. We for our part hope that "Catholic Emancipation" may be "carried," if it were for nothing else than to put an end to them. If there is any good to come of it, we who live at this day are the parties to enjoy the benefit; let posterity now take care of themselves. At all events, since the thing seems inevitable, it is the part of wisdom to make the best of it, and not to mar even a fleeting happiness by recollections or by anticipations unsuitable to the occasion.

THE DUEL.

We refer our readers to the account of this extraordinary event. We are confident there will be but one feeling with regard to it, and that a feeling of satisfaction at the termination at which it has fortunately arrived. We can never cease to lament the prevalence of that state of opinion which makes it necessary for men whose lives are of the utmost value to society, to expose themselves to the hazard of being slain in order to vindicate their possession of a personal courage which no one can really possibly suspect or call the least into question. Of all men, surely the hero of Waterloo had least need of giving such a proof. Such, however, is the state of public feeling, that we apprehend it will be generally considered that his Grace could not have done otherwise than he did on this occasion, and that he conducted himself with perfect correctness throughout. On the other side, it will be admitted that whether in error or not in his opinions, no man can stand higher than Lord Winchilsea.—His Lordship may have been severe in his remarks upon the noble Duke, and he may have taken up an erroneous conception of his Grace's conduct—and we trust events may prove that he has; but it will be allowed that he has made ample amends for any error that he may have committed. The apology speaks for itself. It was not an apology dictated to him; but one voluntarily offered by himself. It was not a retractation of any opinion that he had expressed, but an expression of regret that he had "unadvisedly published" that opinion in the way he did. Thus both parties stand as high as possible, so far as their honour is concerned, and there is happily no room for explanation, or any unpleasant remark, and the affair terminates as it must be the desire of all parties that it should.

BILL FOR DISFRANCHISING THE FORTY-SHILLING FREEHOLDERS.

On Thursday night Mr. Peel moved the second reading of the bill for altering the Elective Franchise in Ireland. A debate, which presented nothing either interesting or novel, took place, when the house divided, the numbers being

For the second reading 223
Against it 17

Majority.....206

On Friday night the bill was committed. Previously to the House resolving itself into a Committee, Lord Duncannon moved an amendment which went to destroy the bill altogether, when the numbers for the motion were 20; against it, and consequently for the bill as it at present stands, 220. The bill was then committed *pro forma*, and ordered to be re-committed on Tuesday next. It would thus appear that ministers expect to get the relief bill through the committee on Monday.

We give a *Supplement* with the present number; but have only to regret that we are still in arrear,—such is the extraordinary pressure of interesting matter just at this moment.

The Roman Catholics of this city have agreed to a petition to parliament against the securities of the Relief Bill and particularly the clause reluting to the Monastic Orders. We shall insert the petition in our next.

On Friday night last, eight sheep belonging to a farmer named Michael Hartry, of Whitfield, were cruelly plucked of their wool.

On Monday night, about eight o'clock, a respectable young man, named Michael Brothers, belonging to the schooner Emulator, fell from the stage into the river and was drowned. The body was picked up in about ten minutes, and every means used for the restoration of life, but vain.

DUEL BETWEEN THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND THE EARL OF WINCHILSEA.

(From the *Courier* of Saturday.)

It is our duty to announce to the public an event which, thank God! has not been attended with fatal consequences to the personages concerned in it. A meeting took place this morning, in Battersea fields, between the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Winchilsea. The Duke was attended by Sir Henry Hardinge as his second. They proceeded on horseback to the appointed place, at eight o'clock this morning.

The Earl of Winchilsea, attended by the Earl of Falmouth, arrived in a carriage and four in a few minutes afterwards.

After the necessary preliminaries had been settled, the parties took their ground. The Duke of Wellington fired first, but without effect. The Earl of Winchilsea then discharged his pistol in the air.

In order to make the subject referred to in the subjoined correspondence perfectly intelligible, we preface it by extracts from a letter addressed by Lord Winchilsea to Mr. Coleridge, Secretary to the Committee for Establishing the King's College, London, dated March 14, 1829:—

"I was one of those who, at first, thought the proposed plan might be practicable, and prove an antidote to the principles of the London University; I was not, however, very sanguine in my expectations, seeing many difficulties likely to arise in the execution of the suggested arrangement; and I confess that I felt rather doubtful as to the sincerity of the motives which had actuated some of the prime movers in this undertaking, when I considered that the noble duke at the head of his Majesty's government had been induced on this occasion to assume a new character, and to step forward himself as the public advocate of religion and morality.

"Late political events have convinced me that the whole transaction was intended as a blind to the Protestant and high Church party, that the noble duke, who had for some time previous to that period determined upon 'breaking in upon the Constitution of 1688,' might the more effectually, under the cloak of some outward show of zeal for the Protestant religion, carry on his insidious designs for the infringement of our liberties, and the introduction of Popery into every department of the State."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COURIER.

SIR,—I request your publication of the accompanying correspondence. I am, sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY HARDINGE.

1.—FROM THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO LORD WINCHILSEA.

London, March 16, 1829.

My Lord,—I have just now perused in the *Standard* newspaper of this day a letter addressed to Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq., dated Eastwell Park, March 14, 1829, signed WINCHILSEA and NOTTINGHAM; and I shall be very much obliged to your lordship, if you will let me know whether that letter was written by you, and published by your authority. I have, &c.

(Signed) WELLINGTON.

Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.

2.—FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

London, March 18, 1829.

My Lord,—I wrote to your lordship, on the 16th, a letter, of which I inclose the duplicate; as, not having yet received a letter from your lordship, I am apprehensive that the original may not have reached you, although I directed it to your house in Suffolk-street.

I am just going to Windsor to attend his Majesty, but I shall be in town this night. I have, &c.

(Signed) WELLINGTON.

To the Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.

3.—FROM LORD WINCHILSEA TO THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Eastwell Park, March 18, 1829.

My Lord,—The inclosed is a copy of the answer which I returned, by this day's post, to your Grace's letter, which only reached me *this morning*. I intend leaving this place for London to-morrow morning, and expect to be at No. 7, Suffolk-street, between four and five o'clock in the afternoon. I have, &c.

(Signed) WINCHILSEA & NOTTINGHAM.

His Grace the Duke of Wellington.

4.—FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

Eastwell Park, March 18, 1829.

My Lord—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Grace's letter of the 16th instant, and I beg to inform you, that the letter addressed to H. N. Coleridge, Esq., was inserted in *the Standard* by my authority. As I had publicly given my approbation and sanction to the establishment of the King's College, London, last year, by his Grace the Duke of Wellington becoming a subscriber to it, I thought it incumbent upon me in withdrawing my name, also publicly to state my reasons for so doing.

I have &c.

(Signed) WINCHILSEA and NOTTINGHAM.

5.—FROM THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE EARL OF WINCHILSEA.

London, March, 19 1829.

My Lord—I have had the honour of receiving your Lordship's letters of the 18th instant.

Your Lordship is certainly the best judge of the mode to be adopted of withdrawing your name from the list of subscribers to the King's College.

In doing so, however, it does not appear necessary to impute to me, in no measured terms, disgraceful and criminal motives for my conduct in the part which I took in the establishment of the College.

No man has a right, whether in public or in private, by speech or in writing, or in print, to insult another by attributing to him motives for his conduct, public or private, which disgrace or criminate him.

If a gentleman commits such an act indiscreetly, in the heat of debate, or in a moment of party violence, he is always ready to make reparation to him whom he may thus have injured.

I am convinced that your Lordship will, upon reflection, be anxious to relieve yourself from the pain of having thus insulted a man who never injured or offended you.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WELLINGTON.

The Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.

Sir Henry Hardinge delivered the letter No. 5, to the Earl of Winchilsea, and was referred by his Lordship to the Earl of Falmouth. The following memorandum, No. 6, contains the substance of the communication made by Sir Henry Hardinge to Lord Falmouth.

6.—MEMORANDUM OF SIR H. HARDINGE.

March 19, Eight o'Clock, Evening.

Lord Falmouth having expressed a desire to know the extent of reparation that would be expected, two suggestions of what appeared to Sir Henry Hardinge to be the most natural mode of reparation were drawn out upon the distinct understanding that they were not made with a view to confine Lord Winchilsea's explanation either as to the terms or manner therein stated—but as suggestions as to the course which might be pursued in bringing the matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Sir Henry Hardinge, therefore, on the part of the Duke of Wellington expects *one* of the *two* following alternatives:—

Either that Lord Winchilsea should forthwith write to the Secretary of the King's College, and express his desire to withdraw his public letter, as one which attributed motives highly offensive to the Duke of Wellington, and stating also that upon reflection he was not justified in attributing such motives to his Grace, and therefore expresses his regret at having done so; or,

That Lord Winchilsea should write directly to the Duke of Wellington himself, and make the same acknowledgments to his Grace, with a similar expression of his regret for having attributed motives highly offensive to his Grace, relating to the occasion of his Grace having president at the meeting of the King's College in——last.

[Which motives he is now sensible he was not justified in imputing to his Grace.]

In either case it is expected that a letter so written, should be published by the Secretary of the London College in *The Standard*, being the same paper as that which contained Lord W.'s original letter.

Thursday, half Past Nine o'Clock evening.

Friday Morning, March 20—The paragraph within crotchets [ ] was not desired to be retained in the last interview with Lord Falmouth, last night.

H. H.

7.—MEMORANDUM OF EARL WINCHILSEA.

March 19.

Whether I may determine to give an explanation of my letter published in *The Standard* on Monday last, will depend upon the correctness of my belief that I had grounds for the opinions complained of by the noble duke as therein expressed.

I am ready to allow that I was mistaken in my view of the noble Duke's conduct, as expressed in my public letter to Mr. Coleridge, on the 14th instant, and to state my regret at having so expressed it, provided the noble duke will state on his part that at the time he came forward to preside at the meeting for the establishment of the King's College, London, he did not contemplate the measures which are now in progress for Roman Catholic Emancipation—or, to use Mr. Peel's words, 'for breaking in upon the Constitution of 1688,' but without some statement to that effect from the noble duke, I cannot withdraw the expressions contained in the above letter.

(Signed) WINCHILSEA.

8.—MEMORANDUM OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

London, March 20th, 1829, in the morning.

Sir Henry Hardinge has read to me a memorandum written by Lord Winchilsea, and delivered to him by Lord Falmouth, from which it appears that his Lordship is anxious that I should justify myself from the charges against me contained in his Lordship's address to Mr. Coleridge, published in the *Standard* newspaper.

I may lament that a Nobleman for whom I feel the highest respect entertains a bad opinion of me, but I don't complain as long as that opinion is not brought before me.

I cannot admit that any man has a right to call me before him to justify myself from the charges which his fancy may suggest.

That of which I complain is, that the Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham should have published an opinion that I was actuated by disgraceful and criminal motives in a certain transaction which took place nearly a year ago.

His Lordship, unprovoked, has insulted me by stating in writing, and authorising the publication of this opinion. For this insult I believe, and am not willing to part with the belief, that his Lordship will be anxious to give me reparation.

(Signed) W.

9.—MEMORANDUM OF SIR HENRY HARDINGE.

Friday, March 20.

Sir Henry Hardinge delivered to Lord Falmouth a Memorandum on the 20th of March, from the Duke of Wellington, in reply to one from Lord Winchilsea last night; in the latter of which it was proposed, as a preliminary to any explanation, that the Duke of Wellington should disclaim having contemplated the intentions attributed to his Grace by Lord Winchilsea, which mode of reparation was considered inadmissible.

In the Memorandum of the Duke of Wellington, his Grace states that his cause of complaint is in the publication of opinions highly offensive to him. Whenever, therefore, any terms or mode of reparation, which Lord Winchilsea may be disposed to offer, are communicated to Sir Henry Hardinge, he will make them known to the Duke of Wellington, and inform Lord Falmouth whether they are satisfactory or not.

HENRY HARDINGE.

N.B.—The original of this delivered to Lord Falmouth.

10.—MEMORANDUM OF THE EARL OF FALMOUTH.

March 20, One o'Clock.

Out of respect for the Duke of Wellington, Lord Falmouth has taken to Lord Winchilsea the Duke of Wellington's Memorandum, put into his hands by Sir Henry Hardinge, this morning, at the War Office, with Sir Henry's own note thereon.

In reply, Lord Winchilsea does not feel himself in a situation to comply with the expectation therein expressed, as to the withdrawal of his public letter. Lord Winchilsea, therefore, desires that Lord Falmouth will decline so doing on his (Lord Winchilsea's) behalf.

WINCHILSEA.

11.—MEMORANDUM OF SIR H. HARDINGE.

20th of March, Two o'Clock.

My Lord—I feel it to be my duty, before I make a final communication to your Lordship, to ascertain beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Lord Winchilsea declines to give the reparation which the Duke of Wellington considers himself entitled to receive.

I am, my Lord, your obedient servant,

HENRY HARDINGE.

The Earl of Falmouth.

12.—FROM LORD FALMOUTH TO SIR H. HARDINGE.

London, March, 20, 1829, Half-past Three, P. M.

Sir—In reply to your note, stating that you wish to ascertain positively whether Lord Winchilsea declines to give the reparation which the Duke of Wellington considers himself entitled to receive, I feel myself unable to say more than to refer you to the note which I delivered to you, as signed by him, in answer to the Duke of Wellington's memorandum this day; and that if by the word "reparation" any withdrawal of Lord Winchilsea's public letter, or expression of regret for its contents, be expected, he does not feel himself in a situation to comply with such expectation.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

FALMOUTH.

To Sir Henry Hardinge.

13.—FROM SIR H. HARDINGE TO THE EARL OF FALMOUTH.

11, Whitehall-place, March 20, 1829.

My Lord—I send your Lordship a letter from the Duke of Wellington to Lord Winchilsea, communicating to his Grace the note of 3 p. m., declining, on Lord W.'s part, to make any reparation or give any explanation, &c. of his Lordship's conduct towards the Duke of W., and in order to avoid the possibility of any mistake, I repeat what has already been verbally arranged between us, that the Duke of W. will be at the place appointed at eight o'clock to-morrow morning.

H. HARDINGE.

To the Earl of Falmouth.

14.—FROM THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO LORD WINCHILSEA.

London, March 20, half-past six, p. m.

My Lord—Sir Henry Hardinge has communicated to me a memorandum signed by your Lordship, dated one p. m., and a note from Lord Falmouth dated three, p. m.

Since the insult, unprovoked on my part, and not denied by your Lordship, I have done every thing in my power to induce your Lordship to make me reparation—but in vain. Instead of apologising for your own conduct, your Lordship has called upon me to explain mine.

The question for me now to decide is this—Is a Gentleman who happens to be the King's Minister, to submit to be insulted by any Gentleman who thinks proper to attribute to him disgraceful or criminal motives for his conduct as an individual. I cannot doubt of the decision which I ought to make on this question. Your Lordship is alone responsible for the consequences.

I now call upon your Lordship to give me that satisfaction for your conduct which a Gentleman has a right to require, and which a Gentleman never refuses to give.

I have the honour, &c.

(Signed) WELLINGTON.

The Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.

15.—FROM LORD FALMOUTH TO SIR H. HARDINGE.

London, March 20, 1829, Half-past Eleven, P. M.

Sir—When I received the favour of your note, with its inclosure, soon after 8 o'clock this evening, I had just sat down to dinner, and being in company, I could not read it without exciting suspicion till some time afterwards. I had then to find Lord Winchilsea—all which I mention in excuse for delay, in case you should think it of importance; but I apprehend that after an arrangement made before five o'clock this afternoon, the Duke of Wellington's letter to Lord Winchilsea, calling upon him for satisfaction in the usual way, was meant merely as a form, to be used on such occasions. All matters will take place of course to-morrow morning at eight o'clock, according to that arrangement.

I have the honour to be,

FALMOUTH.

To Sir H. Hardinge.

16.—FROM LORD WINCHILSEA TO THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Suffolk-street, Friday night, 11 p.m.

My Lord—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Grace's note.

I have already had occasion to communicate to your Grace, that under existing circumstances, I did not feel myself in a situation to comply with what was required of me in regard to my public letter.

The satisfaction which your Grace has demanded, it is of course impossible for me to decline.

I have the honour to be, your Grace's most obedient humble servant,

WINCHILSEA.

To his Grace the Duke of Wellington.

The Duke of Wellington and Lord Winchilsea met at the place appointed this morning (March 21.) The parties having taken their ground, Lord Winchilsea received the Duke of Wellington's fire—and fired in the air. After some discussion the accompanying Memorandum was delivered by Lord Falmouth to Sir Henry Hardinge, and accepted by Sir Henry Hardinge as a satisfactory reparation to the Duke of Wellington.

17.—MEMORANDUM ABOVE REFERRED TO.

March 21, 1829.

Having given the Duke of Wellington the usual satisfaction for the affront he conceived himself to have received from me, through my public letter of Monday last, and having thus placed myself in a different situation from that in which I stood when his Grace communicated with me through Sir Henry Hardinge and Lord Falmouth, on the subject of that letter, before the meeting took place, I do not now hesitate to declare, of my own accord, that in apology, I regret having unadvisedly published an opinion which the noble Duke states, in his Memorandum of yesterday, to have charged him with disgraceful and criminal motives in a certain transaction which took place nearly a year ago. I also declare, that I shall cause this expression of regret to be inserted in *The Standard* newspaper, as the same channel through which the letter in question was given to the public.

KILKENNY ASSIZES.

About twelve o'clock on Wednesday last, the Hon. Baron Pennefather arrived from Flood Hall, the seat of John Flood, Esq., and shortly afterwards proceeded to this Court and opened his Commission. The following Gentlemen were sworn of the

GRAND JURY.—Hon. Pierce Butler, of Ballyconra, Foreman, Sir Wheeler D. Cuffe, of Lyrath, Bart., William F. Tighe, of Woodstock, John Flood, of Floodhall, William Bayly, of Norelands, William M. Reade, of Rossenarra, Harvey Pratt, of Castlemorris, Joseph Greene, of Low Grange, Thomas Neville, of Annamult, Charles Kearney, of Kearney Bay, Michael D. Kettinge, of Tenny Park, John Baker, of the Farm, John Jones, of Mullinabro', Arthur St. George, of Kilrush, George Bryan, jun., of Ballyduff, Robert B. Bryan, of Mallardstown, Michael Warren, of Sandford's Court, William Stannard, of Grange, Daniel Osborne, of Kilmacolver, Peter Connellan, of Dangan, John Shee, of Sheestown, James P. Poe, of Harley Park—and John P. Ryan of Danganmore, Esqrs.

His Lordship then addressed the Grand Jury in nearly the following words:—Gentlemen of the Jury, although the number of cases for trial on the calendar appears small, I find there are several offences which are of rather a serious character. The Schedule of Presentments appears to be of very considerable magnitude; you will therefore give it every attention. An outcry has been raised against Grand Juries, but I could never join in it, because I know the Grand Jury laws, when properly administered, are of the utmost importance to the country.

Although the amount of presentments applied for is considerable, I cannot avoid calling your attention (as indeed, I did at a former period) to a line of road leading from Ross to Waterford.—The road in question is the circuit road, and is in an extremely bad condition. The Wexford Grand Jury at the present assizes agreed upon a new line of road, which will shorten the distance between Ross and Wexford about five miles—the old road between those towns was far better than that to which I wish to draw your notice. I mention this circumstance as an inducement to you to follow their example. At this assizes you cannot do any thing about it, but I would recommend you now to appoint a surveyor, who could furnish you with an estimate of the expence, &c., at the ensuing assizes, and then you might be better able to judge of the expediency of complying with my recommendation.

SALISBURY ASSIZES, MARCH 12.

DEFRAUDING THE POST-OFFICE.—*Francis Eyre*, late postmaster at Marlborough, was indicted for embezzling 9s 8d the property of his Majesty, received by him in his office of postmaster. It appeared that he received double postage on letters, and accounted for it only as single. The prisoner was convicted. Mr. Justice Littledale then ordered the prisoner to be transported for seven years. The trial excited great interest, from the respectable circle in which the prisoner had moved.

SOCIETY OF ST. PATRICK.—The 46th anniversary of this benevolent Society, was celebrated on Tuesday evening, at the Freemason's Tavern, London. The Marquis of Downshire presided; and the company consisted of nearly 500 individuals, including the Earls of Wicklow and Leitrim, Lords Plunkett, Goderich, Dunally, Ranelagh, Dunboyne, Killeen, Hill; Marcus Hill, the Right Hon. Mr. Plunket, Sir W. Brabazon, General Sir. C. Doyle, Sir F. M'Naghten, Mr. Sheriff Booth, Mr. Alderman Farebrother, and Mr. O'Connell. The donations (including the collection at the tables) amounted to £1,371. Among the subscriptions were the King, 100 guineas; the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, £100; &c. Mr. O'Connell's health was proposed by the noble chairman, as "a distinguished member of the Irish bar" (in order to disconnect it from politics), and drank with great applause. Mr. O'Connell, in returning thanks, observed, that it was rather hard that he was not now to be allowed to talk politics, after having served three apprenticeships and a half, and having been just thinking of beginning business for himself. The health of Mr. Peel, the President elect for the year ensuing, was drunk with acclamations, and the company separated at eleven o'clock.

The Lord Lieutenant and her Grace the Duchess of Northumberland attended the Dublin Theatre on Saturday night, and were well received.

The Surrey county meeting to consider the Catholic Question took place at Epsom on Saturday; it had not terminated at the post hour on that evening.

The windows of the Church, at Johnstown, county Kilkenny, were broken on Monday night by a gang of miscreants who flung a parcel of stones into the Church.

We have heard that Patrick Spence, the celebrated soldier and orator who flamed out so furiously at the Bradford controversy, has renounced the faith of the Church of Rome.—*Liverpool Albion.*

It is supposed that the Marquisses of Headfort and Westmeath will be created British peers—and that the Lord Chief Baron and Mr. James Daly will be raised to the peerage, one as a British, the other as an Irish peer.——Lords Headfort and Westmeath are the only Irish Marquisses who are not already British peers.

Published by WILLIAM DART.

Supplement to the Waterford Mail,

OF WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1829.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—TUESDAY, MARCH 17.

Mr. PEEL moved the order of the day for the second reading of the Catholic relief bill.

On the question that it be read a second time,

Mr. BENSON shortly supported the measure.

Sir E. KNATCHBULL had been prevented by indisposition from attending on a former occasion when the subject was discussed by the house. If he acted solely from the influence of personal considerations, he would then, as on former occasions, content himself with giving a silent vote against concessions to the Catholics; but he felt that there were times when a sense of duty was paramount to all personal consideration. He could not assent to the measure, because ministers had not stated any satisfactory ground to justify their sudden change of opinion. There was nothing in the evidence of the state of Ireland, as given by ministers, which in his mind justified that conduct. Ministers and the supporters of the measure might have secret reasons for their conduct; he had heard none that could justify his changing his course (hear, hear). He was as ready as any man to place confidence in the present government, but he would not consent that that confidence should extend to a violation of the constitution of his country (hear, hear). That right hon. gentleman stated that he was induced to bring forward the present bill, by a consideration of the state of Ireland, of the evils arising from a want of unity and sentiment between the two houses of parliament, and of the embarrassments of a divided cabinet. These three were the grounds given by the right hon. gentleman for abandoning, not his opinions (hear) but his former line of conduct. The state of Ireland was not worse than formerly; and no argument could be founded on it now, that did not exist, with at least equal force, when the right hon. gentleman had opposed concession to the Catholics (hear, hear). The right hon. gentleman had said, that he was not on this occasion supported by those hon. members who had formerly voted with him (hear, hear). It was so; but why was it? Why, that they never expected his change of opinions (hear, hear). He (Sir E. Knatchbull) well remembered when the right hon. gentleman left office, on the introduction of the late Mr. Canning—at that period he could have no complaint of neglect or desertion—and if the right hon. secretary had since then deserted his opinions and his friends, why express his surprise? (cheers). The cause produced the effect (hear, hear). If concession to the Catholics was at any time necessary, it was at that period necessary when Mr. Canning, the able and consistent advocate of the Catholics, supported the measure in 1825; but then the right hon. secretary (Mr. Peel) opposed it with all his might (hear, hear). If the question were to depend merely upon the candour and good faith of Catholics, he would have them support the question; and when he was charged with denying his support to the right hon. secretary (Mr. Peel), he felt that, humble individual as he was, it became necessary for him to defend himself against so unjustifiable an attack. He did not deserve the invectives heaped upon him (hear, hear, hear)—neither did the hon. friends with whom he acted. The present divided state of the cabinet was adverted to by the right hon. secretary, as one of the grounds for the singular change which had taken place in his opinions. But, here again, there had been nothing new in the course, at all events, of the last five years. He had heard it stated with surprise, that this question was strictly a political, and not a religious question. If there were nothing in the Catholic religion to excite the apprehensions of all reasonable men, he would grant them all they asked. Why was the question of concession opposed? Because it was considered a religious question, and that very course had been on all former occasions taken by the right hon. secretary (Mr. Peel). There were in this country large bodies of the people who believed this question to be one of a purely religious character; he individually did not mean to advocate that doctrine; but, at the same time, he was prepared to deny that this was entirely a political and not a religious question. His own opinion was, that it was of a mixed character, and if it were not so, where was the necessity for the introduction of so many new oaths? (hear, hear). The right hon. secretary, in the very last debate upon this subject, had said that either the Catholic or the Protestant religion must have the ascendancy (cheers)—and it now remained to see which should be in that situation. But the members of his Majesty's Government said, if the opponents of their measure are not satisfied with it, tell us which course we ought to pursue? (cheers). He wished to meet the question fairly, but he would beg leave to ask if that were the fair way of putting the question? It would be, indeed, a new state of things if the King's Executive Government were to ask such a question (cheers). If such a course were necessary, see in what a situation they would be placed. For in fact they must either say, we shall accept the proposition of the Government, or we must be prepared to plunge the country into a rebellion. As to the latter alternative, however, there was no fear of any rebellion in Ireland now. If the question had been put six months back, an answer might have been easily given; but now that the country was taken by surprise it could not be expected that they would be so prepared to meet the charges made against them as they would otherwise have been. He did not contemplate any unkindness to the Catholics now or at any former time, and if Mr. Canning's measure had succeeded, he would have voted for granting them every thing short of seats in Parliament and the Cabinet. But then it would be said, as it was now said, that the Catholic Question would after all be left behind. That he then believed, and that he now believed, even if the proposed measure should pass into a law. He felt strongly that a very undue course had been taken by his Majesty's Government, and he hoped the House would not sanction an aggression, a gross and foul aggression upon the Constitution of the country. Confidence in public men had received a blow throughout the country which it would not soon recover. Now it might be almost truly said—"Nusquam tuta fides." If the measure should pass, and be attended with the good effects which its promoters anticipated, he should be glad of it: but as he did not anticipate such beneficial consequences from the measure, he would deem it to be his duty now, and in subsequent stages of its progress, to give the measure his decided opposition (cheers.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said he was willing to give his hon. friend who had just sat down credit for having taken the course which he had taken on this question from a conscientious conviction of its propriety; and he would only ask from his hon. friend, in fairness for himself and his colleagues, credit for the same sincerity in adopting the course which they had done, in recommending that measure to the house which a sense of duty pointed out to them was imperiously called for, by a regard to the particular state of Ireland, and the general safety and welfare of the Empire. He had heard with regret the expression of distrust in public men which fell from his hon. friend at the conclusion of his speech; but he consoled himself by the idea, that, when his hon. friend saw the advantages which this measure would confer—and when the benefits that would flow from it were made apparent to him—he (Sir E. Knatchbull) was possessed of too much English feeling not to be himself the first to retract the expression of distrust that now escaped him, and to unite in general congratulation at the peace and tranquillity which the measure would produce—(hear, hear). The time was come when it was the unanimous opinion of his Majesty's ministers that the general interests and safety of the empire required that the Catholic question ought to be settled. And if any thing could entitle those who gave that advice to his Majesty to the credit of sincerity, and in recommending a course which the exigencies of the country demanded, it was that the adoption of that course was at variance with the opinions that they had formerly entertained and expressed on this question. Considering the difficulties of this case, seeing the increasing evils of the state of society in Ireland—seeing the inconvenience of a divided Cabinet and of a divided legislature, the period was arrived when, in the choice of evils that was before them, it was better and safer to abandon the principle of the exclusion of Catholics, on which he had hitherto acted, and to adopt the principle of their admission (hear). Formerly he had certainly thought there was less of danger in exclusion; but he now felt it his duty to advise a different course from that which, when acting on that principle he had advocated. His hon. friend had stated that he saw nothing in the state of society in Ireland that called for this measure, that did not exist in an equal, and even in a greater degree, in many antecedent periods; and he referred, as a proof of it, to the crimes and outrages of the year 1822. The time to which he particularly referred was one at which his right hon. friend, the late Attorney-Gen. for Ireland (Mr. Plunket) had prosecuted certain persons who were bound by illegal oaths for the subversion of Protestant property. In prosecuting for an offence of this description, it was natural that his right hon. friend should have expressed himself in strong and indignant terms against such an Association as that of Ribbonmen, which he was then endeavouring to suppress by the ordinary means of legal process. But this was a different state of things from the present aggravated evils of the state of society in Ireland. In the case alluded to by my hon. friend, the Attorney General was a public prosecutor against an illegal confederacy, the Ribbonmen, who were visited with the condign punishment of the law—(hear, hear.) But what was the nature of the present evil? All classes throughout the country were excited to the highest pitch of exasperation—(hear.) Citizen was arrayed in hostile feeling and attitude against his fellow citizen, and there was a perpetual menace of the disturbance which was only to be restrained by the presence of military force. Surely, no man could approve of a tranquillity which was only to be maintained by such means. The progressive and continued extension of the mischiefs of such a condition of things must eventually subvert the whole system of society; and it was on these grounds of new and additional alarm, that the Government felt it to be its duty to provide an antidote for them. His hon. friend had quoted a passage from a speech of his right hon. friend, which stated, that the two religions were inconsistent, and that one or other of them must be ascendant. His justification of the measure was, that it would establish the ascendancy of the Protestant religion in Ireland—(cheers.) An opportunity would be afforded for the church in Ireland being more favourably regarded and being more intimately known; and when it was so regarded and so known, he had every confidence that its ascendancy would be established—(hear, hear, hear). The situation of the Protestant Church in Ireland was very peculiar. He had greater opportunities than most persons, from his official station in Ireland, of observing the condition of that Church. It was the religion of a minority of the people of a country, the majority of whom principally contributed to its support. It depended mainly on the purity of its doctrines, the morality of its professors, the good-will of the people among whom it was established, and also upon the support of Government, and the protection of Parliament. He had known many of the Clergy of that religion in Ireland, and could bear testimony to their exemplary conduct. Although they had to contend with the difficulties to which he had adverted, yet he could state that when first he went to Ireland, the resident Protestant clergy had conciliated the respect and affection of those who differed from them in religious belief; so far did this feeling prevail, that in temporal matters the Roman Catholics deferred to their judgment; a good understanding subsisted between the clergymen of both persuasions, and the Clergymen communicated religious instruction, and improved the moral feeling of the population in their neighbourhood. But that state of things had since much changed. The Catholic population had not now the same confidence in them, nor did they pay the same attention to them even in temporal matters. The right hon. gentleman proceeded to advert to the moral improvement which he expected would flow from the proposed measure, and the advantages which the cause of true religion would obtain from the subsiding of harsh and angry feelings, which would dispose the minds of the people to religious instruction. The petitions presented to the house against concession afforded evidence of the increasing difficulties and dangers with which the Protestant religion was surrounded in Ireland. In the petition presented from the clergy of Dublin it was stated, that the Protestant religion was daily more systematically assailed, and their faith and doctrines misrepresented. They felt this adverse organization growing so strong, that they prayed the interposition of parliament for their protection. He had many letters containing statements, confirming the description which he had given of the present condition of the clergy of the establishment in Ireland. The right hon. gentleman proceeded to advert to the benefits attendant upon the late composition act, which he took pride to himself in forwarding through parliament; but much good as that act had done, he felt that this measure of concession yet remained to conciliate the respect and confidence of the population towards the Protestant clergy, of whose instructions it could never be hoped that they would avail themselves with advantage until they ceased to regard them with aversion. Did not the church of Ireland suffer from other causes? Had it not suffered from the debates which had taken place respecting it at various periods in that house? Let the house recollect the speeches which had been made on those occasions. Would such speeches have been made if there was not something wrong in the state of the church of Ireland? He trusted that by a removal of the existing causes of discontent in Ireland, the temper of the people might be amended, the voice of reason be listened to, and a considerable moral and religious improvement be effected. Called upon as he had been by the extraordinary position of the question, he had no difficulty in making a sacrifice of all personal considerations, and in declaring his conviction that the course which had been recommended to Parliament by his Majesty's Government was that which, under all the circumstances of the case, was the best which could have been adopted for the purpose of tranquillizing Ireland, and giving to the Protestant Church of that country its proper predominance. He would not trespass longer upon the attention of the house.

Mr. G. BANKES alluded particularly to the declaration of the Prince of Orange when he first landed in this country. This argument did not apply to his right hon. friend who admitted that the measure was an alteration of the Constitution as settled in 1688. But there were others, he believed, who denied it (hear, from the Opposition.) The hon. member read a passage from the declaration, which enumerates, amongst the grievances of the subject, that evil Councillors of the King having annulled the laws for prohibiting the holding of certain offices by persons of the Popish religion, without taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and the test. Also another which states the design of the Prince to be that of having a free and lawful Parliament assembled, "both for confirming and executing the laws concerning the Test, and such other laws as may be necessary for the security and support of the Protestant religion." In the bill of rights itself, these passages were alluded to in these words:—"To which demand of their rights they are particularly encouraged by the declaration of the Prince of Orange, as being the only means of obtaining a full redress." This showed that the maintenance of the test laws was considered essential in the settlement of the Constitution; and if that were the case, he would ask if they were wrong in appealing to the integrity of the Constitution against a measure which went so directly to its violation.

Lord CASTLEREAGH supported the Bill, and anticipated the happiest results from its operation.

Mr. SADLER presented himself to the house with several other members, but, being loudly called upon, proceeded to address it as follows:—I rise to address this house, labouring under feelings which would on any occasion be most embarrassing, but which are now painfully heightened by a sense of the unequalled importance of the subject to which I venture to address myself, and by all the circumstances with which it is connected. A consideration of these may, I apprehend, incapacitate me from addressing you at all. I must, however, attempt it. The cause which demands, at this moment, all the efforts of the true friends of the existing constitution, shall have mine, however humble, and at every sacrifice. I am willing therefore to expose myself in its service,

(*For remainder see the* THE MAIL.)