TO BE LET FOR THE SEASON,

TWO COTTAGES at BALLIMACAW, furnished or unfurnished, with convenient Offices, Stabling, &c. and well-cropped Garden.

Application to be made to Thomas M'Dougall, Esq., Ballimacaw Lodge; or Mr. Patrick M'Dougall, Waterford.

WATERFORD BRIDGE.

THE PROPRIETORS will meet at the TOLL-HOUSE, on TUESDAY, the 21st instant, at ONE o'Clock, to receive Proposals for the LETTING of the TOLLS of said Bridge for One Year, commencing 1st May next. Such Persons as are desirous to send in Proposals, will please attend, prepared with sufficient security.

A Chairman and Committee will then be elected for the ensuing year.

WILLIAM BELL, jun., Chairman.

Waterford, April 1.

MURPHY'S OLD ESTABLISHED OILS, COLOURS, &c. WARE-HOUSE, LITTLE GEORGE'S-STREET.

THE above Establishment is THIS DAY RESUMED, and will be carried on by EDWARD LYNCH, who solicits his Friends and the Public for a continuance of the patronage so long enjoyed by the Proprietors of this House.

Little George's street, Waterford, April 4.

RICHARD AND EDWARD KEHOE,

HAVE on SALE at their STORES, on the QUAY.

100 Chests TEA.
40 Hhds. Muscovadoe SUGAR.
15 Ditto Refined DITTO.
16 Baskets Berkley and Gloucester CHEESE.
20 Boxes Muscatel and Bloom RAISINS.
2 Butts Zante CURRANTS.
20 Drums FIGS.
20 Boxes CANDY.
60 Bags COCOA.
60 Kegs NEW MUSTARD.
80 Casks SALT PETRE.
20 Tierces VINEGAR.
50 Boxes YELLOW SOAP.
46 Puncheons Cork WHISKEY.

WINES of every description in Wood and Bottle.

Which, with their general assortment of Spices, Pickles, Molasses, Starch, Blue, Wafers, Sealing Wax, Pitch, Tar, and Rosin, Paste and Liquid Blacking, Fancy Snuffs, Cigars, &c. &c. they will dispose of on the most liberal terms.

In addition to their Stock of WINES and SPIRITS, they have purchased the principal part of the extensive Stock that was in the possession of the late Thomas Kehoe, consisting of OLD WINES, in wood and bottle; and CORK WHISKEY, four years old, well worthy the attention of housekeepers.

N.B.—Every description of PAPER at the Manufacturer's prices.

Waterford, April 2.

SALE OF CATTLE ON COMMISSION AT BRISTOL.

RIDGWAY, GREER, & Co. having had numerous applications from Landed Proprietors of the first respectability, to effect Sales of LIVE STOCK, now beg to inform such Noblemen and Gentlemen, with the Breeders, Graziers, and respectable dealers in Cattle generally in Ireland, that they have engaged a competent and experienced Salesman, and are now prepared to receive consignments of all descriptions of LIVE STOCK for Sale, and that on arrival of the Steam Packets or other vessels on which Cattle are shipped to them, they will always have a careful person in attendance to see them safely landed, with a constant supply of sweet fresh Pasture, to turn the Cattle into on landing, and the greatest possible attention will be constantly given by the personal oversight and superintendence of one of the Principals of the house, both in the keep and sale of the Cattle, and liberal advances will be made, if required, on receipt of any Cattle consigned to them, and all accounts be immediately closed and paid as soon as the Cattle are sold.

Bristol, 3 mo. (March) 11, 1829.

THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE for April, Price half-a-crown, contains—Art. I. The Cabinet and the Coronation Oath—II. The Druggist of Fife—III. Narrative of some Events in the Irish Rebellion, by an Eye-witness—IV. The Christian Martyr, a Fragment—V. An Adventure near Greville—VI. The London Markets—VII. The Race Ball—VIII. Mr. Peacock's Novel.—IX. The Two Miners of Famatina—X. Theatrical Matters—XI. Notes on the Month—The Duel—Garth's Black Box—Sontag's Little One and Sam. Rogers, or, Who's the Papa?—Lord Lowther and the Lions—German Princes in general, Leopold in particular—Rottenness of an Assembly House—The Anglesey Family—Colonel Labedoyere—My Father!—Attorney-General—Parliamentary Courtesy—The Kemble Family—Burkeism—The Easterly Wind—Sir Jeoffery Gimcrack Michael Angelo Palladio Wyattville, &c. &c.—Monthly Review of Literature—Scientific Varieties—Fine Arts Exhibitions—Biographical Memoirs of Eminent Persons—Agricultural and Commercial Reports—Bankrupts, &c. &c.

Published by Whittaker and Co. London; Waugh and Innes, Edinburgh, and to be had of Booksellers in Great Britain and Ireland.

BEAUTIES OF THE COURT OF GEORGE IV.

LA BELLE ASSEMBLEE for April contains an extremely beautiful Portrait of the Right Honourable ELIZABETH JANE VISCOUNTESS BARRINGTON, engraved by Thomson, from a miniature by Mrs. Jas. Robertson.—This portrait forms the Fifty-Second of the Series of the FEMALE NOBILITY now publishing in LA BELLE ASSEMBLEE, accompanied with Memoirs, Illustrative and Genealogical, &c. &c.

The FASHIONS for April are exhibited by four coloured Engravings with Notices of the London and Parisian Variation.—Price 3s 6d.

The Nos. for Jan., Feb., and March, contained the Portraits of the Duchess of NORTHUMBERLAND, the Marchioness WELLESLEY, and the Hon. Mrs. C. LINDSAY.

The following Portraits are in preparation:—The Hon. Mrs. CHARLES ARBUTHNOT, from a Painting by Sir Thos. Lawrence; LADY NORMANBY, by Jackson, R.A.; LADY CHARLOTTE BURY, by Sir Thomas Lawrence; LADY BELFAST, LADY ELLENBOROUGH, VISCOUNTESS KIRKWALL, LADY ANNE RAMSAY, VISCOUNTESS EASTNOR, LADY SOPHIA GRESLEY, &c. &c. &c.

A few perfect Sets may still be had, in 8 vols.

Published by Whittaker and Co. London; Waugh and Innes Edinburgh; and Curry and Co. Dublin; and may be ordered of all Booksellers in the Kingdom.

WEST OF ENGLAND.
FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

CHIEF OFFICE, EXETER.

OFFICE FOR LONDON, 20, NEW BRIDGE-STREET, BLACKFRIARS.

CAPITAL—£600,000.

PRESIDENT,
ALEXANDER HAMILTON HAMILTON, Esq.

INSURANCES upon Lives are effected by this Company, at a Reduction of Ten per Cent. on the usual Rates. And the Insured against Fire, in addition to a Reduced Rate of Premiums, are entitled to a share of the Profits every Fifth Year.

The Fourth Dividend to the Insured against Fire for the five years ending Christmas, 1827, is now in course of payment.

ANNUITIES GRANTED AND PURCHASED.

By Order.
CHARLES LEWIS, Secretary.
WILLIAM LUMSDEN, Agent,
Waterford.

Dated 26th March, 1829.

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. 591. SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1829. PRICE 6d

WANTS A SITUATION,

AS CLERK or SHOPMAN, a Young Man of strict integrity and excellent good character, who can be well recommended.

Apply at the Office of this Paper.

EXTENSIVE SALE OF OAK WOODS IN THIS COUNTY.

TO be SOLD, the WOOD of MOUNT BOLTON, containing 70 Acres, or thereabouts, on the banks of the River Suir, nine miles from Waterford, and three from Carrick-on-Suir.

ALSO,

The WOOD of CRAGANA, containing 66 Acres, or thereabouts, both plantation measure—both are of about 40 years standing. Every encouragement, and the usual time for cutting will be given to the purchasers.

There are also between four and five hundred full grown DEAL TREES at MOUNT BOLTON, which will be sold.

Written proposals will be received by John Bolton, Esq. 7th D.G.; by John Bolton Bowers, Esq. now in Waterford; or by John Hackett, Esq., Mount Prospect, Waterford. If by letter, postpaid.

Waterford, Aug. 15, 1828.

COUNTY OF WATERFORD TO WIT.

By JOHN KEILY, jun. Esq., High Sheriff of said County.

JOHN FLANNERY, Plaintiff; MARY KEEFE, ELIZA KEEFE, and DENIS KEEFE, Defendants.

BY virtue of his Majesty's writ of *fieri facias* to me directed, I will on MONDAY, the 27th day of APRIL instant, at the hour of 12 o'Clock, SET UP and SELL by PUBLIC AUCTION, at the COURT-HOUSE of DUNGARVAN, all the Defendants' right, title, and interest of, in and to the FARM and LANDS of KILCOONY, with its sub-denominations and appurtenances, situate in the Barony of Decies Without Drum and County of Waterford, to satisfy the Plaintiff's Debt and Costs. Dated this 9th day of April, 1829.

JOHN KEILY, jun. Sheriff.

N.B.—The above lands are held under Anthony Chearnley, Esq., for an unexpired term of 21 years from the 25th of March last, and produce a well secured profit rent of £100 a year.

For further particulars apply to Henry Bagge, Esq., Plaintiff's Attorney, Dungarvan.

LONDON—TUESDAY, APRIL 7.

His Majesty has intimated his intention of visiting the metropolis immediately after the Easter holidays. The King is expected at St. James's Palace on the Monday after Easter week. On Wednesday, the 29th, his Majesty will hold a Levee, and on the succeeding day, Thursday, a Drawing Room, which is expected to be more numerously and splendidly attended than any for some years past.

The Drawing Room has generally been held on St. George's day, but that falling this year in Easter week, it has been postponed to the day we mentioned.

Sir Harcourt Lees, Bart., that intrepid champion of our Protestant Constitution, arrived in London on Saturday from his seat near Dublin.—*London Morning Post.*

The worthy Baronet was in the House of Lords on Saturday night, when the result of the division upon the second reading of the Relief Bill was announced. Tuesday morning had been appointed for his having the honour of an interview with his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland.

By accounts from Lisbon, we learn that Don Miguel, not content with the late executions which he had caused, had sought to gratify his thirst for blood by attempting to murder his eldest sister!! A Count, who interfered to rescue the Princess, fell a sacrifice to the enraged Don who confined his sister to her room, and every day glutted his revenge by personally beating her. Arrests still continue, and many persons were preparing to take their departure. The expedition against Terceira had not, and it was believed, would not sail.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has notified his intention of reducing the auction duty from five to one per cent.

Cardinal Gregorio, who is 71 years of age, has the requisite number of votes for the Popedom; his election is certain, and he will take the name of Alexander IX.

The Duke of Wellington wore a brilliant star over a *green* silk waistcoat, when he moved the second reading of the relief bill in the house of lords.

The Duke of Wellington, the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Aberdeen, and most of the other cabinet ministers, left town on Sunday afternoon, at five o'clock, for Windsor, to dine with his Majesty, by *special* invitation. They passed the night at the Castle, and returned to town the following morning.

After the close of the debate in the house of Lords on Friday night the Duke of Wellington sent off a messenger with despatches for his Majesty at his palace at Windsor. His Grace sent off another messenger to his Majesty after the division in the house of lords on Saturday night.

Mr. O'Connell is determined to put his right of sitting to the proof as soon as the relief bill shall have received the royal assent.—*Observer.*

Major General Grant has been appointed Governor of Trinidad.

The government of the Bahamas is still vacant.

Sunday's letters from Glasgow announce three more failures in that place, but of small amount, and in so bad a state of credit previously, that the stoppage has long been foreseen to be inevitable. A fourth house has called its creditors together, and after showing £50,000 of assets against £30,000 of debts, still declared itself under the necessity of demanding time, but offered to pay in full, by instalments, within 18 months.

The Earl of Westmoreland (who somewhat unexpectedly voted for the Roman Catholic bill on Saturday) returned to town yesterday between one and two o'clock from Windsor. The noble earl was alone in his travelling carriage and four, and dashed along as rapidly as the horses well could convey him. On the division, his lordship was, it is said, rather curiously circumstanced. On the understanding that he would vote against the bill, he held the proxy of a noble lord against the bill, so that when the division came the noble lord voted for the bill, and handed in his proxy against the bill! It is confidently rumoured that the noble earl will be appointed to the office of lord privy seal, which has been so long mysteriously vacant; or rather, which Lord Ellenborough has "kept warm" for some months.—*Morning Herald.*

EXTRACTS

From Memoirs of the Extraordinary Military Career of John Shipp, late a Lieutenant in his Majesty's 87th Regiment.—London, 1829. Hurst, Chance, & Co.

SAGACITY OF ANIMALS.—"Having cut a good deal of the most prominent part of the hill away, and laid trees on the ascent, as a footing for elephants, these animals were made to approach it, which the first did with some reluctance and fear. He looked up, shook his head, and, when forced by his driver, he roared piteously. There can be no question, in my opinion, that this sagacious animal was competent instinctively to judge of the practicability of the artificial flight of steps thus constructed; for the moment some little alteration had been made, he seemed willing to approach. He then commenced his examination and scrutiny, by pressing with his trunk the trees that had been thrown across; and after this he put his fore leg on, with great caution raising the fore part of his body, so as to throw its weight on the tree. This done, he seemed satisfied as to its stability. The next step for him to ascend by was a projecting rock, which we could not remove. Here the same sagacious examination took place, the elephant keeping his flat side close to the side of the bank, and leaning against it. The next step was against a tree; but this, on the first pressure of his trunk, he did not like. Here his driver made use of the most endearing epithets, such as, 'Wonderful, my life,' 'well done, my dear,' 'My son,' 'My wife'—but all these endearing appellations, of which elephants are so fond, would not induce him to try again. Force was at length resorted to, and the elephant roared terrifically, but would not move. Something was then removed; he seemed satisfied, as before, and in time ascended that stupendous ghaut. His reaching the top his delight was visible to a most eminent degree; he caressed his keeper, and threw the dirt about in a most playful manner. Another elephant, a much younger animal was now to follow. He had watched the ascent of the other with the most intense interest, making motions all the while, as though he was assisting him, by shouldering him up the acclivity—such gestures as I have seen some men make when spectators of gymnastic exercises. When he saw his comrade up, he evinced his pleasure by giving a salute, something like the sound of a trumpet.—When called upon to take his turn, however, he seemed much alarmed, and would not act at all without force. When he was two steps up he slipped, but recovered himself by digging his toes in the earth. With the exception of this little accident, he ascended exceedingly well. When this elephant was near the top, the other who had already performed his task, extended his trunk to the assistance of his brother in distress, round which the younger animal entwined his, and thus reached the summit of the ghaut in safety. Having both accomplished their task, their greeting was as cordial as if they had been long separated from each other, and had just escaped from some perilous achievement. They mutually embraced each other, and stood face to face for a considerable time, as if whispering congratulations. Their drivers then made them salam to the General, who ordered them five rupees each for sweetmeats."

* * * *

"There was in our encampment a very large elephant, used for the purpose of carrying tents for some of the European corps. It was the season in which they become most unmanageable, and his legs were consequently loaded with huge chains, and he was constantly watched by his keepers. By day he was pretty passive, save when he saw one of his species, when he roared and became violent; and during those moments of ungovernable frenzy, it was dangerous for his keepers to approach him, or to irritate his feelings by any epithets that might prove repugnant to him. On the contrary, every endearing expression was used to soothe and appease him, which, with promisses of sweetmeats, sometimes succeeded with the most turbulent to gain them to obedience, when coercive measures would have roused them to the most desperate acts of violence. By night their extreme cunning told them that their keepers were not so watchful or vigilant. The elephant here alluded to, one dark night broke from his chains and ran wild through the encampment, driving men, women, children, camels, horses, cows, and indeed every thing that could move, before him, and roaring and trumpeting with his trunk—which is with elephants a sure sign of displeasure, and that their usual docility has deserted them. Of course no reasonable beings disputed the road he chose to take. Those that did soon found themselves floored. To record the mischief done by this infuriated anmimal in his nocturnal ramble would fill a greater space than I can afford for such matter. Suffice it that, in his flight, followed by swordsmen and spearsmen shouting and screaming, he pulled down tents, upset every thing that impeded his progress, wounded and injured many, and ultimately killed his keeper by a blow from his trunk. He was speared in some twenty places, which only infuriated him the more, and he struck away with his trunk at every thing before him. His roaring was terrific, and he frequently struck the ground in indication of his rage. The instant he had struck his keeper and found he did not rise, he suddenly stopped, seemed concerned, looked at him with the eye of pity, and stood rivetted to the spot. He paused for some seconds, then ran towards his place from whence he had broken loose, and went quietly to his picket, in front of which lay an infant, about two years old, the daughter of the keeper whom he had killed. The elephant seized the child round the waist as gently as its mother would, lifted it from the ground, and caressed and fondled it for some time, every beholder trembling for its safety, and expecting every moment it would share the fate of its unfortunate father; but the sagacious animal, having turned the child round three times, quietly laid it down again, and drew some clothing over it that had fallen off. After this it stood over the child, with its eyes fixed on it; and if I did not see the the penitential tear steal from its eye, I have never seen it in my life. He then submitted to be re-chained by some other keepers, stood motionless and dejected, and seemed sensible that he had done a wrong he could not repair. His dejection became more and more visible, as he stood and gazed on the fatherless babe, who, from constant familiarities with this elephant, seemed unintimidated, and played with its trunk. From this moment the animal became passive and quiet, and always seemed most delighted when the little orphan was within its sight. Often have I gone with others to the camp to see him fondling his little adopted; but there was a visible alteration in his health after his keeper's death, and he fell away, and died at Cawnpore, six months afterwards."

FASHIONS FOR APRIL.

(From *La Belle Assemblée.*)

BALL DRESS.—A dress of white crape, with a very broad hem round the border, on which is embroidered an oriental pattern, finished by Spanish points, in festoons, green and gold: these, which are reversed, are ornamented at every fifth point by a chaplet, delicately embroidered in gold. The body is made à la Roxalane, and confined round the waist by a plain green satin belt; it is cut very low off the shoulders, and the tucker part is surrounded by small gold beads, in antique festoons enriched by drops formed of small pearls. The sleeves are short and very full, with mancherons, consisting of two frills of blond. The hair is arranged in full curls on each side of the face, and spread out rather wide: on the summit of the head are braids wound round and round, till they form a corbeille; and each side is ornamented by a branch of heath, with scarlet blossoms. A bandeau of jewels crosses the upper part of the forehead, with three drops of pearls in the centre.

DINNER DRESS.—This costume, which is adapted to the social dinner party, consists of a poplin gown of apricot-colour, with a broad hem at the border, turning over at the head, in points, edged with grass-green satin rouleau-binding. The body is made with fichu-robinge, pointed on each side, and the points edged in the same manner; but across the bust is a drapery, à la Sévigné, divided by a stripe of green satin, which descends to the belt, which is of apricot-coloured satin, bound with green. The sleeves are of white crepe-Aerophane, and are, à la Mamelake, confined at the wrists by very broad, gold bracelets, with a beautiful medallion-brooch, in mosaic. A hat is worn with this dress of white satin, ornamented with white feathers, tipped and edged with green: one feather, on the right side, is placed under the brim, and takes a spiral direction towards the crown; the others play over the crown, and front of the brim: gauze lappets, edged with blond, set on full, and placed under the hat float over the shoulders, and complete the trimming. The ear-pendants are gold; and the shoes are green satin, tied en sandales.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS—FRIDAY, APRIL 3.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

The LORD CHANCELLOR then proceeded to address the house:—My lords, I agree in what has been repeatedly said by several noble lords, that this is a question of the greatest importance. For, if after the recommendation which had proceeded from the crown upon the first day of the session, in the speech delivered by his Majesty's commissioners to parliament, if after having passed through the other house of the legislature by a majority so commanding; if, in these circumstances this bill shall for any cause not pass into a law, it is impossible for the firmest mind—it is impossible for the stoutest heart to contemplate the consequences without feelings approaching to dismay. That the bill will pass, and, finally, become the law of the land, I for one entertain not the slightest doubt. The noble and learned lord then proceeded to vindicate himself from the charge of inconsistency in the course he now took on the question. He had only addressed parliament upon it on two occasions, and on neither did he oppose concession altogether; on the contrary, he had contended that concessions should be made, if, with safety to the Protestant establishment. Upon the subject of the oath he had taken to his sovereign, he had also been reviled and calumniated; but when he bore in mind that the person who had made this attack stated in the same breath that he excluded every consideration of Ireland from his view, he was induced to impute his conduct rather to a disordered intellect than to consider it as the result of a sound mind exercised with deliberation.] I shall now, (said the noble lord) state the grounds on which I have concurred in recommending the measure now before your lordships. For upwards of two years I have been one of the responsible advisers of the crown. During that time I have given the utmost possible attention to the state of Ireland, and made inquiries in every quarter concerning the state of that country. Now of these inquiries the result is, that I have come to the conclusion that Ireland cannot be any longer allowed to remain as it is—(hear). I then considered that for twenty-five years we had been pursuing a course of civil exclusions and disabilities, and that no beneficial change was the result of such policy. On the contrary, I found that day by day the state of that country was growing worse, and that for the last two years they had become infinitely more aggravated than ever, and likely to become continually worse. When I saw that such were the effects of this line of policy, I asked myself if it were possible to persevere in a course which led to such consequences—(hear). The noble and learned lord at the table (Eldon), for the period of five-and twenty years, was one of the responsible advisers of the crown, and during that period he saw, and, doubtless, attentively observed, the state of Ireland. Yet it was under that noble and learned lord's administration that the state of Ireland grew from bad to worse—(cheers). Now, I ask that noble and learned lord to give us the result of his long experience and attentive observation of Ireland; I ask him, fertile in expedients as he is—I ask him, I call upon him, to suggest any line of policy that will put an end to the disorders of Ireland other than that recommended by his Majesty's ministers—(cheers). I am sure that if the noble and learned lord was in possession of the information which I possess on this subject, that he would be satisfied that the result of not making concessions to the Catholics would be the annihilation of the Protestant population of Ireland. I do not say that they will be annihilated by force, but those who are of the lower orders will gradually retire from the country, whilst the higher classes will dread to reside on their estates. My lords, it is the duty of a minister of the crown to advise the crown on every matter materially touching its interests or those of the empire at large; and I say, that any minister who withdraws or withholds his attention from Ireland, who neglects to advise the crown concerning the interests of that large portion of the empire, acts in a manner inconsistent with his duty. I say this advisedly, and the noble and learned lord will refute my assertion if he can—(hear). I do not stand singly when I assert that we are not violating the constitution of 1688.—Look at the constellation of talent, of statesman-like talent, which thus advocated the same arguments as myself, and I shall stand before your lordships excused of presumption. I will now ask what is meant by the constitution of 1688? It would seem from what was thrown out by the noble lord on the cross bench that our liberties are but something more than one hundred years old. I find, however, a long catalogue of grievances complained of in the reign of James the First, as flagrant violations of the law and constitution of the country. So that upon this evidence there must then have been a constitution of some standing. I find afterwards a law and constitution again laid down, and it afterwards stated, that experience "hath shown that it is inconsistent with the law of this country that it should be governed by a Popish prince," and it was upon this special ground that this single enactment was made, and yet from what is said we might be led to suppose that some new system was established in 1688. The case then standing as I have put it, what has that enactment to do with the Roman Catholics to office and to seats in either House of Parliament? It is said that the acts to which I have alluded were re-enacted at the Revolution. My lords, they were re-enacted in this sense. It was necessary to make some alteration in the oaths, and, therefore, those parts of the law were mentioned. I do not say that it was intended to repeal those acts. The question, however, is, whether they were to be considered at the Revolution as having been declared a part of the paramount law of the country? My lords, a right reverend prelate adverted to an argument with great propriety. Why are these two particular laws to be taken out from amongst the numerous others of the Roman Catholics of the time? With respect, my lords, to the penal code, I cannot do better than give you the opinion of the noble and learned lord upon it. In 1797, he declared that those laws were a disgrace to the statute book (hear.) To this opinion, my lords, I subscribe: and great credit is due to my noble and learned friend who effected the change of those laws. It has been observed that William the Third made a distinction between these laws—the laws, I mean, to which I have been alluding. It is said that when application was made to him to repeal the laws imposing disabilities on the Catholics, he drew a distinction between the penal laws and those two particular acts. The declaration is to be found in the correspondence between Mr. Steward and the pensionary of the Hague. 'I will consent,' said King William, 'to repeal the penal laws, but not the other laws regarding Catholics.' The reason of this distinction was obvious—the two acts were passed under the apprehension of a popish successor, and at the very time this application was made to King William a popish prince was on the throne, and the fears of Protestants were realized beyond their expectations. It is not likely that William, III. would consent to repeal laws passed to prevent a measure which afterwards took place? I think the same explanation may be given to every declaration made by the Prince of Orange previous to his embarkation. I am correct, I believe, in stating the circumstances under which these laws were passed, when I say, that shortly after the test act, James II. professed the Roman Catholic religion, and was publicly reconciled to the see of Rome in a chapel of this metropolis. Five years after further steps were taken, and then it was that the second law was passed, by the assistance of the extravagant alarm felt throughout the nation, on whom raised by the faction of Titus Oates. I ask then, whether the danger which these laws were made to meet having been got rid of, it be right that they should be perpetual? (cheers). [The Lord Chancellor here cited an address presented by the house of Commons to King Charles in 1763, desiring that the oath of supremacy should be administered to Catholics, on the ground that it was as important to exclude them from the army as from civil office; the attempt of James II. to avail himself of their services; and the passing of the act which finally excluded Catholics, as proofs that their exclusion from military office was considered as permanent as the other laws of exclusion. In 1817, when the Catholics were admitted to the higher offices in the army and navy, the noble and learned lord (Eldon) was then on the woolsack, and he protested against no violation of the constitution; though Lord Liverpool regretted that by the constitution Catholics should have been excluded from military office.] In 1792, when such sweeping concessions were made, the noble and learned lord was attorney-general; and in 1792 when the bill was extended to Scotland, he did not find that he met it with any opposition (hear, and laughter). The way to rank in the army and navy was also opened, under the patronage of the noble and learned lord, to the Catholics; and he could not help thinking that if the noble and learned lord had remained much longer in office, he would have felt the necessity of completing the work thus auspiciously begun. If there was any danger in the measure now proposed, it was in the admission of Catholics to parliament, but the alteration in the elective franchise, by obtaining a representation of property in Ireland, would guard against any result calculated to excite disquietude. I have not the slightest apprehension that there will be any combination to make returns calculated to endanger the country. But, my lords, are we only to consider the question on one side? Is there no danger to be dreaded from leaving five millions of people unrepresented? There are some who are for admitting the Catholics to Parliament without making them eligible to office; and others for admitting them to office and restricting them from parliament. Now, my lords, I say at once, do every thing or do nothing. Satisfy the Catholics that you cannot go a single step further, or do not advance one step. I next answer, do not admit them to parliament if you do not make office a fair object of competition to them; for otherwise you will have a body always disposed to cross your measures and throw impediments in your way. This would be an unwise policy. And I also say, do not admit them to office and not to parliament, as you must in that case exclude them from places for which seats in Parliament are necessary." The noble and learned lord then referred to the union with Scotland, and contended that it was evident both from the Edinburgh petition, and the sentiments expressed elsewhere, that the people of that country did not object to the measure as any infraction of the union. Besides, when the Scottish union took place, there was no anticipation of a union with Ireland, which had paved the way for the present measure. To argue that the union between England and Scotland must remain unchangeable was to pursue a course that might be most prejudical to the interests of both countries. My lords, with reference to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy a great diversity of opinion exists. One thing is clear, that we have five millions of Roman Catholics all admitting that no foreign prince or potentate hath, or ought to have, any power or pre-eminence within these realms. Is it your opinion, then, that those who make this disavowal shall be still rendered unfit to discharge the duties of legislation, or the duties of high offices of the state? There is another subject, my lords, to which I must call your attention—I mean the coronation oath. It was the opinion of the venerable father of a lord whom I now see in his place—it was the opinion of Lord Kenyon—that there is nothing whatsoever in this measure that interferes with the coronation oath. Such, my lords, is undoubtedly the fact; and it was universally believed to be so until within a very short period indeed. It is only within a very few years that the argument has been revived: indeed, it has never been insisted upon by any enlightened opposer of the measure. I am asked, my lords, what securities I would propose that would satisfy the Protestants, and secure us against all danger from the Roman Catholics? The first security on which I rely is this;—I cling to the hope that this measure will restore universal and permanent tranquillity to Ireland—that it will be productive of the most perfect harmony among all classes of the people of that now distracted land—that it will create a firm attachment to the constitution of the kingdom—and that, by removing all civil disabilities, we shall unite all bodies in one common wish to support the throne and constitution of the country against all attacks, from whatever quarter they may come. I rely next on that security which was established at the Revolution—the unalterable right of Protestant succession. There were, however, strong securities given by the present bill—the alteration in the elective franchise, the oath required from Catholics, the suppression of the Jesuits, but above all he relied upon the soundness of the Protestant religion—upon the zeal, the learning, and the integrity of the clergy. He was aware that he had been compelled to recapitulate old arguments, the subject was in fact exhausted. Their lordships were not met there for the purpose of pleasure or exhibition, but to consider of the best means to give tranquillity and prosperity to the empire. Let them therefore do their work manfully, and, forgetting all little differences, give their best exer-

tions to settle the momentous question in such a manner as should fulfil their objects, and give at once contentment to the subjects, and new stability to the foundations of the throne and constitution (cheers).

The Earl of FALMOUTH thought it would ill become him to attempt any extended reply to the able and elaborate arguments of the noble and learned lord who had just addressed the house; the more particularly, as a speech delivered on a former occasion by the noble lord, afforded the best possible refutation to the one he had just delivered. The speech to which he alluded was not one of a distant date; it was delivered by the noble and learned lord in June last. [The noble earl then read extracts from the speech then made by the Lord Chancellor, in opposition to the Catholic claims in which he laid great stress upon the avowed hostility of the Irish Catholic bishops to the established church, and the continuance of the union; and also argued, that if their lordships wished to establish the Catholic religion in Ireland, they would agree to the motion; that it would only lead to further demands, and finally to the overthrow of the Protestant constitution; that at the revolution the union of the church and state was effected, and a Protestant government completely established; and it was clear that the coronation oath was framed with a view to support the Protestant establishment]. The reading of these extracts was received with laughter and cheers. Earl Falmouth continued.—He knew not how the change had happened in the noble and learned lord, but it appeared to him to be one of those miraculous changes which had recently occurred (hear.) But a few nights since they had heard a noble earl, whose rising talents he respected, laying down the doctrine that consistency fettered the minds of public men, and restrained their faculties. But he would tell that noble earl, consistency was one of the brightest gems in the character of a statesman. He did not mean consistency in that which was adopted without reflection. When, however, that noble earl had maturely formed an opinion, he would advise him to take care how he abandoned it for that wretched and dangerous expediency: and not to do like some other statesmen, who, finding themselves on the point of sinking in the midst of difficulties they themselves had occasioned, grasped at the feeble straw of expediency to stay their destruction (hear, hear.) After passing a warm eulogy on the Earl of Eldon, which he concluded by saying he was quite sure the honours of that noble earl's tomb would not be excelled by those of Waterloo, and which was loudly cheered, the noble earl alluded to the changes which had taken place in the Government during the last four years. He would not pretend to say whether the present Government had been an expediency one or not, but certainly it had been a divided one, and an ambiguous one (hear, hear,) The measure before the House had been concocted in concealment. The energies of the Protestant Government had not been put forward. What said Lord Plunket, and what said the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whose recal was still a perfect mystery, an entire conundrum? (cheers.) When he said the Protestant cause had not been fairly treated, he did not mean, as some would pretend to interpret it he did, to declare in favour of a civil war, or to allude to one. What he, and those who thought with him, wanted to see was, a Protestant Lord Lieutenant, a Protestant secretary, and Protestant law officers in Ireland. He might be told that the experiment would not answer, but he replied it had never been tried. What he wanted to know was, how came it that with so powerful a head the Protestant and stronger part of the Government should give way so completely to the weaker part? Then the noble duke came down with a bill, which he said would be satisfactory to all parties, but which was in reality the most naked of securities that had ever been thought of by the most sanguine of the emancipationists. He would not then go through the provisions of the bill, because they could be much better considered in committee. He would only suppose that fifty Roman Catholics were returned to the House of Commons. They had heard that seventy-nine members of that House had on a particular occasion voted for a motion which went to the destruction of the church of Ireland; if then they add the fifty to the seventy-nine, there would be 129 members ready to assail the established church, and he asked if no danger was to be apprehended from the exertions of such a body? He would suppose another case. Some future king—for they were not merely to legislate for the present day—might be surrounded by favourite Papists, who might advise him to increase the peerage for their own purposes; was no danger to be apprehended from such an occurrence? It had been said that if the Roman Catholics should not be satisfied without further power, the Protestants would to a man resist their claims. But he would remark, in reply, that, like the Catholic Association, the Roman Catholics might prove too commanding for the Government. He wished to say a word on the subject of reform. He (Lord Falmouth) was no reformer; but the question was, whether this bill did or did not by the radical reform made in the constitution, give a dangerous precedent and encouragement to radical reformers in general? When the bill for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts had been brought forward, their lordships were warned that by agreeing to it they would do great injury; but by agreeing to the bill before them they would remove one of the corner stones of the constitution. A right reverend prelate had said that such was the state of Ireland that something must be done; but he would ask in reply, was it necessary that such a naked bill as that should be adopted? The same right reverend prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) had also discovered, through associating with Roman Catholics, that they were not idolaters, but that right rev. prelate appeared to have forgotten that he had taken an oath that the Roman Catholic religion is superstitious and idolatrous. He was unwilling to enter further upon the views of the Roman Catholics, but recommended the perusal of a letter written by Lord Bexley, who had proved that since the death of the Stuarts, the Roman Catholic bishops had been nominated by the cardinal York. Among other arguments urged in support of the measure, it had been said the minority must yield to the majority. He was convinced that the majority of the people of England was hostile to the measure, and it appeared that the bill had been forced upon the public by the minority. If the noble duke would allow him to allude to his political conduct, he would say it was his most earnest hope that the military glory which the noble duke had acquired might not be tarnished by taking off part of the constitution. The noble duke with all his regard for the measure, entertained some doubt of its efficacy, because he had said, if it did not succeed he should come again to Parliament for assistance. (The Duke of Wellington shook his head). He had at least understood that to be the meaning conveyed by the noble duke, but his hope was that the measur might produce the desired effect, and justify th promises held out to Parliament and the country.

Several noble lords instantly rose, but they gave way to the Duke of WELLINGTON, on perceiving that he wished to explain. His grace said—"I stated that it was essential to the honour and dignity of this country that Ireland should be tranquil, and what I said further was, that if this measure did not answer, I should have no scruples in coming down to ask parliament to grant a remedy. I will also take the opportunity of saying that I did not compare episcopacy with the Catholics of Ireland—I did compare episcopacy with the church of England and Ireland. I stated that I hoped tranquillity would be restored, notwithstanding the fears entertained for the church, because after the outcry raised by the episcopalians, tranquillity was restored.

Lord Goderich and the Earl of Mansfield then rose together, and as neither gave way, the Duke of RICHMOND moved that Lord Mansfield be heard. Lord GODERICH, speaking to order, wished to state to his noble friend why he did not give precedence to him. It was not from want of any personal respect, but because, in the course of the debate, he had felt himself called upon to give way to other noble lords. He was desirous of addressing the house, but it would be unpleasant to call upon the house to decide whether hims lf or the noble earl was entitled to be heard first.

The LORD CHANCELLOR then put the question that Lord Mansfield be heard, and decided that the not-contents had it. This was not so clear to a large portion, and a division was called for by the Duke of Richmond and others, but it was not persisted in.

Viscount GODERICH then rose. After entering into a lengthened vindication of the supporters of the bill from the calumny thrown upon them at county meetings, and in placards, his lordship proceeded to discuss the principle of the measure. One thing had greatly astonished him—that both in the petitions and in the discussions on the question, the state of Ireland, that poor country, bleeding at every pore, should have been totally left out of consideration. In fact, it had never been fairly put to the people of England, who had the power to forbid the boon required by the sister kingdom. That power they never would have had, had it not been for the act of union; and that measure never would have been carried if the Roman Catholics of Ireland had not given it their support. It was told them by Mr. Pitt and Lord Castlereagh that their claims should be conceded, and if that expectation had not been held out the union would not have passed. In the view which the opponents of this measure took, they were in the habit of going back to the transactions of the reign of Queen Mary. They forgot that Mary was treated harshly to induce her to change her religion. The true policy of the day was not to examine who was to blame in former times, but to cast a veil over past horrors, and endeavour to sooth rather than to irritate the public feeling. There was another case to which he might allude, namely, the Duke of Monmouth's transactions in the reign of James II. The Duke of Monmouth committed an act of rebellion, and if there were persons who referred to the cruelties of Kirk and Jefferies, he might ask whether they knew that Judge Jefferies was a bigotted Protestant, and Kirk certainly not a Catholic at the time of his cruelties? It was well known that when he was asked by King James to turn Papist, he said he was not disposed to embrace any religion, and that if he did change he should become a Mahometan (a laugh). It was in vain to refer to past ages, for the purpose of fixing principles on the Roman Catholics which affected the temporal interest of states. What passed in 1791? The Emperor of Germany, Joseph II., was a reformer, and he determined upon a plan for abolishing monasteries. The Pope came to Vienna and remonstrated with him, but still the Emperor Joseph carried on his plans of reform. What passed at the treaty of Vienna? One of the articles established by the congress was, that there should be no prevention to persons following their religion. The Pope sent Cardinal Gonsalvo, but he had no power to interfere with that arrangement. He should say, from all the transactions which had taken place in Europe, that the power of the Pope was no more than the shadow of a shade. The great power at the present day was mind aided by education—the march of intellect, which was a security against the abuse of religious power. He wished to advert again to the question—what will you do with Ireland if you give up this bill? Sometimes that question had been answered by an *argumentum ad hominem*, but that was a poor answer. Some said give education to Ireland. He said so too, but thought those who opposed the bill were enemies to education. At the same time he did not see that education would relieve those in Ireland who smarted under exclusion from the blessings of the constitution. The Catholic and Protestant felt different sensations. "To one a prospect opened, gilded by the rays of hope: the other trod a devious way, amidst clouds and storms." Great indeed was the expectation founded upon the measure before the house, and the rejection of it would be felt as a dreadful calamity. There was no other remedy for the misfortunes of Ireland. The boasted *panacea*, the poor laws, would not answer. They were sick at heart, and might say—

> "Canst thou minister to a mind diseas'd,
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
> And purge the foul bosom of the perilous stuff
> That hangs about the heart?"

The English poor laws would not answer. Was it to be supposed that when there existed in Ireland a baneful disease, they could rely on the application of the common law? No, they must remove the cause of complaint or resort to *brute force*—to civil war. No one could resort to a force of that sort without shuddering (hear). There was another point to which the noble lord was desirous of calling the attention of the house. It had been said within and without those walls, that if the bill should pass, and his Majesty be graciously pleased to give his assent to it, he would forfeit his title to the throne. He would only say in answer to that, if there is one man bold enough to raise the standard of the House of Savoy, he will find that the throne of Brunswick is fixed on a rock not to be shaken. It was founded upon the free voice of the people; it was supported by the continuance of one hundred and forty years; it was sanctioned by forty successive parliaments; it was sanctioned by the voice of many millions of people; and he was at a loss to describe the contempt and ruin which must fall upon any man who attempted to impugn it (cheering).

The Earl of MANSFIELD—The noble lord who had just sat down had undervalued the consistency of statesmen; he, on the contrary, entertained the highest opinion of its value; he did not mean that tenacity of opinion which should be inflexible by conviction, but that which might enable the public to know something as to the probability of any given course being pursued by any given statesman. The changes which had taken place afforded one of his chief motives for voting in favour of the most rev. primate, as it would afford him the opportunity of at least six months further study, in which the new lights might perhaps also descend upon him (hear). He would rather the question had been placed upon the ground of positive right than as it was, upon that of expediency. In one case it would have been a tribute to justice; in the present it was a surrender to fear (hear, hear). A right rev. prelate had stated as an argument in favour of the measure, that the rising young men of talent had generally declared themselves its supporters. He did not think this appeal to authority was a happy one, and he should rather curb the lively imagination of youth by the more matured judgment of advanced years. Arguments were adduced as to the inconvenience of a divided parliament. He had always thought this, in a constitutional point of view, an advantage; and it was particularly so when the House of Commons appeared to advance too rapidly in the march of intellect. In the case of an undue tendency of the House of Commons to change, the proper place of refuge for the established interests of the community was the House of Lords. He lamented to say that the House of Commons of the present day did not appear to represent the opinions of the people of England. He was, however, no parliamentary reformer—and, notwithstanding the fashion of conversion, he trusted he never should be. Many projects for Catholic emancipation had been before parliament; but he recollected none so entirely denuded of securities as the present. It was to be expected of a minister who introduced a measure changing the constitution of England in a degree in which it had not been changed since the revolution of 1688, that he should have had so much respect for the constitution, and so much knowledge of it, as to have advised his Majesty after the decision of the house of commons on Monday last, to consult the opinions of his people. But this would not have suited the policy of the noble duke, nor probably have been consistent with the continued existence of his administration. The argument of the noble duke was a lesson to the Roman Catholics what course they ought to pursue. Let them conceal their designs until this measure should pass, and then, as soon as they choose, pursue the same means which gave them their present success, in order to ensure the success of their ulterior objects. The Catholics of Ireland had been continually urging their demands, and the Protestants had been as continually resisting them. They thought that any further concession to the Roman Catholics was likely to further the growth of popery; and an immense majority of the Protestants of England were so bigotted as to agree with them. But, referring to experience, he had no faith in the future tranquillity and contentment of the Catholics, in consequence even of this concession. When the elective franchise was granted, it was said that it must satisfy them, and that it could produce no danger to the constitution, and what were the arguments adduced in support of this opinion? They were, first, that the Protestant elector would always preponderate at every election; and secondly, that it could at the most affect only one branch of the legislature, and that the peerage and the crown must always be Protestant. The present measure was the best refutation of these arguments, but not a better than would be given by the future demands of the Catholics to the arguments now offered in support of the present bill. One of the greatest grievances felt by the Irish was the payment of tithes to the established church, while they had to provide for their own clergy. By admitting the Catholics to office, they would be enabled to seek their next measure of relief, which would be to appropriate the church property. He heard that the Catholics had discussed the motives which compelled them to pay tithes, and he believed the wish to appropriate the church property was not confined to the lowest classes—(hear). It was always felt to be a grievance to pay tithes—the tithes-payers never looked upon it in the same light as the tithe-receivers; but the greatest grievance of all was to pay tithes to a clergy who were not their own. He was afraid the priests might encourage this disposition, and by the power of confession they were able to control the people, whether they directed their exertions against the property of individuals or against the proceedings of government. They might encourage attacks on private property, in order to encourage attacks on the property of the church. If the tithes fell into the hands of the Catholic clergy, that wise measure which had of late been adopted for the compensation of tithes would be quite useless. In support of his opinion that the tithes would be endangered, he might quote an opinion of Mr. Fox, delivered in 1792, on the motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation acts, "that if ever the time should come that the people of England required the abolition of the tithes, the tithes ought to be abolished." Between the Roman Catholic church and the Protestant church there could be no alliance; so that it could not be made a part of the religion of the state, like the Presbyterian religion of Scotland. This measure was not the proper mode of relieving the distress which unfortunately existed in many parts of Ireland. The harshness of middle-men, the collection of tithes, combined with the payments to their own clergy by the Catholics, none of which the present measure had the least tendency to remove, were the causes of their discontent. And would not all these be easily blended into one feeling of enmity, to the established church? How grievous it must be to a Catholic to be distrained upon for tithes for the benefit of another church, when he believed them properly to belong to his own? If this measure passed, there could be no doubt that the endowments of the church would soon be surrendered to Catholics.

The Marquis of ANGLESEY said, he would have been content to have given a silent vote in support of the measure, but, connected as he had recently been with Ireland, and having been a close observer for ten months of the state of that country, and having seen the various bearings of this question on Irish society, he had come to a conclusion that he ought to express to the house the opinions which he entertained on this subject. Anxious as he was that this bill should pass, still he could not help remarking, that he had objections—and great objections, too—to several clauses of the bill which were considered as necessary companions to it. He would not, however, enter into these objections at present. We may consider this question, said the noble marquis, as it regards Ireland, in three points of view. First, politically; next, religiously, as it regards the ascendancy of the Protestant church; and lastly, in a military point of view. And first, as to the political view of it. I say from the moment you pass this bill, I shall consider the regeneration of Ireland complete (cheers).—Ireland wants much, but what is it that it wants most?—Repose. Ireland has for several months enjoyed that repose. Her gaols are empty; her police is idle; her military is unoccupied. I apprehend that this bill will secure the permanence of that tranquillity which is the source of all national happiness, and without which national prosperity can never be lasting. Tranquillity will produce this effect, and I think immediately. It will secure an ample flow of British capital into Ireland (hear, hear). It is a fact well worthy of your knowledge and attention, and I can vouch for the accuracy of it, that when in the year 1825 there was a mere expectation of emancipation being granted by Parliament, a single individual in Dublin received from England no less a sum than £1,300,000 to be invested in Irish speculation. That sum, had the bill then before Parliament been carried, was to have been followed by a larger sum; and I take shame to myself that I assisted at that time in throwing out that bill; for the consequence of it was, that much of that capital was withdrawn from Ireland, and all expectation of further capital flowing into it was for the time destroyed.—Here I would ask your lordships to consider what would be the necessary consequence of an influx of capital into Ireland? First of all, it would increase the value of land. Next, it would diminish the rate of interest; then it would open canals, drain bogs, reclaim lands, draw out all the resources of the country, establish manufactures, and cause all the population of Ireland to receive employment (cheers). Nothing is so fallacious as to suppose that the population of Ireland is dissolute and idle. Dissolute! You may ask for the returns of crime in England and in Ireland, and the contrast will show you which people is the most dissolute. Idle they are, but it is merely because they can get no employment. Give an Irish labourer employment, and pay him in specie, and you will not have a better labourer on the face of the earth. A more important consequence than all which I have yet described is, that the wandering absentee will return. He will repair to the seat of his ancestors; he will find comfort where he left discontent, and tranquillity where he left disaffection; and thus he will re-establish that greatest blessing to any country—the fair legitimate connexion between the landlord and his tenant (hear). It is with regret that I say one word on the subject of religion before that right reverend bench, but I may be permitted to ask, is or is not the Protestant church of Ireland really in danger? If it be, I say that the passing of this bill will do more to strengthen it in the minds of the people, and will better maintain its security than all the penal enactments which the utmost ingenuity of legislation can devise (cheers). One word as to the other point of view in which I propose to consider the question. There is no man acquainted with the state of Ireland who will not agree with me when I state, that in a time of profound peace, under the exclusive laws, 25,000 men is but a scanty garrison for Ireland. In the event of war, or even of the rumour of war, 40,000 men would be barely sufficient. It cannot be questioned that both France and America wish to do us injury, and in case of any collision with either of those powers, the first object of both would be to throw arms to a great extent into the hands of the discontented Irish. I am arguing, be it observed, upon the supposition that the exclusive laws are in existence. I will suppose, however, that we are absolutely at war, and that there is a combination of the powers of Europe—no very unlikely contingency—against us. I then say that it would be madness in any administration not to throw 70,000 men immediately into Ireland. Take, now another view of the subject. Suppose this bill to be passed into law by this day month; declare war if you like the next day; and I assert that you will have no difficulty within six weeks, to raise in that country 50,000 able-bodied, and what is better, willing-hearted men, who will find their way to any quarter of the globe to which you may choose to direct their arms (cheers). I say, my lords, that the passing of this bill is worth to the British empire, more, far more, than 100,000 bayonets. On these grounds, and on others which at this late hour of the night I abstain from stating, I am inclined to give my cordial support to this bill.

The Duke of NEWCASTLE now proposed an adjournment till Monday. It was received with cries of "Go on, go on."

The Duke of WELLINGTON observed, that when a division took place on a question of adjournment, noble lords were little disposed after to attend to the discussion. It was desirable, however, that the adjournment should be as short as it could conveniently be made.

After some further conversation, the debate was adjourned to one o'clock on Saturday.

Their lordships adjourned at half-past two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, SATURDAY, APRIL 4.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

Lords Grosvenor and Westmoreland rose at the same time—the cry, however, for the latter predominated.

Earl WESTMORELAND then said that he hoped to be excused if he trespassed on their lordships' time, by a few remarks which he had to make. The noble earl conceived that the house was bound to the second reading of the bill now before their lordships. Noble lords ought to have kept their opinions upon the subject until the bill came to its last stage; the measures came recommended from the throne, and the house is recommended by these recommendations to well consider the subject. He (Earl Westmoreland) was of opinion that the house should go into a Committee. This measure is to make great and serious alterations in our laws. Between distant and speculative dangers, and pressing and urgent ones we are now placed—it is between these two we are bound to balance, and upon that we take the question into consideration. My lords, after what has fallen from noble lords, there can be no question of the necessity of well considering this subject. For me, upon this subject I have been unfortunate enough, as I am afraid I have agreed with but few friends. I have been considered as a liberal (laughter). All the misdeeds that now press have been laid upon my shoulders—(continued peals of laughter). On the other side I have been marked—none had the honour of being more marked as a persecutor and a bigot, because I have always attended to that line of conduct which I thought would best lead to the peace and tranquillity of the country, and by which I would continue to be guided (cries of hear, hear). I say, my lords, I had the great honour of giving to the people of Ireland every privilege that the British constitution allows, with the exception of a few offices and that of members of parliament. I resisted giving them seats in Parliament, and some political offices, and I don't envy the situation of many of those who acted otherwise, but am rather proud of my conduct—proud that I was enabled to put the people of Ireland into all situations except seats in parliament, and some offices; and I do not envy much this measure, which will at this day, in any way detract from the liberties of the people by taking from them their franchises. My lords, I had the honour, much to the dissatisfaction of some of doing that, and I shall now continue to do all in my power to give to the Catholics of England that which I had under his late Majesty the power to give to Ireland, and, I believe, if instead of yielding to their turbulence, due attention had been paid to the loyal Catholics of Ireland, the unhappy dilemma in which we are placed would not now have been brought about. However, in that dilemma we are now placed, and after the speech of the noble duke and his Majesty's speech there can be no doubt of the urgency of the measure. My lords, the powers of Government are paralysed. What is the cause of that? The great misfortune is the divisions of the Protestants of Ireland. That has given power to the Catholics, and taken away the power of resistance.—In my mind it is necessary for the preservation of the church, and the exigencies of the state, that the minds of the Irish Protestants should be set at rest—(hear.) From what cause this dilemma arises may by some be considered doubtful.—To what cause I shall attribute it in the first instance is, to the noble lord opposite. My lords, I personally blame no men, but it is because it has been made the source of English and of Irish party that the subject has been continually worked upon, and the public irritated. The next party whom I charge with this are the landholders and gentlemen of Ireland, who, for election purposes, have sacrificed themselves and the state. My lords, they have to go out their influence in their own country, and given their legislative powers to the Catholics (hear). But there is another class, and I am afraid I must put myself into it, I mean every member of my Lord Liverpool's government, for the last ten years. It is necessary, therefore, to look to the situation we stand in, and to give an account of it. In the first place let us see what happened on the appointment, in the first instance, of a gentleman who entertained those opinions strongly, to be the minister of that country.—The Secretary of State for that country is responsible for the consequences that have taken place, because it is impossible for any man to suppose that any Government favourable to the Constitution of this country could have placed in the Government of that country a gentleman of his opinions. We are bound to look with fear upon persons who have thus conducted the business which has brought us into this dilemma. My lords, what was the next step? Perhaps the noble lord opposite (Eldon) will admit that it was the appointment of the Attorney-General to that country, a person still different in his opinions upon it The noble lord will, perhaps, excuse me for saying, and also a noble marquis, a friend of mine, that however I may differ from them, I will do the Catholics the justice to say that they were always more ready and willing to execute the laws than the lawyers and ministers of this country—(great laughter).—My lords, I have heard a great deal of English common law, and I have heard that the law against the association was not rightly executed; that if the law against the association was not sufficient, other laws ought to have been made. With that opinion I perfectly agree. I hope no one will attribute to me, or any noble lord, that for the purpose of keeping office we were actuated by unworthy motives—(hear).—Certainly there was no one who could not see to what these things would lead. But it was hoped that better times would come, and we were afraid of bringing on the crisis. The crisis did come, and what was the result? The appointment of Mr. Canning, and the adoption of those measures by the government which have brought Ireland and England into that state in which I agree with the noble duke, it is necessary there should now be a settlement of the question. My lords, while speaking on this subject, I had almost forgotten his Majesty's visit to Ireland. Who were the persons who were presented then? Who, but those who are now the Catholic Bishops, who in their paraphernalia made an address to his Majesty. Was that no symptom? Could not that lead men to expect something, and, last of all, the letter that was written on the subject. All these things must have led men to expect what was to come to pass. I should have been ashamed, after the statement which had been made by the noble lord, to have troubled the House at length, but I cannot forbear mentioning a story of Erasmus (hear and laughter.) I mean a dialogue between Charon and an evil spirit, in which the latter told him that he must have a larger boat, for there were many souls coming over the river Styx, in consequence of religious disturbances, that his present bark would be unable to carry them over. I think that story is peculiarly applicable to the present state of the country, for the father is now against the son, the brother against the brother, and the landlord divided from the tenant, and even the fair sex (laughter) —take part in broils. Every body is trying to do this for the sake of humanity towards the poor Irish, who are concerned in this question as much as the people of Mogul. I should think that the sooner this matter is brought to the contest the better, but it must be clearly seen that the mischief is with ourselves, and the Roman Catholics of Ireland have no disposition to act harshly towards us if we only do them justice.—It is true we have had a Bill to put down the Catholic Association, but is there any one man who supposes that he can execute that Law?—(hear.)—for I assert that all Laws, strong as they, are carried by public opinion. I recollect that I put down the volunteers who had for many years domineered over that country with a simple proclamation. We then put down a more dangerous Association, but then we had the Protestants of Ireland and the people of England to support us unanimously. Now, however, you have a part of the Protestants of Ireland, and nearly the whole of the landed proprietors, assenting to this measure, because they think it will improve their estates. You have also a large majority of the House of Commons in favour of it. I will now ask, if, under these circumstances, there is any noble lord who will take upon his Herculean shoulders the danger and responsibility of refusing this concession (hear,

hear, hear). I think no man has a right to resist this measure, unless he is prepared to meet the danger and difficulty. I am not only one of those who approve of this measure on account of the policy of it, but from what ought most to operate on the consideration of all, the present benefits to Ireland that will result from it. Whatever the next grievance may be, for there will still be some one, it will be long before so large a majority of people of all ranks will be enlisted in their cause. I observe that one of the points in opposition to this measure would have been that of a temporary remedy, but I believe if such had been tried, it would have been a useless attempt; and if we had made up our minds to emancipate Ireland, it never could have been done at a better period than the present; for if the Catholics can command the government, the minister, and the landlord, I must think it better to have a certain number of avowed Roman Catholics in parliament than to have a great number of secret supporters of Catholicism, whom you would not know how to appreciate, as they were acting under Catholic influence (hear, hear). Another part of the objection is that by this measure we destroy the English church. Now, I think it is the only way to protect it. I am satisfied that when this measure is passed, those noble lords who have uniformly supported it will stand up to protect the Protestant interest, and the church establishment. I must now offer a few observations on the coronation oath, and I think the question alone stands in this way, whether the words of the coronation oath are technical or constructional. In the first place, what are we to do, supposing them to be technical? The oath is a great law necessary for the admission into office; and from the time of Elizabeth I find that oaths for admission to public offices have at all times been subject to continual alteration. Such was the case in the reign of Charles the Second, of King William, and of Queen Anne; and with regard to those oaths, it is curious that in both the Unions with this country, it is specifically stated that they shall continue as long as they are—how long? Why till they are altered (hear, hear.) We will now come to the construction of them. A person may act as he pleases on the construction of them. His Majesty, if he thought it right to rob the Church of any one gain, or any established property, in this country, might do so. I contend, however, by this measure you weaken Catholic power, for, instead of having 100 Members in the British House of Commons, or, as lately proved, above 200, the Catholics would not have 20. On this construction of the present measure no Protestant could complain that it affected his rights in this country, and I believe that going apart in such case would be nothing like a breach of the oath, if it would, there is unfortunately many honourable men would be guilty of those offences. There are two classes to which these oaths are applicable, the civil and the military, and I should like to know which of the oaths of these two offices it is allowable to alter. In 1793 the Attorney-General authorised me to admit officers into the army with an alteration of the oath, and within these two years the others have been altered. We are told that this measure is hostile to the opinions of the people of England, and I am certain that if such be the case that it will have the beneficial effect contemplated. That question, however, can only be decided by a reference to the petitions presented, and we are told that there are two thousand on one side and five hundred on the other. That, at all events, only shows that there is a great variety of opinion, and, I think if they were fairly looked into it would be found that one-half at least would be in support of this measure. I am certain that we lessen the power of the Catholics by this bill, and also that we give additional power to the people of England, and security to their church. (The noble lord then continued). The way in which these differences had been accounted for was of the most extraordinary nature. It was said, when Pitt and Fox differed, that one of them was right and that the other was wrong—that whenever they happened to agree, why both of them were wrong (loud laughter). Just so with the government at that time, and so it is with the present government. My lords, when it shall be known that this measure has been brought forward and sanctioned by his Majesty, and with the consent of his Majesty's council, I think I may venture to anticipate a concurrent opinion in the public mind, and that when this bill shall have passed into a law, the country will reap from it those important benefits which in my judgment it is calculated to confer upon us.

Lord SIDMOUTH—My lord, after the very extraordinary speech of the noble lord who has just sat down, I must claim your lordships' particular attention to some parts of that speech, which I am bound to notice. My lords, it has sometimes happened that when a person has changed his own opinions, he has found it necessary to resort to the expedient of inculpating others, for the express purpose of keeping up a show of consistency. Whether or not this applies to the noble lord it is not for me to say, but I confess that I was never more surprised than at hearing the speech of the noble lord—nor am I less surprised at the charges which he has made. My lords, it is just eight years since a respectable gentleman (Mr. Grant) was appointed to the office of chief secretary of Ireland, which at that time was in a very distracted state. I have already said that Mr. Grant was a most respectable gentleman, and with the utmost admiration for his talents, I am free to admit that the appointment had not my concurrence; but I yielded to it from the distressing exigency of the occasion. It is well known to the noble lord that the appointment had not my approbation. I am compelled to say thus much in reply to the charge of the noble lord, and I feel that I am justified in breaking punctilios, in thus adverting to this circumstance. The animadversions in which the noble lord has indulged on my conduct, were, I think, perfectly uncalled for. I will now, my lords, call your attention to another charge upon which the noble lord laid the greatest stress. I mean the reception which was given by his Majesty to the Roman Catholic bishops on presenting their address after his Majesty's return to this country; a question had been put by a noble friend of mine whether there was any objection to his Majesty receiving Catholic bishops in the character of bishops. As it was a point worthy of consideration, I thought it my duty to consult my revered friend, Lord Liverpool, upon it, and that lamented nobleman thought it was impossible to refuse receiving any address of the Catholic bishops in that character. That, my lord, was my own opinion. Every one knows that they are as much bishops as those of the Protestant church. Every one knows that ordination has the same effect in both cases. How then was it possible to advise his Majesty not to receive them in the character in which they presented themselves? They did not come as a titular bishop of Limerick, or any other place, but simply as bishops. The noble lord has said that they came in their full paraphernalia and were received with all the respect and deference due to Protestant bishops (hear, hear). I am not very certain as to that fact, but I think it would be rather an awkward thing if, when they claimed an audience of the King in the closet, a Secretary of State, or any person in attendance on his Majesty were to say, you cannot appear thus, you must go back and put off your dress. Allow me here, my Lords, to say, that the members of convocation had presented addresses not only to the King in the closet, but on the throne. The next charge of the noble lord alluded to a change in the system of his Majesty's government, as intimated in a letter to my noble friend opposite. But I do not find one word in that letter to justify such a charge. It has been said that the Government would be acting unfairly, if, after the suppression of the Catholic Association, this measure of relief was not passed. It should be recollected, however, that in the King's speech the recommendation to parliament was to take into consideration the whole condition of Ireland. How, I will ask, has an opportunity been afforded for such consideration? What assurance have your lordships had that this measure will pacify that country? I confess, my lords, that I, for one, would be sorry to decide on a question of such vital importance, without fuller and better information than that contained in the speech of the noble duke. My lords, what inquiry has taken place? What do we know about the condition of Ireland? at least, what do we know of it from that authentic source to which we are bound to look for information? I should have thought before the introduction of any measure of relief, the recommendation of his Majesty in his speech to parliament should have been complied with, and that the condition of Ireland, the object to which the attention of parliament was peculiarly directed, would have formed the subject of inquiry in a committee of the whole house. Nothing of this sort, my lords, has been done, and I am afraid that your lordships will get no further information upon the subject than that which has been given by the noble duke. The noble lord continued, he did not expect to be able to say any thing to induce some of their lordships to depart from the course which they seemed determined to adopt, though he should succeed in convincing them that the course was fraught with difficulties, embarrassments, and dangers of all sorts to the constitution. But what was the plea upon which they were called upon to pass this measure? The influence of the Catholic Association was talked of—its terrors magnified! For his part, he should be disingenuous indeed, to withhold from ministers the praise of sincerity. He had himself been a member of administration, but he never intended to affix distrust to the motives of his colleagues who differed in opinion from him (hear, hear, hear). It was but fair to say, that he believed no set of men could be influenced by greater regard for the constitution of this country than his Majesty's present ministers were (hear). It did not follow, however, he was of necessity to take for granted that all their measures were of the most judicious kind. Quite the contrary, respect was one thing, confidence another—but a blind and indiscriminating reliance upon the infallibility of any set of men, was a degree of self-denial to which he could not pretend. What then was his opinion of the present measure? Did he think that under the present conjuncture of affairs in Ireland nothing ought to be done? Certainly not. He agreed that that country was, and had ever been, in a condition to require the attention of the members of Government, and no man was less disposed than he to withhold a remedy, when a proper remedy was pointed out. But whence came this organization—whence this dismemberment of the parts of the body social and politic? Were its cause to be found in the misconduct of administrations, the errors of Government—the abuses of law? No, the evils of Ireland were a laxity of rule, a too great moderation in authority—a connivance at the proceedings of agitators and disturbers—The Catholic Association was the fruitful parent of all these evils—to that fertile source were all the grievances to be traced. He would ask, for it really was necessary to ask—what was the Catholic Association—what were its attributes—what its character? Was this the Association which had been already denounced as the disturber of the public peace in Ireland—as the proscribed of the peaceful citizens of that country, of the King's Ministers, and of the two Houses of Parliament? (hear). Was it decent, then, to adduce the existence of such a body as an argument in the discussion of any great question? Their lordships have been solemnly told, in the speech from the throne, in a former session, that this Association was dangerous to the public peace—that it was at variance with the Constitution. Was it not upon these grounds, and these only, that the bill for its suppression was asked—that it was passed? The evils of Ireland were then traced to this cause, and the suggestion was, that by removing the cause you destroy the effect. Why not do the same now? In what respect had things altered in Ireland, that the same proscription for the malady (which had not changed its character) might not be effectual? But they were told that things had changed—that it was no longer safe to put down the Association, as an integral measure. Nay, it was said, that so affectionate was the House of Commons become of this favourite body, that it would never consent to its suppression by law, unless some other measure, by way of indemnification, was made congenial with that extinguishment. What, then, were we come to that pass, that concession was the only basis for our legislation? Were we in future to pass no law, without first throwing a sop to the people of Ireland, in order that they would be pleased to condescend to submit to our imperial legislation? This was the language used by some of the supporters of this measure—others thought that it was not enough for the return, which they affected to say was paid for it—others that require no terms. Ought the forty shilling freeholders of Ireland to be disfranchised! To the first he should say, that he was unwilling to believe that the house of commons would so stultify itself, as having a few years ago passed a bill for the suppression of the Catholic Association, and thereby acknowledged the principle, it would now refuse to adopt the same measure. To the others, that this was in fact no price at all—because, looking at all the various circumstances under which the Catholic government got the elective franchise, it would be seen that it was not contemplated by the legislature to give them that extent of political rights which they had since used and abused; what a noble earl had said upon a former occasion in his place, was unhappily but too true, that the use which the Catholic freeholders had made of the boon of 1795, was a good sample of the manner in which they would hereafter pervert any further concessions which might be made to them—namely, to the advancement of their political power and the overthrow of the church and constitution. The predictions which had been made of the effect of that measure, while it was under discussion in the Irish parliament, was soon after fearfully realized by the result—(hear, hear, hear.) It was then said, however, that the effect of the measure would be to cause a splitting of freeholds—a minute subdivision of property by the landlords—an ultimate encouragement to early and improvident marriages, and, in fact, to every thing which would tend to foster idleness and improvidence—(hear.) Had these predictions been belied—had they not been fulfilled to the letter in the state of Ireland? The most eminent men of that day—the Lord Clare—and the then speaker of the Irish house of Commons, Mr. Foster, were amongst the great opponents of this measure. They deprecated, in the strongest terms, the power which had been given to the Catholic freeholders. He was of opinion, that the measure to which he confessed he brought his mind with reluctance to agree, was justified by the circumstances and by the evidence which was offered to parliament some years ago. He (Lord Sidmouth) should not therefore oppose the measure for the raising the elective franchise, as unconnected with the others, and so far from throwing obstacles in its way he should give it his warmest support. But he must be understood as not including in that pledge of support the other measures with which that bill was accompanied. What then, was to be done? Were we to remain as we were, or make a change, cost what it might? This question had been asked in the other house, but to this he had not received and satisfactory answer. What the right honourable gentleman (Mr. Peel) was unable to solve, he (Lord S.) would offer to explain. Better, far better, he should say, remain as we are than make unworthy sacrifices.—(cheers.) If we had a chance of continuing to remain as we are, the way to accomplish that was not to recede, not to give fresh power to our enemies. But admit that something must be done—did it follow that this was exactly the step which we ought to take? Was this a remedy for the admitted evils of Ireland—was it not a confusion of terms to call it so? It had not a symptom of a remedial measure. The evils of Ireland were long admitted to be poverty, ignorance, and bigotry—(hear). Which of these would Catholic emancipation remove? Rid the people—the poor benighted people—of the trammels of priestcraft: that was the true and Statesmanlike humane emancipation. The evils were, it was now allowed, of very long standing. In the language of an enlightened writer, these evils were poverty, depression, want of education, the relaxation of industry, the want of encouragement—the want of proper protection for the poor, want of sympathy in the landlords—the distress arising from the necessity of paying tithes to the church, whilst they had their own clergy to support—rents out of proportion to their means—want of the necessaries of life, and above all, a distrust in the administration of justice—(cheers). Remove these grounds of complaint then, make it their landlord's interest to look to the wants of his tenantry, check rapine, prevent violence, and put an end to misrule. These were the first duties of a wise, considerate, and beneficent legislature. The next, to give the people education—(hear). Much had been done in this way of late years, under the administration of Lord Liverpool and his noble friend—much had been done for the education of Ireland.—The powers of the Grand Jury had been enlarged—beneficial changes had been made in the courts of justice in Ireland—constabulary force had been established, and what was of no less importance, justice was now in open courts in Ireland. Who could deny that the result of all this was not an increased confidence in the people of that country in the administration of justice—(hear)? But this was not all. He might allude to other measures—the review of the whole state of the magistracy in that country—a better arrangement of tithes. This measure alone was sufficient to stamp a value upon an administration which conferred so great and so important a boon upon Ireland; other suggestions equally beneficial had been made by other administrations, though not unfortunately carried into effect. He alluded to the suggestion of appointing lord lieutenants of the counties in Ireland as they were here; it could not be denied that there was wanting some such responsible officers who would be answerable for the recommendation of magistrates, and whose business it would be to punish any delinquency that took place in the due administration of justice in that country. Looking then at the situation of things in Ireland, and judging by the rules that governed human nature in the abstract, he should say that the true benevolence of legislation was not in the granting of Catholic emancipation; but in the carrying into effect the unnecessary suggestions which had been made by former administrations. Noble lords might then with sincerity put their hands on their hearts, and congratulate themselves on the state of things which they had produced. They might then indeed realize the picture which they had drawn in their imaginations, which, as applied to this bill, had no solid materials for its construction; they might then figure to themselves the agitations now so dangerous to authority removed (hear)—the condition of their tenants improved; the value of their rents enhanced, and more freely paid; confidence increased, or at least the terrors reduced in the mind of the labourer that the fruits of his exertions would not be his own property. The great grievance of Ireland was distress, arising from the want of food (hear, hear.)—The remedy for that was acknowledged on all hands to be the influx of capital, but by a strange round-about mode of reasoning the measure of Catholic Emancipation, which after all must influence only remotely and circuitously, the sources of capital, were said to be the means of curing these evils. Surely when public confidence in the administration of the law was increased, noble lords must admit that that was *pro tanto* a palliative for the evils of Ireland. Increase that confidence then, give them an equal and impartial system of law; educate the people, stimulate their industry; that was the true way to legislate for Ireland, and not the measure now under consideration (cheers.) He acknowledged being disappointed at securities in this bill; he thought it would only tend to increase the dissatisfaction of the Protestant population, and by no means give satisfaction to a portion of the Catholic community. He in his conscience believed that the wiser course was now to resist emancipation which we were better able to do so than at a future time, when we would be in a worse condition to resist them. Generous minds must be gratified at seeing one's fellow-subjects restored to the full enjoyments of their rights, but there were higher interests which must be consulted before one yielded to the kindlier, and therefore, perhaps, weaker suggestions of one's feelings. The noble lord concluded by reading a portion of a letter in which the author recommended that the wise examples of our ancestors ought to be followed, who had never given up solid substances for theoretical speculations, and that like them we ought to endeavour to gain the confidence of our friends, and the respect of our enemies, by manfully hazarding every thing in defence of that fabric of the Constitution which had been handed down to us sanctioned by such high authority, and sanctified by such long experience—(cheers.

Lord WESTMORELAND rose to explain. I think I could not say more, observed the noble lord, to satisfy the learned lord who has just sat down, than that I considered myself as much concerned in those transactions, as I considered him—that whether the measures were right or wrong. I was equally right or equally wrong with himself; therefore it is quite impossible I could mean any reflection.

Lord LIVERPOOL supported the bill.

Lord TENTERDEN—Many who were in favour of the measure under consideration, had denominated themselves the friends of civil and religious liberty. If they meant to imply that those who differed from them were not friends of civil and religious liberty, he begged to enter his protest against any such doctrine. This was the very reason which induced him to oppose the bill. He had all his life admired the Church of England. From that Church he had derived the greatest consolation and the best of hope—(hear, hear). His esteem for it had "grown with his growth, and strengthened with his strength;" and was at the present moment stronger than ever. But his esteem for the Church of England was also excited by his opinion, that it was more favourable to civil and religious liberty than any other church establishment that ever had prevailed in the world (cheers). There was no church so tolerant, so ready to give to persons of every other persuasion, freedom; and he never could consent to any measure which would put its interests, much more its existence, in jeopardy. Such he believed would be the effect of the present measure (cheers). In Ireland there was an unacknowledged Popish hierarchy, assuming the names of the Protestant hierarchy established by law. Was it not impossible but that there must exist in such persons an earnest and anxious desire to obtain a restitution of the advantages of which they had been deprived? (hear, hear). The accomplishment of that desire would be assisted by the present measure, by giving them political power; power increased by legitimate means. Such were, briefly, the reasons which would induce him to vote against the measure. It had been assumed that the exclusions in the reign of Charles the Second were introduced in consequence of the wilful misrepresentations of Titus Oates. In that view there was a great deal of exaggeration. That the assertions of Titus Oates had greatly excited the public mind at the period when they were made, there could be no doubt, but a reference to the Acts of Parliament themselves, and their dates would give the most just view of the subject (hear, hear). In the very first year of Elizabeth the oath of supremacy was adopted, and persons could not hold office under the crown, or sit in the lower house, without having previously taken it. The oath of supremacy of the 1st of Elizabeth was essentially the same as that of William and Mary; and declared that no foreign Prince or Potentate had, or ought to have, "any temporal, ecclesiastical, or spiritual power in these realms" (hear, hear). Members of their lordships' house were not required to take the oath of supremacy in the reign of Elizabeth. But there was a special reason for this. Queen Elizabeth stated that she had too much confidence in their lordships to require at their hands any such test of their loyalty. That an oath, then, existed in the time of Elizabeth, which, if properly taken, must have excluded Roman Catholics from the House of Commons, and from office, there could be no doubt. He was bound, however, to state, that Roman Catholics did then sit in the lower house, although he could not say how their consciences had been reconciled to such an oath: but he supposed the Pope of Rome, ever fertile in expedients (hear, hear), had devised means whereby they were reconciled to taking this oath. The next Act was that which contained the oath of allegiance. He then came to the Acts of Charles II. The former acts were renewed, and by a subsequent one, all persons in office, and members of Parliament, were compelled to take the two oaths and to make the declaration against transubstantiation and the invocation of saints. In the subsequent act, however, the oaths were not specified. He then came to the time of the Convention. On January 22, the Convention drew up that declaration of rights which afterwards was formed into a law. On February 13, they presented it to the Prince and Princess of Orange, by whom it was immediately received, and on the same day the Convention became a Parliament. In that declaration a provision was introduced, whereby it was declared, that no foreign Prince or Potentate hath or ought to have, any spiritual jurisdiction, &c. within this realm. And what was the first act of the new parliament? It passed a measure founded on and containing the declaration of right, and imposed those oaths, which it declared, together with the declarations, were to be taken by all future parliaments. And if their lordships passed on a little further they would find that the next measure was that which had reference to the coronation oath to be taken by the King, and all future Kings. The words in the two acts of Parliament, as to their permanency, were precisely the same (hear, hear.) And if the one could be repealed without breaking in upon the constitution, why could not the other? (cheers). It was plain then, that the Protestantism of future Kings was not, of necessity, any more a permanent and essential ingredient of the constitution, than were the taking and observance of the oaths prescribed by previous acts of Parliament obligatory upon all future members of parliament. His mind was not sufficiently subtle and acute to see the distinction which made the coronation oath more binding on the King than were the oaths imposed upon members of the legislature binding and indispensable. The act of settlement was not passed in the same session as the others, but in the next. It set forth the whole of the declaration made by the convention; but there was nothing in that declaration stating that any oath should be taken by members of Parliament, or by the King, respecting the Roman Catholic religion. In the act passed in Scotland, and in the declaration embodied in it, it was set forth, that "by the laws of these realms no Roman Catholic can be King, or bear any office therein" (hear, hear). The resolution thus embodied was presented to and accepted by the Prince and Princess of Orange. If it be asked why these oaths to be taken by members of Parliament were not declared to be an essential part of the constitution, as well as the oath for the regal office, it was because a provision had been already made for that purpose. As it had been once done, it was thought unnecessary to repeat it (hear, hear). To say that it was not the intention of those great men who brought about the revolution to perpetuate the oaths to be taken by the members of parliament, was just the same as saying, that because we had done a thing well, and did not unnecessarily repeat it, we did not mean to do it all. That passage of the union with Scotland in which it was declared, "that the oaths then prescribed to be taken by members of parliament should continue to be taken, until parliament should otherwise direct," that this passage had been triumphantly quoted, as if it were intended that these oaths should be altered. But, after the union, when an act was passed declaring how the sixteen peers should be elected, the same oaths of qualification were enforced, and it was then made part of this act, that "it be further enacted and declared that the said last-mentioned act, passed in Scotland, for the settling the manner of electing the 16 peers, shall be declared to be as valid as if the same had been part of, and engrossed in, the said articles of union, ratified and approved of by the said act of parliament of Scotland as aforesaid."—The necessary qualification of a representative peer, was, that the elected peer should be twenty-one years of age, and that he should not be a papist, or suspected of popery. Thus, so far from parliament altering the law, they confirmed it, with respect to the peers at least, and strengthened this article of the act of union, by annexing this provision as an integral and essential part of it. This was the state of the law upon this question. It was true their Lordships, with the concurrence of the other branches of the Constitution, had the power of abrogating the Statute which composed that law, if they thought proper so to do (hear, hear). But it was desirable that they should proceed to the consideration of any proposed change with an accurate knowledge of the law as it now stood, and on the grounds on which it so stood (cheers.) He would now offer a few remarks upon the proposed measure. The principal ground on which it rested was, that it would give tranquillity to Ireland. If he could as sure himself that that state of society, which was such as to baffle the soundest judgment, and appal the stoutest heart, would be tranquillised, he would be disposed to support the question. But he anticipated no such result. Their Lordships could not have failed to observe the proceedings of a body of men in Ireland, who, whether from neglect, encouragement, or whatever cause, were permitted to hold daily meetings, and make speeches, in which the foulest obloquy was poured out upon all indiscriminately. Those persons openly declared that they would not rest satisfied until they rooted out the Protestant Church, which they denominated a pestilent heresy (hear, hear.) If these meetings could not be prevented, could not such speeches as he had described be restrained—or, at least, could not the publication of them be punished? Would this measure give tranquillity and prosperity to Ireland? He sincerely hoped that if it should become a law it would do so, but he could not see any ground for believing that it would (hear.) At the very best he could only anticipate from its effects a temporary and brief tranquility—the question of the Church Ascendancy would still be left behind, and he implored their Lordships not to place themselves in a most dangerous predicament by throwing away their guards at the very moment they might most require them (cheers.) Their opponents would be armed with new political power (hear, hear.) He conscientiously apprehended that the concession of political power to the Catholics would only enable them to aim at the ulterior objects which he believed they had in view. If the measure should pass into a law, he hoped it would be found that he was mistaken, and that all the good effects might flow from it which its warmest advocates anticipated (cheers.)

Earl GREY said it would be presumptuous in him to follow the learned lord (the Chief Justice of England) in the statement which he had made upon the various laws affecting Roman Catholics: but the conclusion to which he (Lord T.) came was, that he admitted not only the power of Parliament to abrogate those laws, but that he individually would sanction the abrogation of them, if he were convinced that the result would be the tranquillization of Ireland (hear, hear.) It was incumbent on him and on those who thought that the measure would be productive of that beneficial consequence to Ireland and to the empire to support those opinions which he and they had so frequently supported by their votes (hear, hear). The Bill of Rights, the Act of Union with Scotland, and the other Acts adverted to by the noble and learned lord, were passed in times when dangers of Popery were entertained, and when those Acts were passed, guards were introduced into them to avert those dangers. Many of the dangers may have been founded in justifiable apprehension, but many of them were also imaginary, and in some instances, the most diabolical means had been resorted to, to fabricate and invent grounds of apprehension. But surely it cannot be contended that when the same dangers do not exist, nor can be pretended to exist, the same guards are necessary to be maintained. He did not assert that those who differ from him were the enemies of civil or religious liberty (hear.) They might think that other guards and securities were necessary for the Church, to which he, with no less fidelity of attachment than them, was conscientiously and warmly devoted. But it might be permitted to him to hold that the best security of the Church was not in exclusive laws, but in the purity and excellence of its doctrines. The measure, so far from menacing it with danger, imparted to it additional security. So much confidence did Elizabeth repose in her Roman Catholic subjects, that although an Act was passed which in its operation would have excluded the Catholics from parliament, it was not attempted to be enforced (hear). The noble and learned lord, it is true, admitted that the Catholics were not excluded by this act, and at last hit upon that which seemed to be the beginning, the middle, and the end of all the noble and learned lord's arguments—that the Roman Catholics possessed some peculiar power of evading the obligation of an oath, through the effect of the dispensing power vested in the head of their church (hear, hear). Mr. Pitt and Lord Liverpool imputed no such notions to the Catholics, and objected to their admission to political power on account of their adherence to a spiritual supremacy at variance with the just authority of the crown of this country. Parliament trusted them on their oaths (hear, hear). By oaths they have been repeatedly admitted to offices under the crown; and where is the proof of any evasion of these oaths? When Elizabeth was threatened with an attack from that armada, so falsely called "invincible," she called around her her Roman Catholic subjects, and she had the proud satisfaction of reaping the rich harvest which was the result of their devotion. At that period Lord Howard of Effingham, whose visage was placed among the first of those portraits which adorned the tapestry of their lordships' house, and whose skill and whose courage contributed so much to preserve that house from being regained by a Catholic Sovereign—Lord Howard of Effingham, a Catholic, was appointed to the command of the fleets of the Protestant Elizabeth (hear, hear)—of that Queen of England who had been formally excommunicated by the Pope, and whose subjects and all who served under her, had been absolved from their allegiance. Lord Howard of Effingham was such a favourite of the Pope that he contrived to prevail on him to withdraw that law of excommunication which was laid upon all those who supported the Queen of England. It must have been by nothing short of some contrivance of this kind that the Admiral of Elizabeth was permitted to place himself at the head of the combatants who were arrayed against that Armada which possessed a banner consecrated by the hand of the Pope himself, and which, under his auspices, and at his express command, was intended once more to place this country under the authority of his See (hear). He admitted that by the 25th of Charles the Second, and by the Test Act, steps were afterwards taken to exclude the Roman Catholics from political power, and that these laws continued in force at the time of the revolution, and after the new settlement of the Government. The noble and learned lord seemed to come to the conclusion, that as the Catholics were excluded under particular circumstances, so, whenever the reasons of exclusion ceased to operate, they might and were bound to take away the laws which supported them.—Parliament had such a power, and he was contending for its exercise. What he had always admired in the conduct of the framers of the acts of the revolution was, that they provided for the dangers which existed at the time they were called upon to legislate, and that they did no more (hear, hear). They applied themselves to provide a remedy for the evils of their situation, and left to their successors the power of providing for the emergencies which the lapse of time might render necessary (hear, hear.) If it had been their intention to provide for the perpetual exclusion of popery, they would have attempted to frame some provision expressly directed to that end. There is no noble lord prepared to argue that the bill of rights itself has not undergone numerous alterations since its first enactment. In the bill of rights it was expressly provided that there should be frequent parliaments; has not that clause been evaded by the Triennial act, but still more by the Septennial act. It provided that privy councillors should place their signatures to their opinions given to the crown—that clause had been repealed. There was a clause declaring that those who held offices under the crown should not be permitted to sit in the house of commons—that had been re-

pealed. The noble and learned lord, when he rests his argument on the bill of rights, says, however, that it is to be taken in connexion with the Act of William III., which prescribes that oath under which Catholics must be excluded from Parliament. But was that oath sacred from all innovation? The noble and learned lord on the Woolsack gave a triumphant refutation to the arguments founded on such an assertion. He proved that the principles of that Act had been violated by the admission of Catholics into the army and navy.

[*For remainder of the adjourned Debate of Saturday, see Supplement*].

HOUSE OF LORDS—MONDAY, APRIL 6.

DISFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

The order of the day for the second reading of the Irish freeholders disfranchisement bill having been read,

The Duke of WELLINGTON spoke as follows:—It is now my duty to state to your lordships the nature of the other measure which it has been the duty of government to propose to parliament, in conformity with the recommendation in the speech from the throne—namely, the bill to regulate the franchise of persons to vote for members of parliament in counties in Ireland. The Irish act of 1793 gave Roman Catholics the power of voting for members of parliament; and very shortly after that date it appears that the evil commenced which has now grown to such magnitude, that, five years ago, it drew the attention of parliament to it; and it was then thought necessary to take some measures to apply a remedy. I believe, that shortly after the passing of the act of 1793, certain persons in possession of leases for one or more lives, under grants from some of the great proprietors in Ireland, commenced the system of granting freeholds by virtue of their leases. This was done for the purpose of creating for themselves political and parliamentary influence; and I am afraid that it laid the ground for the example being followed by others, their superiors in station, their superiors in fortune, and their superiors in intelligence. No doubt the system has since been extended to an enormous degree. In Ireland there are many more freeholders than are necessary for the freedom of election upon any well regulated principle, and many of the attendants upon the system are such as to have become the general subject of complaint throughout the country—(hear, hear, hear). The persons who have become entitled by the abuse of the power of making freeholders to vote for members of parliament are, as appears by the proceedings of a committee of your lordships' house and of the house of commons, of the very lowest class of society—(hear.) In making out their right to vote, in possessing themselves of their freehold, and in all the circumstances attending the transaction, perjury is committed; the people are demoralised in every stage of the proceeding; and on that account alone, if on no other, the subject deserves the most serious attention. As I said before, these freeholds were originally formed for the purpose of giving political and parliamentary influence to certain individuals; but latterly, and more particularly since those Committees made their report, it appears that the influence resulting from the system I have been describing, has fallen into the hands of persons in whose possession there can be no doubt the legislature never intended that any political power or parliamentary influence should be found—I mean the Priests. The continuance of such influence in such hands would be highly detrimental to the public interest, under whatever system we should continue to govern that part of the United Kingdom. But when we consider the measure that was adopted the other night, there can be no doubt that this evil ought not to be allowed to continue. After the vote of Saturday night, I may safely say in this house, that if a Roman Catholic gentleman possess property and talents to enable him to serve his country, and to entitle him to a seat in Parliament, it is desirable that he should have one. But I am sure there is not one of your lordships who will not agree with me that it is not desirable that he should obtain that seat by the exertion of Popish or religious influence (general cheers). I say, therefore, that on this ground it is fit that the bill I now propose should be passed into a law. I would likewise beg your lordships to observe, that one of the subjects which I particularly held out some nights ago, when I recommended another measure to your notice, was the desire I felt to put an end to combinations—illegal combinations—in Ireland. Those illegal combinations are founded upon religious opinions. I beg your lordships to advert to the advantages and to the inducements held out for the formation of such combinations, if we are to continue that policy of law which now exists in that country. Therefore, I proceed with confidence to intreat your lordships to consider this system, and in order to change it, to adopt the measure the second reading of which I am about to propose.—I can assure your lordships that it is not our wish or intention, nor would your lordships consent if it were, to give an influence over elections into the hands of any particular class of persons. Our wish is, that the possessor of land should have as fair an influence under this system as under any other; but we wish also, not only that the possessor of land should enjoy this advantage, but that all other persons whose talents are such as to qualify them to serve the public, and who wish to exercise those talents by obtaining a seat in Parliament, should have an equal chance of finding their way hither. I move, my lords, that this bill be read a second time.

The Duke of RICHMOND was opposed to the bill as a plan which, by one single enactment, went to disfranchise a large body of electors unaccused, unheard, and uncondemned; and for that reason was in his opinion, contrary to the practice and principles of the Constitution.

Lord REDESDALE supported the bill; and after going through the Statutes relating to elections, contended that by the change in the value of money, the forty-shilling freeholds had passed into the hands of a class of men much below those originally intended to be electors, and that consequently this bill was but a return to the old standard of qualification.

Lord FARNHAM did not mean to deny the abuses of the forty-shilling freeholders, but he had a strong objection to the provisions of the bill now on the table.

Lord MANNERS said, that judging from the practical effects of the bill of 1793, he could not conceive any measure more calculated to improve the general state of Ireland and benefit the poorer classes of its inhabitants than the proposed bill. It would renew and strengthen those ties between landlord and tenant so beneficial to both, but which had been so grievously broken in upon by the act of 1793. He looked upon the bill as an act of justice, and one which would confer considerable benefit on a great portion of the forty-shilling freeholders themselves. As the law at present stood, many of the forty-shilling freeholders came to vote with a suspicious title; some on a lease of lives, with an old life thrown in, in order to strengthen the title, those leases were held at a high rack rent, and the land was tilled by the occupier, he being unable to pay for the labour of another. In 1793, it was thought necessary to grant concessions to the Roman Catholics; and it was thought better to grant them the elective franchise than give them admission to parliament, the latter being deemed the less constitutional mode of concession. Now, their lordships had heard the effects of the act of 1793. It had demoralised the country; it had produced great mischief, and no good; and, in addition, it had inflicted serious injury upon the forty-shilling freeholders themselves (hear). He supported the bill now before their lordships from a conviction that it would improve the morals of the country, and add to the peace of Ireland. But as this bill was so intimately connected with another measure still within their lordships' house, he hoped he might be allowed to say a few words upon it.—He had voted against that other measure, but he had done so with pain, as it ever must give him pain to vote against the noble duke, for whom he uniformly entertained the highest respect. But he assured the noble duke and his colleagues, that, in having changed their opinions on this great question, they had not diminished but increased his confidence in them (hear, hear)—for he felt that in doing so they had made great and painful sacrifices to the discharge of their public duty—(hear, hear). And when he saw the noble duke and his friends supported by so many noblemen, whose wisdom, and talent and integrity were unquestioned—men, whose only interest was in the prosperity and tranquillity of the country—so far from distrusting the noble duke, he could not help fearing that his own opinion was not right. He hoped he should find that it was wrong; and when the bill was passed into a law, he trusted it would have the effect of tranquillizing Ireland, of uniting both Protestant and Catholic, or at least of depriving the latter of all cause of complaint; that it would strengthen the hands of government, and give the country at large a more general confidence in the protection of the legislature.

The Marquis of BUTE said that in supporting the bill, he felt that he was conferring a benefit on Ireland, but more particularly on the forty-shilling freeholders themselves.

The Marquis of CLANRICARDE opposed the bill.

The Earl of WINCHILSEA, in his parting speech—(for his lordship announced his intention of not again entering the walls of the house, until the constitution should be carried back to its original principles)—suggested the following plan of reform:—Triennial parliaments instead of Septennial.—That such boroughs as are now owned by individuals should be purchased.—That very root and branch work should be adopted towards the bishops. He would have no translation from See to See; but that where a Bishop is first placed there he should remain, with the exception of the two Archbishoprics and the Bishopric of London. He would deprive the Minister of any power in the appointment of Bishops, leaving it to the Bishops themselves to choose three or four candidates on any vacancy, and submit them to the Throne. He would equalise the revenues of the different Sees; and, finally, he would deprive the Bishops of their seats in the House of Lords.

The Duke of WELLINGTON—I brought your lordships this bill in as nearly a perfect state as I could conceive to be practicable; I entreat you will allow it to be read a second time to-night, that it may go simultaneously to the committee with that other measure, there to be examined; and if your lordships deem it expedient, there to be amended. But I do also entreat that your lordships will not unnecessarily amend it, so as to deprive it of its essential character, as an appendage and auxiliary to the greater measure which it accompanies (hear).

The question being loudly called for, their Lordships divided. For the original motion:—

Content (present) 139
Not content, (present) 17
Majority in favour of the second reading.... ——122

The bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be committed on Thursday next.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,—APRIL 6.

CORPORATION OF APOTHECARIES.

Mr. G. DAWSON presented a petition from certain medical practitioners in the north of Ireland, against the claims set up by the apothecaries' company of Dublin. This company did not prosecute the ignorant or the quack, but some of those gentlemen who were of the first practice, education, and experience. Such a monopoly should not be allowed any longer to exist.

Lord L. GOWER concurred with the prayer of the petitioners, and would use every exertion to put an end to such a vexatious course as was pursued by the corporation of apothecaries.

The petition was ordered to be printed.

IRISH ESTIMATES—COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

The report of the committee of supply was brought up.

On the resolution that the sum of £10,583 be granted for the Protestant charter schools of Ireland,

Mr. HUME said that he understood that the consideration of all the grants of this class would be deferred until after Easter.

Lord F. L. GOWER said that, in answer to a question from the hon. member for Mallow some days since, he had stated that the consideration of three grants respecting education in Ireland, regarding which there was a difference of opinion in the house, would be deferred until after Easter.—The three grants were for the Society for the Suppression of Vice, the Kildare-street Society, and Maynooth College. As to the grant to the Protestant charter schools he had not anticipated any opposition to it.

Mr. HUME said his object was reduction.

Mr. Secretary PEEL thought it had been generally understood that the principle admitted some years ago should be carried into effect. It had been agreed that the charter schools should be abolished as soon as the children upon the establishments should be provided for. This was still the intention of government, and he thought there was no necessity for going into a committee upon the grant.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said that certain of the schools were already abolished.

The resolutions were severally agreed to.

On the order of the day being read for the further consideration of the supply voted to his Majesty for the payment of pensions in Ireland,

Mr. HUME objected to the pension granted to Mr. William C. Smith as a retired paymaster from the Exchequer Bill-office after thirteen years' service, on the ground that Mr. Smith was only forty years of age and capable of service. The hon. member also objected to the pensions proposed to be given to the inspectors, and others of the linen board in Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER defended the propriety of the grant to the linen board in Ireland. The grant was originally made in the time of Queen Anne, for very useful purposes, and to promote a great public benefit for Ireland.

Mr. BROWNLOW (as we understood him) supported the proposed grant.

This and some other resolutions, after some conversational discussion, were agreed to.

After some further discussion the house adjourned.

APRIL 7.

Mr. HUME moved for accounts of the number of freemen attached to the different corporate towns in Ireland, distinguishing non-residents.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER feared that the return could not be made with so much particularity.

Mr. DOHERTY said they were not so distinguished as to enable returns of residents and non-residents.

Mr. HUME observed that if he obtained accounts of the number of those freemen who were entitled to vote, he should be satisfied.

Accounts ordered.

IRISH ESTIMATES.

Lord L. GOWER gave notice that on Thursday next, he should move that the Irish miscellaneous estimates which had been the subject of conversation on a former evening be referred to a select committee.—(Left sitting).

The Mail.

SATURDAY, APRIL 11.

The French papers announce the elevation of Cardinal Castiglione to the Popedom. His Holiness has assumed the name of Pius VIII.; he is 68 years of age, and has been a member of the Sacred College since the year 1816; he was born at Cingoli, Nov. 20, 1761. The ambassador of France, it is reported, endeavoured to procure the election of Cardinal Zurla, who did not obtain a single vote. There is a rumour very generally prevalent at Paris that M. de Chateaubriand, the well known author, is to be made Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

By the London Journals of Wednesday, which arrived in course, we find that the relief bill is regularly progressing. The debates in committee on Tuesday, however, in consequence of their great length were adjourned to next day.

Stephenson, the London banker, and his clerk, arrived safe at Savannah, in the Kingston.

The Brazilian frigate Izabel has arrrived at Falmouth, from Rio Janeiro, she has brought over a Brazilian nobleman, empowered it is said, to settle all differences between Don Pedro and Miguel.

Nothing has occurred since the first announcement of the intention of ministers to propose a bill for the relief of Roman Catholics, so well calculated to inspire the country with confidence, as the fact, that that bill has been approved of by the House of Peers, by a majority so decisive and triumphant, as that of *one hundred and five*. Those who have been the most opposed to the measure, and who, down to the latest period, have had their opposition rather confirmed by the number of petitions daily poured in against it, must now feel their apprehensions greatly diminished and see much to warrant a total change in their sentiments, so far as these were founded on the apparent disproportion of the number by which the measure was supported to that by which it was opposed—a measure carried thus triumphantly through both houses of parliament, must rest on a basis of wisdom and good sense—and must have been supported to a large and most important extent, by honest and independent men—and the very suddenness with which it was at first brought forward, is now an argument in its favour;—for it would be impossible for any minister in so short a time to secure such majorities, if he rested his hopes of success upon an unconstitutional influence, or any corrupt inducements merely. The only subject of amazement now is, how it was possible that things could go on so long with a government divided on such a question. That a decision either way would have been better than such a state of things, both parties were inclined to admit; that it is now made for the best, there are many circumstances which already lead us to hope and believe. The Catholic has now nothing farther to desire—he is on a perfect equality as to civil rights, with his Protestant fellow-subject. With one or two exceptions—and such exceptions as he has no reason to complain of—every post and office is open to him. The wall of separation between him and the Protestant is levelled to the ground. Now nothing but emancipation certainly could have made a cordial reconciliation either thus practicable, or so likely to be permanent. An opposite measure or a different system, might, after the misery experienced from vacillation and indecision, have produced some temporary good, but nothing short of the ample measure which has been now adopted, could give the opportunity—could have created the possibility, if we may use the expression, of the full and entire abandonment of all party hostility and the perfect reciprocation of friendly dealing and feeling between men long estranged from each other. That opportunity is now offered, and we hope will at once be so largely embraced that it will be difficult if not impossible for any future differences—if any such should arise—to produce consequences in any degree comparable for extent and duration to those which have been suffered from the system under which we have lived for the last years.

Thursday, at a meeting of the Council of the Corporation, Alexander Wallace, Esq., son of James Wallace, Esq., was appointed an Assistant or Common Councilman, in the room of Alexander M. Alcock, Esq., lately chosen an Alderman. There is still one vacancy in the Council, the nomination to which rests, we understand, in the Right Hon. Sir John Newport.

The Disfranchisement Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords on Monday night, after a debate and a division, in which there were, without proxies, 139 for the second reading and 17 against it, leaving a majority of 122 in favour of it. Proxies were not called.

There was some rioting in Bristol on Monday evening last, in consequence of the success of the Emancipation Bill in the House of Lords.—The windows of the Roman Catholic chapel, and of several houses belonging to advocates for the measure, were broken by the mob. Several of the rioters were arrested.

Mr. SHEIL.—We learn on highly respectable authority, that Mr. Sheil will have a seat in Parliament immediately after the passing of the relief bill.—*Dublin E. Post.*

Mr. Kean and his son, performed together at Cork theatre on Monday night, before a crowded and delighted audience in the new tragedy of Brutus. The father acted Brutus and his son Titus.

His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant has been pleased to appoint the Rev. Richard Murray, Vicar of Asheaton, to the Deanery of Ardagh, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Graves, T. C. D. The appointment was communicated in very flattering terms to this most worthy divine—an appointment that will impart general satisfaction.—*Limerick Chronicle.*

THE PRESS.

(From the *Dublin Mail.*)

One part of his military character, which the Field Marshal Minister certainly retains in the Senate, is, the indomitable obstinacy with which he stands to his point when once assumed. Hour upon hour it is said, passed at Waterloo, during which a General of less perseverance and resolution would have withdrawn his troops; but in which the Duke, with a noble confidence in his resources, only looked at his watch, and sighed for Blucher. He is the same man in the Senate-house. He has taken his stand. He will triumph, or be annihilated as a Minister. His head is as impervious to reason, argument, experience, or authority, as his hollow squares were to the charges of the French Cavalry. The indignant voice of all England sounds in his ears with as little regard as the portentous batteries of Bonaparte did, while the "distant and random gun" of advancing Prussians kept tune with the ticking of his time-piece; and, inaudibly to others, spoke to him in thunder, of a successful issue of his protracted contest. And his was the glory of Waterloo—

"He won the day,
"Like prudent Fabius by delay."

His too will be the glory, such as it may be, of overcoming the British Constitution by the impenetrable obstinacy of his position; and to all future generations of British subjects he will stand enamoured by

"The whistling of a name,
"Like Cromwell, damned to everlasting fame."

(From the *Morning Chronicle* of Monday).

We believe few people were prepared for such an overwhelming majority as that by which the second reading of the Catholic relief bill was carried on Saturday night. The highest number anticipated, even in quarters likely to be well informed, was sixty or seventy. A majority of 105, in a total of 329, annihilates at once the hopes of those who conceived that they would be countenanced in their appeals to the ignorance and prejudices of the people, by the strength of the opposition to the measures of ministers in the House of Lords. The cry was, dissolve the parliament; but they must now cry also, annihilate the House of Lords. What a state we must be in, if parliament sympathise so little with the country that votes of two to one, in both houses, are not to be considered indicative of the sense of the nation! When we see this great majority in both houses—and when, on the other hand, we look to the arguments urged in opposition to the measure—the narrow ground taken by the bishops, with whom the security and prosperity of the Empire, and the happiness of five or six millions of human beings, were not deemed of sufficient moment to be even taken into consideration—the pitiful cavilling of the judicial faction respecting clauses in bills and treaties of union, and the intention with which certain oaths were prescribed, as if the means were to be preferred to the end, the welfare of the nation, the miserable arguments *ad hominem* of another class of opponents, as if the proving that the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Peel had formerly held opinions widely different from those which they now professed, were sufficient reasons for refusing assent to a measure, the necessity and importance of which could not be denied. When we discover this poverty of mind—this lack of all Statesman-like views in the opposers of the measure—where a proud array of talent was enlisted in support of it—and when we reflect upon the important declaration with which the Duke of Wellington closed the debate on Saturday night, we hardly know what to think of the circumstances by which the fate of nations is determined. "When my colleagues and myself," said His Grace, "determined to adopt this measure, we did so with a determination to sacrifice ourselves and our popularity to the duty which we owe to our sovereign and to the country at large. We knew very well, that if we had chosen to put ourselves at the head of the Protestant cry of 'no Popery,' we should have become much more popular, than those who have raised the cry of 'no Popery' against us. But we felt that in doing so we should leave a burden, by which it must ultimately have been borne down; and further, that we should deserve the hate and execration of the country."

(From the *Limerick Chronicle.*)

The ultimate fate of this great and momentous question is now decided beyond any moral hazard—the overwhelming majority of 105 voices in the House of Peers, secures its success in all the future stages. Its triumph is morally certain. Heaven grant then, that it may operate as an effectual sanative of the ills, real or imaginary, which its advocates ascribe to the agitation of this measure—that the happy boon will be accepted in that spirit of gratitude and good will, which a concession so important is calculated to elicit—and that it may finally conduce to the pacification and prosperity of this long distracted country. Such is the feeling of all men of every party, and of every creed, whatever may have been their apprehension of the consequence of a change equally sudden and unexpected in the laws of England. Time and the progress of events may seem to dissipate this alarm, honestly and conscientiously as it was entertained, and we firmly believe that in such case the Protestants of Ireland will unite with the same degree of sincerity to promote the happiness of our common country, as their brethren of the Roman Catholic communion—and perhaps to lament that a feeling of distrust had ever estranged fellow-Christians in their native land. May the mutual charities of social life be henceforward cultivated more extensively, and the blessings of peace and concord extinguish for ever the unkindly growth of enmity and disorder. Let the only struggle be, who shall best benefit the State.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

Mr. North has, within these few days, been canvassing the college. Mr. Croker, it is thought will be raised to the peerage. In the event of a vacancy occurring shortly, Mr. Sergeant Lefroy will be returned.—*Dublin Paper.*

MR. O'CONNELL.

The fan-famed "member for Clare" reached Newry on Friday evening, between six and seven o'clock, on his return from Down assizes to the metropolis. His stay was short and hurried—several hundreds of the populace assembled on the occasion, and exhibited the usual noisy demonstrations of Irish regard and attachment. Further, we are informed, they might have proceeded—but the honourable and learned gentleman deprecated the slightest delay, *humbly* intimating to his friends, that if they desired *immediate* emancipation, they ought not wish to detain *him* an instant from his *duties* (!) in England !!! Off, then, he went, in his chaise and four, amid cheers and shouts which made the welkin ring: but, we confess, we entertain some doubts that, after all, the honourable gentleman would be able to "attend *mass* at *Oxford*, on Sunday," as gravely announced in *the Evening Post*. A contemporary states, that on Mr. O'Connell passing through Dundalk, a balloon of extraordinary dimensions (prepared by a party of the 17th *lancers* at present quartered in that town) elegantly ornamented with loyal and national emblems, ascended from the quay in magnificent style. On one side of the balloon was represented the King, holding an olive branch entwined with shamrocks: on the other, the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, *and Mr. O'Connell*, sounding the trumpet of victory !"—*Newry Telegraph.*

THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION—A history of this remarkable society, which has of late been the subject of so much discussion, and which exercised such an extraordinary influence in the sister kingdom, is announced for immediate publication, from its commencement in 1760 to its dissolution in 1829. It is said to be written by a leading member of that body.—*London Paper.*

The accounts from Manchester, Leeds, Macclesfield, Blackburn, and others manufacturing towns, are as unsatisfactory as ever. In some places, the men have turned out for higher wages, though even at the present rates the masters find it almost impossible to carry on business. Several failures, we regret to hear, are spoken of—we hope not to the extent reported to us.

An unparalleled stagnation pervades all commercial pursuits; transactions are on a very reduced scale, and are, for the most part, wholly without profit. In some articles, and those the most important, the trade is attended with very serious loss. We have heard the loss on the import of cotton into Liverpool stated at 20,000*l* per week, and we believe it is not exaggerated, though the price is lower than was ever before known. All commodities are daily sinking in price, the demand is decreasing, and the confidence which formerly induced speculations is entirely at an end. In the mining and manufacturing districts the causes we have mentioned are producing similar effects. In the iron counties, Staffordshire, &c., the distress is greatly felt, and the daily loss is stated at an enormous sum. In Manchester a meeting of the spinners has been held to deliberate on the loss attending their trade; and a general feeling is abroad among them in favour of a material diminution or a total abandonment of their business. In Leicester a similar meeting has been held, at which 60 hosiers attended, when they resolved to discontinue their manufactures for one month, in the hope of the demand then increasing. In Sheffield, and other seats of the hardware manufactory, the complaints of the state of trade are loud and general. Nothing but the scarcity has kept up the price of corn, but other agricultural produce had not been exempt from the general fall; cheese at the fair held at Ashbourne, fell 10s per cwt. and the price of Irish butter is lower than it has been for the last 20 years. In short, the depression of commerce and manufactures has already produced a general feeling of alarm, and it is daily, nay, hourly increasing.—*Liverpool Chronicle.*

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

The following bishops voted for the bill:—

BISHOPS—Winchester, Norwich, Rochester, Litchfield; St. David's, Oxford, Llandaff, Chester, Kildare, Derry.

The following voted against it:—

ARCHBISHOPS—Canterbury, York, Armagh.

BISHOPS—London, Durham, Worcester, Hereford, Salisbury, St. Asaph, Ely, Bath and Wells, Peterborough, Lincoln, Exeter, Gloucester, Chichester, Bristol, Carlisle, Meath.

DECREASE OF THE REVENUE!

On this quarter's Revenue, compared with the corresponding quarter of last year, there is a deficiency of £546,912. This fearful decrease was principally on the Customs, Excise, Stamps, and Post office. When we consider that the Newspaper department was never more luxuriant, and that the treasury has derived, *at the expense of the agricultural classes*, a large and unusual duty on foreign corn, we see in this ominous deficiency bitter food for cogitation. Are we on the eve of a national bankruptcy, as a *finale* to the Peel and Huskisson theories? We can add, that not only in England, but also in this country, the banks have been compelled to diminish their discounts to an unprecedented degree. Trade, therefore, must be still further cramped, national distress still further increased, and the Revenue still further diminished!—*Dublin Paper.*

The remarkable fact was stated by the Earl of Westmoreland, that with the exception of three persons, *every* statesman who has been called to the Cabinet, either by the late King or his present Majesty, is now favourable to the Relief Bill. The three excepted persons are—Lord Eldon, Lord Bexley, and Lord Sidmouth.

In *The Monthly Magazine* for April, we find the Coronation Oath, and the Rat Cabinet—The editors' notes of the Month on the Waterloo Duke and his Duel, the picked out Marquess, the Spinning Jenny Apostate, Garth's Grand Secret, Sir Thomas Lethbridge, Miss Sontag, her little one, and Sam. Rogers, Sir Jeffery Gimcrack, Prince Hohenlohe, and the Earl of ——, &c., and exclusively of all the general matter that can interest or amuse, in a Magazine, about 10 or 12 striking articles, of fact, fiction, and criticism on all the popular topics of the day. *The Monthly Magazine*, now devoted to the Protestant Cause, is at once the most original, the most talented, and the most useful periodical we possess.

PORTRAIT OF VISCOUNTESS BARRINGTON.—This gem of art, the semblance of all that is beautiful and lovely in woman, forms the leading attraction of this month's La Belle Assemblee, a work of unrivalled merit in literature and the fine arts. Lady Barrington's portrait is from the exquisite pencil of Mr. James Robertson. In the three succeeding numbers of this periodical, we have (independently of four coloured figures, in modern costume, in each), the Duchess of Northumberland, the Marchioness Wellesley, and the Hon. Mr. Charles Lindsay; and, forthcoming, are those of the Hon. Mrs. Charles Arbuthnot, and Lady Charlotte Bury, both by Sir Thomas Lawrence; Lady Normanby, by Jackson; Lady Ellenborough; the Viscountess Eastnor; Lady Anne Ramsay, by Mrs. James Robertson, &c. It is creditable to the taste of the age, that a work so conducted, with unsparing expense, should carry with it the universal patronage of the highest circles.

THE MARKETS.

Waterford, April 11.—In the prices of all kinds of corn, flour, and oatmeal there is not the slightest change since our last. The supply from farmers is small, and business of every kind in this city is, at the present moment, remarkably dull. New butter, 82s to 85s per cwt.; 67 firkins weighed yesterday. Bacon pigs, singed, 32s to 33s; scalded, 24s to 28s per cwt. In other articles no change.

ASSIZE OF BREAD FOR THE ENSUING WEEK.

	White.	Ranged.	Household.
	lb. oz. drs.	lb. oz. drs.	lb. oz. drs.
Penny	0 4 5	0 7 0	0 9 1
Twopenny	0 9 2	0 14 0	1 2 2
Fourpenny	1 2 6	1 12 1	2 4 4
Sixpenny	1 12 1	2 10 2	3 6 7

Middle price of wheat and flour last week, was 35s 6d per barrel, besides an allowance of 8s per quarter on white and ranged, and 10s on household, for the benefit of the baker. Purchased by bakers last week 660 cwt. of flour.

London Corn-Exchange, April 6.—The wheat, barley, and oat trade was heavy to-day, but prices not lower than on last market day.

APRIL 8.—Our supply is 2900 sacks of flour, 2500 qrs. of wheat, 1800 of barley, 5800 of oats, 11,400 of Irish oats, 18,350 sacks of flour, 1950 qrs. of barley, and 1000 of oats. We have nothing doing in our market this morning, and the prices of all grain remain unaltered.

Liverpool, April 7.—The firmness in Mark-lane on Friday last gave a little more confidence to holders, and at this morning's market wheat fully recovered the depression of the week: inferior descriptions were, however, bought on rather better terms. We note oats 1d to 1d per bushel cheaper and dull. The quotations for other grain remain same as last week.

BIRTH.

On Thursday morning, at Newtown Lodge, the lady of Joseph D. Latham, Esq., of a son.

MARRIED,

On the 4th inst. at the Friends' Meeting House, Ballintore, county of Wexford, Mr. Joseph Haughton to Miss Abigail Wright, both of Ferns.

April 6, at London, the Hon. George Henry Talbot, brother and heir presumptive to the Earl of Shrewsbury, to Miss Augusta Jones, of Greek-street, Soho.

DIED,

Thursday morning, at Larchgrove, (the residence of his son, Robert Francis Sargent, Esq.), in his 78th year, Thomas Sargent, Esq. Mr. S. was an old and respectable inhabitant of Waterford, and formerly a member of the Corporation, and served in the office of Sheriff in 1790. He was always distinguished for the urbanity and kindness of his manners—He was a pleasing companion, and in all the relations of life his conduct entitled him to universal esteem. By his family and friends his memory will long be cherished.

April 2, at Brighton, the Hon. Miss Caroline Vernon, for many years Maid of Honour to the late Queen Caroline.

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE.

ARRIVED—7th, and 8th, none—9th, Nora Creina (steamer) Stracy, Bristol, gen. cargo; Munster Lass, Chappell, St. John's N. B. timber—Peregrine, Propert, Pembray coals.

SAILED.—7th, Eliza Williams, Barnes, London, provisions—Pembroke, Hurlow, Milford, ballast—Jane, Howlan, Newport, do.—Providence, Jones; Devonshire, Lowther; Britannia, Jones; Swansea, ballast—Gleaner, Rosser, do. limestone—William, Beer, do. flour and bacon—Selsey, Lancaster, Penryn, flour—Auspicious, Loveridg, Bristol, do. and wheat.—8th, Kingstown (steamer), Soy, Cork, gen. cargo—9th, Gipsy (steamer), Owen, Liverpool, do—Invulnerable, Phelan, St. John's N. F. L. provisions and passengers—Despatch, Jones, Liverpool, wheat—Peace Lowther, Swansea, limestone—10th, Hope, Colgin, Glasgow, ballast (from Dunmore).

Wind at 8, A. M. N. N. W.

Arrived from Waterford, at London, April 3d, Malcolm, Pond; Sultan, Read,—8th, Fame, Miller,—5th, Clonmel, Davies; Margaret, Duck. At Portsmouth—4th, France and Mary, Gray,—5th, Favourite, Duck. At Shoreham—3d, Regent, Blaber.

SHIP NEWS.

The Munster Lass abovementioned is a new steamer, belonging to Thomas Neyins, Esq., of this city; she is 282 tons register (80 larger than the Nora Creina). She will be immediately supplied with steam engines equal to her burden and is intended we understand to ply between this city and some port in England. In lat. 40 N. long. 60 W. she fell in with an American schooner in distress, the crew having been twenty-five days living on nuts, part of her cargo. Capt. Chappell took the crew and part of the cargo and stores on board, and brought them in here.

*** This Journal is extensively circulated in the counties of Waterford, Wexford, Tipperary, Kilkenny, and Carlow It is taken at all the public News-rooms. It is filed at the Commercial Buildings, and at Johnston and Co's., Newspaper agents, *Dublin*—at the Chapter, and Peele's Coffee-house, and at Newton, and Barker's, agents, *London*; at the Exchange, and *Lyceum* News-rooms, *Liverpool*; at the Commercial Rooms, *Bristol*, and at various other places of public resort in both kingdoms.

SUBSCRIPTION YEARLY.

Country £2 8 0
Town 2 5 0

Days of Publication—*Wednesday and Saturday.*

Published at the Waterford Mail Printing Office, Orange Place, Quay, by WILLIAM DARE, to whom all papers for subscriptions, advertisements, &c. are to be addressed.

Supplement to the Waterford Mail,

Of SATURDAY, April 11, 1829.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE,

In continuation from Last Page of the Mail.

Lord ELDON.—Their exclusion from the Navy was provided for by a separate act.

Lord GREY.—That makes no difference; the same argument still applies. In 1807, he then holding the office of Principal Secretary of State, brought in a bill for the partial relief of the R. Catholics. Under the provisions of that bill concessions were made to Catholics entering the army; and it was held, both in that house and out of it, that if you gave the Catholics the power of the sword, it would be easy for them to take all else they required (hear, hear). The sovereign, too, was induced to declare, that any assent to the proposition would be a violation of his coronation oath. Another administration was formed, and formed upon the principle of the strictest exclusion of the Roman Catholics. Those very ministers who declaimed so virulently against any attempt to break in upon the act of William III., came down to this house, and proposed to offer to the Catholics, not the army, which was the object of the bill of 1807, but the navy as well as the army, and that proposition passed into a law, almost *sub silentio*. By this measure, a manifest invasion of the *unchangeable* act of William III., all ranks of the army and navy were open to the Roman Catholics, and a person of that persuasion may even now obtain the rank of commander-in-chief (hear). The act of union has been called by a noble lord a national compact between England and Scotland. Admitting it to be so, have not the articles of union with Scotland been repeatedly departed from? By the act of union it was provided that the government of the church of Scotland should remain in the same condition as during the reign of William and Mary. Under their government all pastors of the church of Scotland were chosen by the Heritors; but it being found necessary to alter this, the power of appointing was transferred to the crown. After an alteration of that kind, what becomes of that kind of *sacrosanct* obligation which the noble earl imputed to its supporters? By the sixth article of the act of union, it was provided that as all importation of foreign corn tends manifestly to the injury of the agriculture of Scotland, no further change is to be made in the laws upon that subject, until the united parliament shall have taken into consideration the means of carrying into effect an enactment for the entire discouragement of importation (cheers.) What then became of the assertion that the act of union is inviolate? (hear, hear.) Then what was done in the case of the heritable jurisdictions? At the time of the union, it was provided that the land tax of Scotland should be calculated in a certain proportion to that of England, and that, at no future period, Scotland should ever be called upon to pay a land-tax exceeding that calculated proportion. It became necessary for the government of this country to impose a property-tax; and that was, in effect, a tax imposed on land; but the proportion reserved by the act of union was altogether abandoned. It was impossible, after this, to contend, with any sense of decency, that parliament either has or can be restricted in its interference with the provisions of this act. The noble lord then made some observations on the Coronation oath. Among Lord Somers's tracts is one which contained the answer of King William to a memorial presented by James II., when at Lisbon; in that memorial the King's opinion was asked frankly, as to the repeal of those laws which related to the Roman Catholic religion. King William, in reply, certainly stated that he did not think it advisable, under the existing circumstances, to repeal those laws which prevented the admission of the Roman Catholics into Parliament; but even then it did not appear that he thought such a measure in contradiction of his coronation oath; for King William stated, that if the Catholics behaved themselves so well as to obtain the confidence of the remainder of the nation, those laws might be repealed at some future time (hear, hear). In the articles of Limerick it was expressly provided that the Roman Catholics should enjoy all those privileges which they had been in the enjoyment of in the time of King Charles II. (hear, hear), and that they should, consequently, be entitled to sit in Parliament with only taking the oath of allegiance, leaving out altogether the oath of supremacy. These were among the articles negociated by General De Gwinckle and the Lords Justices; and those very articles were afterwards ratified by King William III., under the great seal of England. Now, would King William have given his sanction, or have set to his seal in ratification of such articles, if he had thought that the admission of the Roman Catholics to their seats in Parliament was in violation of the oath he had taken? (hear, hear). He read an extract from a letter of John Lord Yester, second marquis of Tweedale, the purport of which was, that King William had declared himself in council as to the oath; and the sense in which he understood it was, that it bound him to maintain the church as by law established, reserving liberty to the legislature to make what alterations they might hereafter think fit. The noble and learned lord said that the Catholics aimed at political power, as if it were a species of power which they claimed for the purpose rather of invading the rights of others than of protecting their own. This measure gives power to the Roman Catholics, but then it is a power which is an essential ingredient of the British Constitution. The subjects of this country were the freeest in the world, and they enjoyed privileges of which others were deprived. Why is this? Because they possessed political power and civil rights—(hear, hear)—and indeed these were the necessary and indefeasible components of a free government. Take away these privileges from the people of Great Britain, and they will become slaves instead of subjects (hear, hear). Or take them from any portion of the people of Great Britain, and that portion will be slaves, with this additional aggravation and injury—that they will not only be insecure against the insults of the government, but open also to those injuries which arise from being degraded in their rights, and distinguished as a separate and particular caste of society—(cheers).—The energy which they displayed in endeavouring to obtain that which was their unalienable right constituted one of their best claims to it—(cheers). The political power of which the noble and learned lord was so much afraid was a thing to which the Roman Catholics were entitled. The points that the Roman Catholics will obtain in consequence of the passing of this bill will be seats in parliament, and the eligibility to any office (with one or two necessary exceptions) that it may be the pleasure of the crown to bestow upon them, and to any dignities that the law can afford. But what is the political power that the Roman Catholics now possess? (hear). They possess the power of being eligible for certain offices, which it is not necessary to specify—of admission into the army and navy; a power which, as has been well observed, is one that may extend itself enormously, and which even as it stands is a great and important power. They possess the power of the elective franchise (hear). All these things are already possessed by the Roman Catholics; but they possess them with a feeling that they are still unjustly treated But what is the addition that is proposed? The Roman Catholics are to be privileged to hold seats in the two houses of parliament. The way in which those who were opposed to this bill looked at all this was very curious; they talked as if the whole of these offices were to be surrendered at once, and the council, the bench, and the parliament, to be in a moment overwhelmed by the incursions of the Catholics—(hear, hear, and a laugh). But how was all this to come to pass? In the first place they must suppose the King so fascinated on this point, as to forget all the services that he has received from his Protestant servants, for the sake of trying the novelty of a Catholic ministry; next, that the Protestant people of England will become all at once so enamoured with the Roman Catholic religion as to be unable to find followers of any other faith sufficiently to their taste to represent them in parliament. A noble viscount (Sidmouth) who preceded him that evening, detailed the measures he would propose for the relief of the condition of Ireland; but would the proposals he made offer any objection to the adoption of this bill, or be carried into effect until this bill has passed into a law? (hear). What had they been about for the last twenty or thirty years, but endeavouring to do without this measure in Ireland, while the things proposed by the noble lord were to be met with at every turn. The consequence has been that the power of parliament has been crushed—the energies of the executive government have been paralyzed, and all attempts at amelioration or improvement have been destroyed. But it is asked by those who are opposed to the Catholics, will this measure tranquillize Ireland? He did not venture to say that it will at once give tranquillity to Ireland; but without this law it was impossible to have tranquillity, or to be free from danger. Looking at the dangers likely to arise in the time of war, was it not the duty of every statesman to meet the danger by the promotion of a conciliatory feeling. The noble and learned lord said, that one effect of this measure would be to destroy the established church. The only fear he ever had for the church of England was, from the impolitic laws which have been enacted under the pretence of supporting it, but the only effect of which could be the weakening of its cause—(hear). With respect to the church of Ireland, the case did not stand exactly in the same point of view. That church was placed in a situation which could not be freed from difficulties of one sort or another—(hear, hear). The great obstacle to its triumph has always been, that, under all circumstances, it has never been more than the church of a small minority of the people of Ireland—(hear). That it is the church of so very small a minority, was in a great degree owing to those very laws against which we are now struggling—(cheers.). Take away that false protection of exclusionary laws, and the ministers of that church whose doctrines are of superior truth and excellence, will prevail in the conflict of the argument. One of the greatest of all evils dreaded from this measure was, the ascendancy of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland, and its establishment as the religion of that country. If there was any measure that would prevent that result, it was the measure now under discussion. But see the difficulties which would arise from the existence of a Roman Catholic church in combination with a foreign power, and united in close alliance and affection with the See of Rome. What security would be then for that branch of the church of England which was established in Ireland, if the Roman Catholic church had acquired the ascendancy? Those who opposed this measure have alluded to the possible case of the Irish Roman Catholics going beyond the bounds of prudence, and, by insurrection against the constituted authorities giving this country an opportunity of employing military force with effect. This suggestion was almost a reproach to the noble duke, as if he would have had the weakness to have recourse to measures of severe coercion. But the noble duke has refuted the imputation admirably—(hear). His forbearance which was made a reproach as an instance of weakness, was a proof of his great magnanimity, and of the wisdom on which, above all, true courage depends. It was honourable to him that he, a soldier by profession, stated that he would shrink with fear and horror at the prospect of the barbarities and atrocities of a civil war (cheers). But if they resorted to the cruelties of a civil war, and it were successful, would that success be complete and effectual? Let the events in Ireland since the rebellion of 1798 answer the question. Have the flames of disaffection ceased to burn since the blood of the people was shed over them. No, the bloodshed did not extinguish them, but spread over the country into one general conflagration. Besides, the Catholics of Ireland did not offer an open resistance; theirs is a secret discontent, a spirit against the government, which is nourished until the opportunity shall offer to take advantage of what may be passing. They are animated by the spirit described by our great Poet:—

"The unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit or yield."

The certain result of the policy on which his Majesty's government proposed to act towards Ireland will be highly beneficial for that country. This measure will be as a noble marquis said last night, the beginning of the regeneration of Ireland—(cheers).

Lord TENTERDEN said a few words in explanation.

Lord REDESDALE shortly addressed the house, but in so low a tone as to be inaudible at the bar.

The Earl of ELDON was called upon by several noble lords.—I am called upon, my lords, again to deliver my opinions on a subject the most important that was ever agitated in Parliament. But on this occasion, to those who think with me I shall have nothing new to address, and those who differ with me I will not attempt to convince. I shall be very unwilling to trespass at length upon your lordships' attention, as I have so often repeated my views of this question. I must begin by telling my noble friend (Earl Grey) who has spoken of me as the leader of the opposition to this bill, that I have no intention of sustaining the character of a leader of any party in this house. I believe in my conscience that the noble duke has made this proposition because he felt it to be his duty to the country; but it was a matter of great surprise at the moment at which it was made. But I must say that, as it applies to the noble duke himself and the other ministers, I have no doubt that this bill was introduced as a matter of duty on their part towards the country; and they may have judged it necessary, under the circumstances, even to make it a matter of surprise. Some nights ago, a noble lord remarked that it was the duty of a Prime Minister not to discover what measures he was going to pursue until he had obtained the approbation of his sovereign to the proposition he was going to make. But as in this instance, it happened to be revealed by some mistake, the public were taught to believe that no such proposition would come from that quarter.—I do insist, therefore, that the people of this country have in fact been taken by surprise with this measure, which they conceive, and justly, affects their dearest interests in this world, and their best property; for Lord Somers, when speaking of the established church as the property of the people, remarks, "that it is the best property we can leave as an inheritance to those who will come after us."—When this question was discussed in this house last session, the noble duke stated, in reference to Ireland, that that country was "in such a state of agitation that no attempt could be made to settle the question, and that the question should for a time be consigned to oblivion." A letter of the noble duke to a Roman Catholic prelate, in December last, stated that it was not the noble duke's intention at that time to bring forward any measure of this kind, and that Ireland must cease to be in a state of agitation before he could do so. Now, the publication of this letter has been, I must say, towards the people of this country, a great misfortune; for it led them to sink into a state of apathy, generated by the persuasion that no measure would be brought forward at any rate this session (cheers). This was the case also in consequence of what passed in other places where the right honourable gentleman (the Secretary of State for the Home department) was visiting last summer. I do solemnly declare that if there be any unfavourable impression on the mind of that right honourable gentleman towards me, thinking perhaps that the old maxim, "*Idem velle, idem nolle,*" is the foundation of all true friendship both in public and private life, that I suffered the most excruciating pang I ever endured, when I found that I differed from him on this question. I do not doubt that it has happened from his feelings of duty, that he has felt himself bound to change his opinions, and act on another system, and while I state that with respect to him, I hope he will admit with respect to me, that if I have not changed my opinions, it is because I think my duty to my king, to my fellow-subjects, and to my country, requires that I should not do so (cheers.) The late Lord Privy Seal (Lord Westmorland) whom I am sorry not to see in his place, has been pleased to arraign me for my conduct while we were fellow-servants of our Sovereign; I can only say, that if the charge be made upon just grounds, that noble lord is not free from impeachment for so long suffering me to sit with him in the King's Councils. I heard the proposition laid down last night, that it was the duty of any man who found himself a member of a divided Cabinet to withdraw from it. I have heard a different opinion from Mr. Pitt and Lord Liverpool, and I could not feel it my duty to retire from a Cabinet which was divided unless an opportunity presented itself of forming a united Cabinet. The noble lord on the Woolsack will excuse me for stating, that if he considered it his duty not to remain a Member of a divided Cabinet, he must have extremely good luck to go through the Cabinet up to a certain period, of his friend the Duke of Wellington—the Cabinet of his esteemed friend Viscount Goderich—and the Cabinet of his honourable friend Mr. Canning (hear, and laughter.) When we are arguing this question let me at once say that I do not at all rely upon the construction which some persons have put upon His Majesty's Coronation oath; the sole intent and meaning of which is, that his Majesty is bound to execute the laws the Legislature imposed upon him. I do not at all, I say, place any dependance upon the construction of that oath—I rather prefer going at once into the spirit and principle of the Constitution as cemented in 1688 (hear.) The full and fair purpose of the law was this only, that the Constitution should be essentially Protestant; the Throne Protestant; the Parliament Protestant, and the great officers of State Protestant. I do not contend that however necessary at the time were these precautions, they were never under any change of circumstances to be liable to alteration. All I mean to show is, that such was the nature of the Act of tenth Charles II. and twenty-fifth and thirtieth, which were all directed to maintain an exclusively Protestant ascendancy. Exactly in the same spirit was the Act of Queen Anne for the Union of Scotland. That was the clear and plain governing principle. I know enough of history to know, however, that laws so planted must abide the eventual modification of circumstances. But it must be upon a clear and palpable ground of necessity. The feelings of the people are identified with these laws. These feelings will necessarily be affected by any alteration of them. Where, then is this necessity? Show it to me and I will endeavour to deal with it. At present I deny its existence. I see it not. I can therefore neither shape my course by it, nor grapple with it (hear,) I think I may venture to say, the duty is felt both by him and you, as one of the most prominent duties you have to execute, to preserve in this Protestant kingdom the Protestant religion inviolate. My lords, if the safety of this Protestant Kingdom is to be preserved, it is to be preserved by a Protestant King, a Protestant house of Peers, and a Protestant house of Commons. This bill only excluded one minister from being a Catholic, and to this, therefore, he attached little value, because it might so happen that a Protestant Lord Chancellor might be considerably under the influence of a powerful Prime minister (hear, hear.) The principle of the measure which it proposed to repeal was an old one. Your lordships have heard a great deal about the taking of oaths; you have heard that the act imposing them was obtained by a kind of stratagem! but I have the satisfaction to state, that the old act registry excluded the persons of the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics, it had been said, are not mentioned in any acts of an early period; and your lordships have heard a great deal about the enactments in the time of Elizabeth: but I shall carry you back a century before, and shew your lordships that the legislature, which was then as fondly attached to liberty as at any time, had passed laws of this description, of which the act of Elizabeth was only a confirmation, intended to protect liberties of a still higher date. The legislators and the monarchs of England, who lived anterior to the time of Magna Charta, had maintained the King's supremacy as necessary to protect liberty; and the declaration of the King's supremacy was neither more nor less than a resolution, guarding the crown from any risk of having the allegiance of the subjects transferred to the See of Rome. In *Hale's pleas of the crown*, he lays it down that the obligation is most imperative; and he says, that to say the Pope has any power in the country is con-

trary to the oath of allegiance, and that those who contracted that obligation were also bound to acknowledge the King's supremacy, both in ecclesiastical and spiritual matters. The acts made since that time are not, therefore, an encroachment on the privileges of the Roman Catholics. Those who maintain they are, commit a great error, if they knew of those of which Lord Hale speaks, who says, that they who throw off these fetters must take an additional oath of supremacy. He states that his Majesty's power is supreme in the state, and that to deny this is neither more nor less than revolution. Another topic to which I shall advert, is one alluded to by a right rev. prelate who informed their lordships last year that they were to give way to the sense of the people, as expressed in their petitions, though the greater part of these petitions declared that the rights of the established church were a most intolerable abuse. Were he now to support such an opinion, see what would be the consequence. If you look, to the nature of the case, you will see that there is no security provided for the church; and the bill proposes, in one clause, to admit persons to have a seat in this and the other house of parliament who do not acknowledge the King's supremacy in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, and who are united in opinions with those who look on the established church as an intolerable abuse. The oath the bill imposes, give away, by legislative enactment, the claim of his Majesty to the duty of his subjects. If my noble friend on the opposite bench, who perhaps thinks my authority on such subjects worth nothing, had consulted me, I might have prevented him doing that even by this bill, or doing away with the oath of supremacy to satisfy the Catholics. The measure is described as necessary to give a new buttress and support to the church of England—a support which I fancy is to supply the place of that which was taken away by the Act of last Session for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act. Against that Act, if I voted, it was because I thought it would injure the Church, and on the same principle I mean to vote against this measure. Is it probable, that it will strengthen the Protestant Church? Will those for whose benefit it is intended pledge themselves to support that Church? I answer, no; quite the contrary, as they state themselves, and avow by their abominable proceedings. Will they defend the Church in future, who have already described that Church as the greatest nuisance on the earth? (cheers.) They do not scruple to say so, my Lords. Will they travel with you when your object is to preserve the existence of the Established Church? Are their assertions, then, to be received as deserving implicit credit, while every word which falls from the members of the Established Church is to be regarded as destitute of truth! We have heard enough of the statute of Mary, in relation to the King's supremacy, and supporting the power of the Pope in ecclesiastical and spiritual matters. To these remarks I shall not further reply than by showing that the Catholic religion is, in respect to the ambition of its head, unchanged. I need not go back very far, but if any credit is to be given to the persons who lived at that time, no change whatever had then taken place in the opinions of the Church of Rome from what they were in the most ancient times. The doctrines of that Church, I believe, as they are in general entertained, are the same to this day in spiritual matters—at least they are the same to a great degree. It is, I say then, the duty of the ministers, looking to the duty the subjects are bound to pay the sovereign, and looking to the consequence of this measure, not to sacrifice the supremacy of the Crown—(hear). Your lordships have now been addressed by a great many peers, and I waited to this period of the debate before I addressed you, because I was willing to hear all the arguments which could be urged in favour of the measure. I have listened studiously to the speeches which have been delivered, and I expected to hear from the noble earl (Grey) some new reasons for agreeing to this measure. But after listening to all the arguments stated in its favour, I must say that the subject seems just where it was before. I give great credit to the statements which have been made, and I shall take care at a more favourable opportunity to examine all the clauses when they can be discussed in the committee. It will be much better to listen to the arguments in favour of the several clauses of the bill in that stage, and to remove their consequences; and at present I shall let it stand to that stage of the proceedings. The noble lord has stated, that if their lordships were in possession of all he knew, they would not scruple to pass the Bill. I shall be always an enemy to going into Committees to inquire into reasons, unknown to others than the Ministers, the operation of which is to influence the Members of this House to pass any measure, when Parliament is not to know the reasons for introducing it. I have one thing more to say; I will never consent because some of his Majesty's subjects are of a different religion from him, to point the finger of dissatisfaction against the Sovereign, but it is rather against the laws it should be directed. I have thought it my duty, in the course of these discussions, to pay great attention to the Petitions of the people; and though I may lament the apathy of the people, I must still observe that there has been some display of public feeling. With respect to the opinion of Mr. Pitt, at the time of the Union with Ireland, what I know of that great man's opinions is this, that he said he never would give his consent to any change without a full and sufficient security. I never could learn what the security was which he contemplated; but I know also that that great man never would, if he found the people of this country uneasy, have consented to pass such a measure (loud cheers).

Lord PLUNKET said he would not at this time of the night attempt to review the opinions stated by the noble lord who had just sat down. After the arguments of the noble lord on the Woolsack, and the noble earl (Earl Grey) little was left to him to say. It was said that expediency was not a justifiable ground for legislation; but be denied it, if the expediency were founded upon justice. Was there a violation of justice here? Was not expediency the ground of the exclusion of the Catholics? He fearlessly answered in the affirmative. Privilege and franchise were the benefit of a free constitution, and exclusion was the exception. If under the system followed in her civil concerns, Ireland has outstripped all calculation; and if, in direct opposition to this, she is suffering under political laws, and is discontented, what can be the cause but those laws? The Catholics have, during the last fifty years, been advancing in wealth, in knowledge, and in numbers. In proportion as you promote the education of the people, and increase their wealth and intelligence, your danger, if you persist in this exclusive system, will be three times as great as before—(hear). It is in vain, then, while this most unjust, impolitic, and irritating system is continued, to talk of producing peace, good order, and affection, to the State by ameliorating the condition of the people, and promoting the progress of civilization among them, and increasing intelligence and wealth. The object can never be attained in that way. The attempt to govern a people on such a principle is perfectly wild and impracticable. It is a complete solecism, and is condemned by both theory and practice, and is contrary to the system which has been acted on by every civilized government. If you continue to conduct the government on the principle of exclusion, discontent becomes a force which is fitted for any thing; it is a whirlpool which draws vices and virtues, knowledge and ignorance, talent and imbecility, wealth and poverty, all into its overwhelming vortex. The noble lord contended that there had been nothing in the conduct of the Catholics which warranted the supposition that they would do any thing to subvert the Protestant church after taking the oath provided by this bill. An establishment was not a principle of religion, but merely a political institution; and therefore it by no means followed that because a man is a sincere and honest Catholic, he must necessarily feel disposed to invade the rights of the Protestant church establishment. The English church establishment was intimately connected and bound up with the established church of Ireland; therefore, neither the English establishment, nor the state authorities in England and Ireland, would ever permit the established church of Ireland to be injured, or the Protestant ascendancy, in the proper sense of the word, to be destroyed. The noble and learned lord on the cross bench said, that though the Protestant church establishment was safe now, when there was a Protestant King on the throne, there would be no security when the throne might be occupied by a Papist, who might pretend that he was a Protestant. Why, really, I know of no security which the law affords against that happening, even as matters stand—(cheers). I know of no law at present to guard against hypocrisy—(cheers).

Lord FARNHAM should have addressed their lordships at an earlier period of the debate, but for his willingness to give way to other noble lords who were anxious to do so. At that late hour he could not go largely into the question. In referring to the state of Ireland, the expression, "the church of Ireland," had been improperly employed. That church had been described, as a minority; the church was the united church of England and Ireland, and was, therefore, the majority; and when its prosperity was injured, the hierarchy of England might tremble in their seats. He did not believe that the Roman Catholics were insincere in the professions of the belief of their religion, and therefore he thought them as zealous as ever in their wish to make it predominate. Now, all the members of that house had sworn that their religion was idolatrous, and he asked whether the worship of a substance as containing the body, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, was not so? If it was he thought they had no right to favour idolatry. He did not, however, think that the Roman Catholics would wish to escape from the charge of idolatry through the door of hypocricy. Another opportunity would occur for stating his sentiments more at large.

The Duke of WELLINGTON did not intend to keep their lordships longer than was absolutely necessary for explaining that part of his conduct which required such an explanation. The first point was, that they ought to have put into execution the laws against the Roman Catholic association. Although he endeavoured to find the means of prosecuting this association, he was bound, when his opinion was that this measure was essential for the interests of the country, to bring it forward at once. Moreover, he considered it his duty to propose in the first instance, a measure to put down the Catholic association, which having been passed, had been found to answer its object; and there was now tranquillity in Ireland. The next point was that the church of England in Ireland was in danger. He called on those who apprehended that danger, to state clearly whether that danger, on this occasion, was more resulting from legislation or from violence. If from legislation, their apprehensions were puerile.—It was impossible to suppose that a small number of persons admitted into that and the other house, while they had a Protestant sovereign on the throne, should be productive of legislative danger to the church of England in Ireland. A fundamental article of the union was the junction of the two churches, called the united church of England and Ireland. It was impossible, therefore, that any mischief could occur to the church of Ireland, without a breach in the union of the two countries. Although they did admit into parliament members of the Roman Catholic persuasion, yet by another measure brought forward with it, they proposed regulations which would destroy the influence of the priesthood in the election of members of parliament. They had carefully examined the measure, and ascertained that it was calculated to give additional security to the state. It was true that he had voted against this question, and so had many of his colleagues; and when they determined to adopt this measure, they did so with a determination to sacrifice themselves and their popularity to the duty they owed to their sovereign and to the country. (cheers). The noble earl on the cross-bench had alluded particularly to the services which he was good enough to say he had rendered to the country. He performed those services under good repute and under bad repute, and he was never deterred from doing his duty because the cry of the country happened to be against him at the time (cheers). Then he had been accused of maintaining the strictest secrecy. He would tell the noble lord in the language of a right hon. friend of theirs, that he had thrown a large paving stone instead of throwing a small pebble. But, in making this charge he had not dealt fairly with him. How had he a right to say a single word to any man upon that measure till he had ascertained the opinions of the first and most interested person in the kingdom upon it? (cheers). Before the noble and learned Lord accused him of secrecy, he ought to have known the day upon which he received the sanction and approval of the highest personage in the country (hear). He wished to advert to the charge of a friend of his of not having dissolved parliament. The noble earl was mistaken in his calculation of the benefits which would arise from the adoption of such a measure. But knowing as he did the state of the elective franchise in Ireland; when he knew the number of men who were on the watch even at one election in Ireland, last summer; when he knew that such was the state of the country, that a general election would lead to little short of a civil war; he should have been wanting in his duty if he had advised his Majesty to adopt such a measure (hear, hear). He should not have said so much were he not anxious to vindicate himself and his colleagues from some unfair and unfounded imputations.

The Earl of ELDON explained.

Their lordships divided, when the numbers were—

Contents, present	147	
Proxies	70	217
Non-Contents, present	79	
Proxies	33	112
Majority in favour of the second reading of the bill		105

The house adjourned at a quarter past eleven o'clock.

ADDRESS OF THE IRISH PRELATES.

The following is the address of the Irish prelates of the established church to his Majesty on Saturday last at Windsor. It was read in a very impressive manner by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.

"Sire,—With the most profound attachment to your Majesty's person, and with the firmest reliance upon your Majesty's paternal care, we, the undersigned, Archbishops and Bishops of the Irish branch of the united church of England and Ireland, beg leave to present to your Majesty this our dutiful address.

"In a moment like the present, when the dangers which threaten our Protestant institutions, have spread a just alarm amongst those classes of your Majesty's loyal subjects, who have been accustomed to identify the best interests of the state with the maintenance of true religion, it is impossible that the appointed guardians of the established church in Ireland should remain silent and unmoved. We therefore humbly trust that your Majesty will deign graciously to receive this expression of our sentiments.

"We desire earnestly, but respectfully, to represent, that after the most painful and dispassionate consideration of the subject, we are persuaded that the admission of Roman Catholics to a share in the legislature is a measure calculated to subvert the established religion in Ireland, which it is your Majesty's pious and unalterable determination to uphold.

We are confident, however, that your Majesty will not be induced to think, that we are so little actuated by the precepts of our holy religion, as out of a narrow and jealous spirit to desire the exclusion of our Roman Catholic brethren from any civil privileges, to which they can be admitted consistently with the safety of the established church. But we feel that it is our sacred duty, as bishops of that church, which is the firmest bulwark of Christianity, to endeavour by every constitutional means to maintain it in the integrity of its rights and the purity of its doctrines. And we object to the admission of Roman Catholics to the privileges in question, solely because we cannot perceive how that admission can be made compatible with the church's security. We, therefore, with all humility, but at the same time with all earnestness and solicitude, seek your Majesty's protection against an evil so destructive, and look naturally for the preservation of our Protestant church to its legitimate and supreme guardian, under Almighty God.

J. G., Armagh,
W., Dublin,
Pope, Tuam,
George, Kilmore,
R. P., Clogher,
Thos., Cork,
Jas., Killala,
John, Elphin,
Robert, Ossory,
Richard, Waterford,
James, Dromore,
Richard, Down,
Thomas, Ferns,
John, Limerick,
John, Cloyne.

MAJORITY

FOR THE SECOND READING OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL, APRIL 4, 1829.

DUKES.		
Clarence *a*	Orford *a*	Fitzgibbon
Sussex	Grey	Alvanley
Cambridge *b*	Harrowby	Abercrombie
Gloucester	Mulgrave *b*	Ellenborough
Somerset	Minto	Barham *b*
Grafton	St. Germains	Erskine
Beaufort *a*	Morley	Monteagle
St. Alban's *a*	Somers	Lauderdale
Leeds *a*	Stradbroke *a*	Granard
Bedford	Vane	Crowe
Devonshire	Amherst *b*	Ailsa
Marlbro'	Dudley	Breadalbane
Rutland *a*	Cawdor	Hopetown
Brandon *b*	VISCOUNTS.	Lynedoch
Portland	Hereford	Hill
Northumberland *a*	Torrington *a*	Meldrum *a*
Manchester *a*	Leinster	Ross *a*
Wellington *a*	Maynard	Foxford
Buckingham	Hood	Melbourne *b*
MARQUISES.	Duncan	Kerr *a*
Winchester *a*	St. Vincent	Minster
Lansdown	Melville	Ormond
Stafford	Anson	Wemyss *a*
Bath *a*	Gordon	Kingston
Hertford *a*	Granville	Marybro'
Bute	Hutchinson	Oriel *b*
Northampton *b*	Beresford *a*	Ravensworth *a*
Camden	Goderich	Forester
Anglesey	BARONS.	Somerhill
Hastings *b*	Clinton	Wigan *a*
Bristol	Dacre	Ranfurly
Cleveland	Howard of Effingham	Wharncliffe
EARLS.	Howard of Waldon	Seaford
Derby	Say and Sele	Lyndhurst *a*
Suffolk	Clifton	File *a*
Denbigh	Teynham *a*	Plunket
Westmoreland *a*	Byron	Melrose
Chesterfield	Gower	Stuart of Rothsay *a*
Thanet	Boyle	Roseberry
Essex	King	Clanwilliam *a*
Carlisle	Mountfort *b*	Durham
Doncaster *a*	Ponsonby	SCOTCH.
Albemarle	Sondes	Queensbury
Jersey	Grantham	Tweedale *b*
Oxford	Holland	Errol
Ferrers	Lovel and Holland	Home *a*
Dartmouth *a*	Ducie	Elgin
Tankerville	Sunridge	Arbuthnot *a*
Cowper	Hawke *a*	Strathallan *a*
Graham *a*	Foley	Forbes *a*
Waldegrave	Southampton	Saltoun *a*
Ashburnham *a*	Berwick	Napier
Harrington *b*	Sherbourne	Belhaven
Warwick *a*	Montague *a*	IRISH.
Buckinghamshire	Carleton	Charlemont
Fitzwilliam	Suffield	Wicklow
Harcourt *a*	Braybroke	Lucan
Hardwicke	Douglas *a*	Belmore
Ilchester	Carteret	Caledon
Delawarr	Grenville	Gosford
Radnor	Auckland	Rosse *b*
Spencer	Littleton *b*	Blessington *b*
Chatham *a*	Mendip	Carberry *a*
Bathurst *a*	Selsey	Dufferin *a*
Hillsborough	Dundas	Dunally *b*
Clarendon	Yarborough	BISHOPS.
Grosvenor	Stewart of Garlies *b*	Winchester *a*
Strange *a*	Saltersford *a*	Norwich
Fortescue	Dawnay	Rochester
Carnarvon	Calthorpe	Lichfield *a*
Liverpool *b*	Willoughby d'Eresby	Oxford *a*
Rosslyn	Dunstanville	Llandaff *a*
Chichester *a*	Wellesley	Chester *a*
Walton	Carrington	Kildare *b*
Powis *a*	Lilford *a*	Derry *b*

a Voted against 1828.
b Voted for 1829, did not vote 1828.
Lords Northwick and Gort for the minority, but too late.
Lords Rivers, Zouche, Pomfret, Stanhope, Northwick, Gort, Penshurst, Heytesbury, Abergavenny, Egremont, Cathcart, Harris, Sidney, and Broderick, absent 1829—in majority 1828.

MINORITY.

DUKES.	Howe	Tadcaster(Thomond)
Cumberland	VISCOUNTS.	Farnbro'
Richmond	Sidmouth	Feversham
Dorset	Lake	Tenterden
Newcastle	Exmouth	Skelmersdale
MARQUISES.	Clancarty	Wallace
Salisbury	Loftus (Ely)	SCOTCH.
Exeter	BARONS.	Morton
Cholmondeley	Le Despencer	Gray
Aylesbury	De Clifford	Sinclair
EARLS.	Willoughby de Broke	Colville
Stamford	Hay	IRISH.
Winchilsea	Middleton	Carrick
Cardigan	Boston	Mountcashel
Shaftesbury	Rivers	Mayo
Abingdon	Dynevor	O'Neill
Plymouth	Walsingham	Charleville
Scarbro'	Bagot	Lorton
Rochfort	Grentley	Farnham
Poulett	Rodney	ARCHBISHOPS.
Aylesford	Kenyon	Canterbury
Macclesfield	Fisherwick	York
Guildford	Rolle	Armagh
Norwich	Bayning	BISHOPS.
Talbot	Wodehouse	London
Mount Edgecombe	St. Helens	Durham
Digby	Redesdale	Worcester
Mansfield	Arden	Hereford
Malmesbury	Sheffield	Salisbury
Onslow	Manners	St. Asaph
Romney	Gambier	Ely
Nelson	Dalhousie	Bath and Wells
Manners	Grinstead (Enniskillen	Peterborough
Lonsdale	Churchill	Lincoln
Harewood	Colchester	Exeter
Verulam	Clanbrasil	Gloucester
Brownlow	Silchester(Longford)	Chichester
Bradford	Stowell	Bristol
Beauchamp	Delamere	Carlisle
Eldon	Bexley	Meath
Falmouth		

It is rumoured that the splendid mansion at the South side of Stephen's green, lately occupied by John Wharley, Esq., has been taken for the residence of the Marquis of Anglesey, who is said to have derived great advantage to his health by the air of this country.—*Dublin Paper.*