

PARLIAMENTARY ANALYSIS.

In the House of Lords on the 13th July, Tuesday, on the occasion of the third reading of Lord Melbourne's Bill, to extend to Ireland the benefit of Lords-Lieutenant for counties, the Marquis of Londonderry availed himself of the opportunity to defend himself against attacks, which he stated, had been heretofore made upon him by various Lords, and afterwards to attack the provisions of the bill, as giving powers exceeding those of any previous enactment regarding Ireland. Lord Farnham, however, defended the bill—after Lord Plunkett had vindicated the conduct of the Government respecting this measure.

Mr. Wilks, in the Commons, after having presented some petitions, gave notice that in the course of the Committee on the English Reform Bill he would move the introduction of a clause providing that no Parliament should continue longer than **THREE** years—a notice that was greeted with Mr. Hunt's **CHEER** only. Lord Ingestrie, in presenting a petition from the Clergy of Ossory, &c., respecting the tithe system in Ireland, asked whether the Government intended to propose any measure on that subject. Mr. Stanley, Secretary for Ireland, admitted that the time was fast approaching when this subject must force itself on the consideration of Parliament; but as to the question, he replied that it would be to mislead the country to state that any measure had been prepared, or was at present contemplated by the Government. He, however, viewed it as a consolatory circumstance that the tithe receivers, as well as the tithe payers, were directing their anxious attention to this important matter. A long and desultory conversation resulted from these remarks, in the course of which Mr. Grattan expressed the opinion, that, if the tithes and rents could not be collected without the aid of an armed force, it was time that the legislature interfered. Captain Gordon having adverted to some general resistance of tithe payments, Mr. O'Connell denied that there was any such general resistance. He acknowledged that there had been resistances, and that the spirit, or example, of resistance was spreading; and he submitted that, as such was the fact, it behoved Government to attempt a remedy for such an evil. He (Mr. O'Connell) added, that the people were not unwilling to contribute to just remuneration for services which were performed; but while there was such a rich Bishoprick as that of Derry, for instance, with an income of £22,000 a year, besides other advantages, which increased the income—while the granaries of the country were bursting with their stores, and while people in the midst of this plenty were starving, was it to be expected that such a state of things could last? Having declared that some remedy ought to be attempted, he asked what had caused the Newtownberry affair, and whether Clergymen had not attempted to collect three half years' tithes in one year. Mr. D. W. Harvey maintained that all these facts showed the necessity of Parliamentary interference—that the incomes mentioned were six times more than any Christian bishops ought to receive—and that the enormous incomes were calculated to injure the sublime yet penurious system of Christianity. A Member having observed that the Newtownberry affair was caused by the mob having fired on the yeomanry, Mr. O'Connell denied that there was any evidence of that fact; while on the other hand it was in proof that no officer had ever given orders for the yeomanry to fire—showing, he continued, that in their estimation there was no occasion to fire on the people. Mr. S. Rice observed, in reply to eulogiums on the Tithe Composition Act, that it had not effected the good that it would otherwise have accomplished, in consequence of its having been reluctantly conceded, after having been scoffed at—a charge which was warmly rebutted by Mr. Goulbourn. The extended conversation then closed—Lord Althorp afterwards renewed, in a Committee on His Majesty's Message, the proposition that there be a provision of £100,000 a-year, with the residence in Bushy Park, for the Queen, in the event of the King's demise; which resolution was adopted.—Lord J. Russell then moved the order of the day, that the Speaker do leave the chair, for the purpose of enabling the House to go into a Committee on the Bill. Lord Maitland thereupon moved that he might present a petition, praying that Counsel be heard at the bar against the disfranchisement of Appleyby. This led to considerable discussion. Lord John Russell urged that the progress of the bill ought not to be impeded by this proposition, the Bill not being one of pains and penalties. The question was one of fact—the amount of the population of Appleyby; and to ascertain that fact it was not necessary to call in counsel. Sir R. Peel defended the petitioners, on the ground that they wished to show that the principle of the Bill did not apply to them. The House eventually divided: the numbers were—for the motion, 187; against it, 284; presenting a majority of 97 against its reception. The following ten Members voted for the Bill in its former stages, and voted in this division AGAINST the Ministers:—

Burrell, Sir Charles,	Lewis, Thos Frank
Cripps, Joseph,	Staunton, Sir George,
Chichester, Sir A.	Thompson, Alderman,
Frankland, Sir R.	Wynn, Rt. Hon. Charles,
Halse, James,	Wood, Colonel Thomas.

There were about 30 members, supporters of the Bill, came too late for the division, and were shut out. On the question that the Speaker do leave the Chair, various members addressed the House, speaking to the general question, and occupying the time till one o'clock. Colonel Conolly, Mr. Fane, Mr. C. Pelham, and Mr. Attwood, were amongst the Members who condemned the Bill as violent, revolutionary, sweeping, delusive, incongruous, incomprehensible, &c., and 'repugnant to the first principles of justice, to the known maxims of the Constitution, and to every thing that favoured the security of property; also as a 'flagrant insult to the understanding of the British nation,' &c. None of the friends of the measure rose to answer these several remarks, so that they did not interrupt the question that the Speaker do leave the Chair. Midnight having passed, Capt. Gordon moved an adjournment of the debate, but that proposition was resisted by Lord Althorp, who said, after the general discussion that had taken place, he must press the commitment of the Bill. He did so press it; and the result of the extraordinary proceedings was, that, upon a division, there appeared for the adjournment 102, against it 328, giving the Ministers a majority of 226. A further discussion ensued, and upon the motion 'that the Speaker do leave the Chair,' the House divided—for the motion, 286, against it 90, the Ministers gaining a majority of 196. Another discussion took place on the motion that the debate be adjourned till Thursday, when the Ministers, upon a division, had a majority of 172, there appearing for the adjournment 63, against it 235. Lord Stermont then

moved that the debate be adjourned till five o'clock this day; Lord Althorp hoped the Noble Lord would allow the Speaker to leave the Chair, but a division being pressed, there appeared for adjournment 44, against it 214, again leaving Ministers 170 majority. Division on division succeeded, but on the seventh and last the Ministers triumphed, with a majority of 163, and the House adjourned at half-past seven this morning.—**MORNING HERALD.**

The extraordinary scene that was acted in the House of Commons from two o'clock till seven this morning, demands from us at this hour a few explanatory observations. After the question respecting Appleyby had been disposed of by the sheer numerical strength of the Ministry, and one or two Members had spoken to the motion for going into committee, an equivocal and fixed determination was evinced by the Ministers and their adherents to prevent all further discussion by dint of noise and clamorous interruption. Under these circumstances the Opposition proposed the obvious alternative, either that the debate should be allowed to proceed regularly, or that it should be adjourned till the next sitting. To neither of these propositions would the Ministry, relying on their members, accede; and the minority were thus driven to the only resource which remains to a reasonable minority against a tyrannical majority. No less than seven adjournments were moved in succession, and, between each, discussions arose in which the injustice and violent conduct of the majority and the reason that supported the minority were clearly demonstrated. The minority, small as it was, it was quite evident could not yield, but at seven o'clock a species of compromise was agreed to, by which the Speaker then left the Chair **PRO FORMA**, on the understanding that the motion should again be made this evening, when the Members to whom a hearing was denied this morning will be at liberty to state their opinions. We have not time at present for further comments.—**MORNING POST.**

ANALYSIS OF WEDNESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

In the House of Peers last night the motion of Lord Farnham, for papers explanatory of the late melancholy events at Newtownberry, was very properly opposed by Ministers, on the ground that the production of them would prejudice the judicial inquiry about to be instituted. Lord Farnham immediately acquiesced in the justice of this reason, and withdrew his motion. The Lord Chancellor has given notice of two motions which all friends of economy and legal reform will hail with pleasure. His Lordship proposes to abolish that nest of judicial sinecures the Scotch Court of Exchequer, which, with all its expensive machinery, executed last year the amazing labour of hearing one cause! We suppose that the loudest clamours for 'vested rights' will hardly venture to predict any serious injury to the Constitution by the abolition of this venerable batch of useless functionaries, whose only duty seems to be the receipt of large salaries. We say not one word against the respectable persons who have been perhaps annoyed by appointments which exhibit them in an invidious light to all who know their real situation.—On the contrary, we anticipate the hearty concurrence of all of them, and most certainly of the chief Baron, in the projected measure for letting them down from their painful eminence. The other plan of Reform, proposed by the Lord Chancellor, is of a more extensive nature; it is for the complete organization of a new Court of Bankruptcy, to supersede that multitude of tribunals now in existence, whose inadequacy to the efficient discharge of the duties imposed on them has long been a fruitful source of bitter complaint among all classes of the trading and commercial world. We suppose we may safely rely on the wisdom and patriotism of the House of Peers for their cordial co-operation with the Lord Chancellor in both these important labours for the benefit of the public.—The proceedings in the House of Commons last night were not so lively as on the previous morning, when Hon. Members had so much clever walking out and in, but their interest was of a more useful and permanent character. The House at last got into a Committee, and will be able to 'report progress' to-day, though little 'progress' was made. The intended progress was stopped by Mr. Charles Wynn, who insisted on reading the bill, like a Hebrew Bible, backwards, and would not let the first clause be discussed till other clauses were settled. After a good deal of discussion, the motion of the Right Hon. Gentleman was rejected by a great majority, 174 only supporting it, and 292 being against it. This preliminary obstacle being removed, the Committee can start with schedule A to-morrow, unless some other very learned member should propose another inversion of the alphabet, and should divide the Committee on the question whether A or B should have the preference.

DIVISIONS ON THE REFORM BILL.—Second Reading—for Ministers 367, against do. 231, Majority 136.

Sir Robert Peel's amendment—for Ministers 290—against do. 193—Majority 96.

Sir A. Agnew's amendment—for Ministers 316—against do. 205—Majority 111.

For the census of 1821 instead of 1831—for Ministers 244—against do. 169—Majority 71.

The Committee of Privileges sat yesterday at the House of Commons, to consider the alleged breach of privilege, by Mr. Wellesley's arrest, pursuant to the Lord Chancellor's order. The proceedings were private, but we hear Mr. Wellesley attended, and having been examined, was at first ordered to be committed to the fleet; but this order was subsequently suspended for the present.

PLURALITIES IN THE CHURCH.

The following is Lord King's Bill, introduced into the House of Lords on Friday, 'to prevent pluralities in the Church in all cases where the annual value arising from the different benefices shall collectively exceed a certain sum:—'

PREAMBLE.

'Whereas the non-residence of the clergy on their respective benefices is contrary to the original compact and purpose for which tithes were granted, and injurious to the true interests of the church; and whereas the abuse of pluralities, when two or more rich benefices are held by the same incumbent, is the cause of great scandal both in England and in Ireland; and the practice of holding several benefices is indefensible, except where the annual income from benefices separately is too small for the decent maintenance of the clergy; be it therefore enacted, &c., that no two or more benefices, livings, donatives, perpetual curacies, or other preferment in the church having cure for souls within any diocese of England or Ireland, shall be held by the same incumbent, the

aggregate value whereof, shall exceed the sum of £500., unless he shall have been in actual possession of all such preferment before the passing of this act.

'And be it further enacted, that if by any contrivance, misrepresentation, or other contravention of the true and intent meaning of this act, any spiritual person shall hold any two benefices in plurality, the annual aggregate value of which shall exceed the sum of £500 he shall have no power to enforce by law the payment of any tithes, rents, dues, or emoluments over and above that sum, and on proof being given that the said sum of £500 of lawful money shall have been tendered to the incumbent of such livings by the occupiers of land, or by any person on their behalf, the same shall be an effectual bar to any action or further proceeding at law or otherwise.

SPIRIT OF THE BRITISH JOURNALS.

POLITICS, &c.

TIMES.—The precedent of interference on behalf of Greece is much insisted on as a justification of that which we hope and trust is about to be more signally and energetically exhibited on behalf of our Polish brethren, by two at least of the preponderating powers of Europe. The continuance of uncertain war, the sufferings of humanity, and the injuries to commerce, were the grounds alleged by England, France, and Russia herself, for wresting Greece out of the grasp of Turkey. It is true, there is no answering or resisting such a precedent, short, even, though it manifestly fail, of the case which it professes to sanction.—The case of Greece, we say, is nothing as compared with that of Poland. The Polish question, indeed, contains all that ever was contemplated as an argument or authority by the advocates of Greek interference. By the war of Russia against Poland, commerce is extensively restrained and embarrassed. The pacific enterprises and occupations of the whole of Europe are disturbed, patriot and christian blood is poured out in torrents, and, more than ever was alleged of the Greek contest, the invasion of Russia against the unhappy Poles has been the channel through which pestilence pervades the whole continent, and threatens nearly these sea encircled Islands. But what of all these things? The soldier who perishes may revive in his children; the merchant baffled in this year's speculation, may repay himself hereafter; the ravages of disease are but for a few months, and leave the bulk of the community uninfected by any thing but terror. But the true, distinguishing, and obvious character of the present crisis is, that by the prolonged and glorious resistance of the Poles, they have achieved the same rights over the people and governments of Europe, as their progenitors of the last generation had, when they opposed, however fruitlessly against the mandates of the unprincipled Catharine, and the arms of the ferocious Suwarrow; that the whole question is now re-opened; whether Europe shall look on and witness the extinction of one of its most ancient and noble members;—that Lord Grey and Cassimir Perier have now to ask themselves the same question as was put to Mr. Pitt and to the French cabinet at the last partition—'Shall we suffer tamely the balance of Europe to be destroyed?' And that the French and British Ministers of the present day are bound to answer that interrogatory in a very different manner, every friend of Mr. Pitt's reputation will surely concur with us in affirming. The equilibrium of Europe and the faith of treaties, both speak, trumpet-tongued, for our interference on behalf of Poland, in addition to every one of the arguments which were brought forward in the case of Greece. Nor will the glory, any more than the usefulness of this vast triumph, ever fade upon the brows of the British sovereign and nation. Never did such an opportunity arise for achieving an immortal benefit to Europe. That secured, through the settlement of Belgium, is auspicious of success to every generous effort of the British government. Of France we may be secure; of Austria we ought to be so, if she could see beyond to-morrow. Is it possible that Metternich—if he have an atom of the sagacity imputed to him—can put the continued possession of Galicia in the scale against such a security for the House of Austria as a formidable Polish state would prove against the restless projects of the Czar?

MORNING HERALD.—It was natural to expect, that when the Russian despot found his steel was powerless against the brave people of Poland, he would try what virtue there is in gold. He first tried the thunders of his Manifestoes, which he thought of themselves, sufficient to annihilate the rising freedom of Poland; he next