

LONDON, MARCH 19.

A CONCISE EXPLANATION OF THE BILL FOR REGULATING THE DUTIES ON TIMBER AND DEALS.

Ev. Mail.

The following outline is intended to give a concise view, divested of technical terms, of the bill for the regulation of the timber duties, now in dependence in the House of Commons:

	Per Load	Difference in favor of America.
Baltic Timber is to pay	£2 15 0	
American do.	0 10 0	£2 5 0
*Baltic Deals	2 0 0	
American Deals	0 5 0	1 15 0
Norway Deals	3 10 0	
American Deals	0 5 0	3 5 0

These duties are intended to place the timber and deals of every country on a footing of equality in the English Market! It is therefore asserted by the proposers of these duties—

1. That American timber cannot compete in our Market with Baltic, unless protected by a bounty of £2 5s. per load.

2. That American deals (that is timber reduced to smaller size) can compete with the deals of the Baltic with the bounty of only £1 15s. per load.

3. That American deals cannot compete with the deals of Norway (of the same species of fir, and only a slight degree superior in quality) unless protected by a bounty of £3 5s. per load.

Query—Which of these three ideas, all of which are to be acted upon, is the correct one?

If Baltic deals can just keep their ground in competition with American deals, under a difference in favour of the colonies of £1 15s. what is to become of the trade of Norway, which is to be subjected to a difference against it of £3 5s. per load? Already the deal trade of Norway has diminished to one third of former importations; and it will be altogether annihilated, as soon as the saw mills of Canada and New-Brunswick shall be sufficiently enlarged to be able to manufacture the entire supply of this country; and as Norway, depending almost entirely on her forests, has no other produce to give in exchange for our commodities, all intercourse will in a short time cease between this country and a people linked to us by all the ties that used to bind civilized society together—a people descended from common ancestors, possessing the same religion, and retaining in manners, habits, and sentiment, a greater similarity to the people of England, than any other nation in Europe.

Another extraordinary feature in the duties proposed is the preference given to the foreigner over the home sawyer:

Baltic timber is to pay	£2 15 0
Baltic Deals	2 0 0
Direct bounty in favor of the foreigner	0 15 0
Add duty on waste by the saw, and less by caliper measure, with low duty on slabs, together 30 per cent.	0 16 0

Total bounty in favour of the foreign sawyer 1 11 0

In like manner American timber is to pay double the duty on deals.

This is a degree of liberality that will astonish foreign nations. Other states have, in common with England, acted upon, and sometimes carried too far, the system of protecting home capital and labor: but if the timber bill is passed in its present shape, we shall have the singular merit of being the first government who ever regulated their taxes with a view to the annihilation of a valuable domestic manufacture.

In proposing the resolutions, the chairman of the committee openly disavowed all principle; and claimed no merit but that of having adhered as closely as possible to the existing system of taxation, which he admitted to be strange and unaccountable: yet, so far from following no principle, he has (unconsciously it is presumed) put no less than three principles into operation, namely—

1. The principle of partiality, Norway deals being charged at the rate of £3 10s. and Baltic at the rate of £2.

2. The principle of exclusion, it being impossible that Norway deals can compete with the deals of America, under a difference of duty at £3 5s. whilst the difference of freight is only from £1 5s. to £1 10s. per load.

3. The principles of monopoly, and that too in favour of the foreigner, in opposition to our own people, timber in the log being charged with so high a duty, as compared with the deals, as altogether to prohibit the manufacture in this country.

This is the mode proposed to "remove the excessive inequality of the present system, to facilitate our intercourse with foreign nations, and to mark our desire, as far as circumstances will permit, to adopt more liberal principles than those by which our commerce with them has been hitherto governed."

\*Deals are to be charged, as at present, by the long hundred; but as every country will adopt its shipments, as far as local circumstances will admit, so as to come under the lowest rate of duty, Mr. Wallace was correct in stating the duties to be equivalent to £2 per load on Baltic deals, £3 10s. on Norway, and 5s. on American.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 19.

TIMBER DUTY BILL.

The order of the day having been read for the third reading of the Timber Duties Bill, Mr. Wallace moved that the bill should be read a third time.

Mr. Gurney made a few observations on the Bill, and said, that if it were not too late, he would propose an alteration in the rate of duties, as they related to the admeasurement of Timber.

Mr. Monck said, that the best hope he could entertain respecting the bill was, that it would be wholly inoperative, for if operative, it would do mischief. He proceeded to argue against the measure at considerable length, contending, that for the benefit of one class, the ship-owners, a heavy tax was laid on the rest of the community. He trusted that a pledge would be given by the advocates of the measure that it would not be a final one, but that the subject should again be brought under the consideration of the Legislature.

Sir I. Coffin briefly restated his objections to the Bill.

Mr. Phillips argued against the bill, and trusted it would not be a permanent measure.

Mr. Wallace shortly replied, but was generally inaudible in the Gallery. We understood the Right Honorable Gentleman to say, that the Bill arose out of particular circumstances, and that when those circumstances ceased the law might be beneficially altered.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

LONDON, APRIL 21.

The Paris Papers of Wednesday arrived this morning. A royal decree dated the 4th inst. has been made public: according to which 40,000 men of the class of 1820 are to be called out.

*Expedition to the North Pole.*—The ships preparing for the Arctic regions prove a most powerful attraction to all those interested with scientific researches; the numerous and distinguished persons who have visited them, amongst whom are Lord Glenbervie, Sir W. Scott, the Bishop of Chichester, with a host of fashionables, prove the interest which exists in any naval enterprise.

The reductions in his Majesty's dockyard at Deptford, are proceeding rapidly. The clerk of the cheque, George Gainer, Esq. is appointed to fill the vacancy at Chatham-yard. The office of clerk of the cheque and storekeeper, at Deptford will now be combined, and placed under Mr. Moose from Sheerness.

It has been remarked, as a curious coincidence that the number of the majority of the House of Lords, who voted against the Catholic Relief Bill corresponded with that of the articles of the Church of England—thirty-nine.

HANOVER, April 7.

His Excellency Count Munster has officially announced that the King will visit his Kingdom of Hanover at the end of July or the beginning of August.

VIENNA, April 6.

"The Submission of Naples, and the

reduction not less certain, of the rebels of Piedmont, does not make any change in the march of the Russian troops.

"Yesterday Te Deum was performed in the metropolitan Church, to return thanks to the Almighty for the happy issue of the war against Naples. All the provinces are ordered to follow this example.

"By a private letter inserted in the Gazette de Milan, the total loss of the Austrians in the campaign against Naples, amounts to seven killed and fifty wounded. Not an Austrian was made prisoner.

LIVERPOOL, APRIL 20.

FATE OF THE CATHOLIC BILL.

In the House of Lords, on Tuesday last, the debate on the Catholic question was resumed. The Bishop of St. David's opposed the bill. The Duke of York declared, that the Protestant Church had always been considered by him as an integral part of the constitution, and the proposed measure would be the effect of endangering its ascendancy.—The Earl of Darnley supported the Bill.—The Lord Chancellor argued at considerable length against the bill.—Lord Grenville in a most luminous and eloquent speech defended the bill.—The Earl of Liverpool reprobated the measure.—Lord Melville stated the reasons that would induce him to give his vote for the second reading.—Lord Ashburton and Lord Somers supported the bill.

Strangers were then ordered to withdraw, and the House divided: when there appeared,

Contents - -	Present	72	} 120
	Proxies	48	
Non-contents	Present	90	} 159
	Proxies	69	
Majority against the Bill		39	

Lord Audley's proxy against the Bill arrived too late, or the Majority would have been Forty.

HOUSE OF LORDS, APRIL 17.

The Debate on the Catholic question was resumed. The Bishop of St. David's opposed the bill. The Duke of York declared, that the Protestant church had always been considered by him as an integral part of the constitution, and the proposed measure would have the effect of endangering its ascendancy.

Lord Darnley regretted to hear these opinions (dictated by truth and honour) from the illustrious person who was now heir to the throne of these realms. The more he had heard and read on this subject, the more convinced was he of the importance of granting these concessions to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. He was astonished at the speech of a noble earl (Mansfield) full of ability, no doubt, but one which would have better suited the time of Oates and Bedloe; when a noble Lord in that house said, he would not touch or come near a popish dog, bitch, or cat. Sooner or later this great measure of true policy, of Christian charity, and of substantial justice, must pass; and the Catholics be met by their Protestant fellow-subjects, in the spirit of moderation and conciliation.

The Lord Chancellor addressed the house at great length. It had been said, that sooner or later this bill must pass: be it so; but being convinced there was sufficient toleration in this country, consistent with the safety of the state, he should therefore, through evil and good report, do what he conceived to be his duty to his country; and if he erred, he should have the satisfaction of knowing that he had spared no pains in endeavouring to discover what that duty was. His opinion was, that every statesman ought to take care of the church and all its interests, for the purpose of preserving the political interests of the state itself, which had secured both the civil and religious privileges of every Protestant and Catholic in the country. They could not pass this bill without repealing the test and coronation acts. If a person would not conform to the institutions of his country, he had no right to the enjoyment of the privileges it bestows. His country was well now, and he would not risk its happiness by consenting to this untried measure.

Lord Grenville declared that his former opinions were strengthened, that there was nothing in the whole scope of legislation which could give so much relief to the people of this united realm as to adopt the prin-

ciple of this measure. It was the unhappy policy of this country for a long series of years, to endeavour by confiscations and oppressions of various kinds, to destroy the Catholic faith in this country, but their lordships knew how that had failed, as all attempts to bring about such an end by persecution must fail. It was undoubtedly their duty to uphold the protestant religion both in church and state; but that might be done without persecuting our Catholic brethren. The country could not be either prosperous or happy, when persecuting laws, such as those against the Catholics, were suffered to exist. The only way to render Ireland any thing but a dead weight upon this country, was to overturn the whole system, and to return to one of conciliation and affection, by opening to them the paths of honour and emolument. It was absurd to say, that there was any thing in the Catholic belief which rendered them incapable of discharging with upright-ness the duties of loyal and faithful subjects. The whole system of conciliation would be defeated, if kindness and liberty were not continued—if men were made to distrust each other, and not share these honours and distinctions to which their rank and property might entitle them. He conjured the house to abolish the nefarious code of laws which was now a disgrace to the statutes of the country.—Never could kindness and conciliation come with more grace than now; and the great advantage to be derived from this measure, was the attaching the people of Ireland to the throne and monarchy of this country.

The Earl of Liverpool said, the rights to civil and religious liberty, of personal liberty and property, ought to be enjoyed by every man in the state. But he could not join that with political privileges and political power. It was for the state to say who should be admitted to the enjoyment of those privileges and that power; it was for the state to judge what was best for its own security. He took the alliance between church and state, as established at the revolution, as the true basis of our constitution. The principle of this measure he contended was to dissolve that connection, and to destroy the Church. If these concessions were granted, what would become of the test and coronation acts, and what security should he have that those should not be repealed. What security should he have that they would not be obliged to go further? For most of them were of opinion that they ought not to pay to any church but their own! The question was, whether they did not stand better now than they could by this change. In his opinion it was better to fight for the frontier than the capital. After the fullest consideration he could give this bill, he was satisfied that if it passed, the principle of the protestant succession and religion would be overturned. He admitted that there would not be a majority of Catholics in parliament, nor in the privy council, but the moment they were admitted there, the principle of admitting to any extent would be fully admitted. The law of the constitution as heretofore, was, that political power should be confined to persons of the established church, but this would open all the offices of the state to persons of all sects and denominations. Such a change would be a total alteration of the law and constitution, and he begged them to pause before they granted such power. They might open a door again to the horrors of religious persecution. They ought to leave the Catholic church as it was, as they had done every other class of dissenters, but we ought to have the same check on the Catholics as other protestant states had over their Catholic subjects. He believed this measure, as it regarded the great mass of the population of Ireland, would have no effect whatever. If any benefit could be conferred on the Irish Catholics they owed it to them to bestow it on them, if it was not attended with danger to the state; but they also owed a duty to the Protestants of Ireland for their liberties, lives, and properties.

The Marquis of Lansdown said, they were now arrived at the time when they ought to grant such concessions as would strengthen the state, by a union of all classes in the country. He agreed that it was proper and necessary to protect the Protestant church of Ireland; but it was hard that the Catholics should be debarred from those privileges which Protestants enjoyed, especially when the Catholics were ready, on