GREAT BRITAIN, &c.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 31.

CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

Considerably before five o'clock an unusual number of Peers assembled, and when the Lord Chancellor took his seat there were more in the House than probably have been at any period during the present sessions. The space below the Throne was filled with ladies and Members of the House of Commons, and a vast number of visitors were admitted below the bar.

At five minutes past five Mr. Peel and others brought up a bill, entitled "An Act for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects."

When the Lord Chancellor had read the title of the Act, and stated, that the Members who had brought it prayed their Lordships' concurrence, there were loud cries of hear, hear! and several dissenting voices.

Mr. Peel and others also brought up a bill, entitled "An act to amend certain acts of Parliament in Ireland relative to the election of members to serve in Parliament, and to regulate persons entitled to vote at the election of knights of the shire."

The Duke of WELLINGTON moved the first reading of the Bill which was agreed to; and after some opposition, the second reading was ordered for Thursday.

THURSDAY.

The Duke of WELLINGTON moved the order of the day for the second reading of the Catholic relief Bill, and, the order having been read, his Grace addressed their lordships as follows:—It is now my duty, my lords, to move your lordships that this bill be read a second time, and to explain to your lordships the grounds on which I recommend this measure to your consideration. The point which I shall first bring under your Lordships' consideration is the state of Ireland.—(Hear, hear!) I know by some it is considered, that the state of Ireland has nothing to do with this question; they say, "Ireland has been disdisturbed for the last thirty years—to those disturbances we are accustomed, and they do not alter the circumstances of the case, as it appears to this House." It is true, my lords, that Ireland has been disturbed during the long period to which I have alluded: but, my Lords, there have been circumstances of considerable aggravation in the disturbances which have taken place there within the two last years.—(Hear, hear!) Political circumstances have, no doubt, occasioned, in a considerable degree, that agitation; but I must say, (though I had not positive legal proof of the fact,) that there has been an organization of the people for the purpose of mischief. The influence and authority of the Catholic Association was shown in a deliberation which they held upon the means and on the propriety of adopting some measures for the ceasing of all dealings between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants.—(Hear, hear!) Is it possible, my Lords, that we can believe that these dealings could be made to cease, and these measures could be put into execution (which I believe would at least have been attempted,)—is it possible, I say, that we can believe that those who ceased their dealings would not also cease to carry into execution all the contracts into which they had previously entered? Will any man say that a people in this situation are not merging towards that state in which it is impossible that they can perform the duties of jurymen, affording the protection of the law between man and man, and guarding, by its proper administration, the lives and properties of His Majesty's subjects? This, my lords, is the state of things to which I wish to draw your Lordships' attention, and for which it is necessary that Parliament should provide some remedy. Before I proceed to consider what that remedy would be, I wish to show what effect this state of society had upon the King's prerogative. The King, my Lords, could not create a peer; and the reason he could not create a peer was this. His Majesty's servants could not venture to advise him to incur the risk of the event of an election in another part of the country, and the risk which might also attend the pro- [illegible] in the country; but not only for that reason did I refrain from giving that advice, but because I had a strong objection to give another triumph to the Roman Catholic Association.—(Hear, hear!) We are asked, my lords, why we did not carry into execution the laws that had been passed. My lords, we could not execute the laws. There was no resistance to the Laws. When, therefore, we hear gentlemen reproach the government for not carrying the laws into execution in Ireland as they are carried into execution in England, the observation shows that they do not understand the state of things that exists in Ireland.—(Cheers.) Neither the law nor the means possessed by the government were such as enabled the government to put an end to this state of things. It was necessary for the government to come to parliament. What chance was there that we should put an end to this state of things by coming to Parliament? We all know, my Lords, what is the opinion of the majority in another place as to the remedy for this state of things.—(Hear, hear!) It is a repeal of the civil disabilities which affect His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects.—(Cheers.) We might have come and asked Parliament to enable us to put down the Roman Catholic Association; but what chance was there that we should prevail with Parliament to pass such a Bill without coming forward and stating that we were ready to consider of the whole condition of Ireland, with a view to remedy that which the Parliament had already stated as the cause of the discontent?—(Cheers.) But, it is said, my Lords, if these things will not do, let us proceed to blows. What is meant by proceeding to blows is a civil war. We are, therefore, told to go into a civil war. Now, I believe that every government must be prepared to carry into execution the laws of the country by the force placed at its disposal, in case it should become necessary. But in this case I have already stated that there was no resistance to the laws; nay more, I will go further, and say that I am positively certain that this state of things, bordering on civil war, with nearly all the evils of civil war, might have continued a year and a half, or for a considerable time longer, to the great injury and decay of the country; and that those who managed this state of things would prevent that resistance which would alone create or justify a civil war. They know as well as I do, that they are not strong enough to wrestle with the King's Government; they know that they would be the first victims of any attempt of that kind; and, knowing this, and being, as I believe them to be, able and sensible men, and being perfectly aware of the nature of the materials with which they are working,—I say I do not doubt that this state of things might have continued for years, and your lordships would never have had the opportunity of putting it down by force.—(Hear!) But, even if I were certain that we possessed any such means, I should certainly wish to avoid using them, if possible. My lords, I am one of those who have passed the larger portion of their lives in war, and I may say in some respects, in civil war; and if I could avoid by any sacrifice whatever—if I could avoid even for one month a civil war in a country to which I am attached, I would do so.—(Cheers.) I would sacrifice my life to do it.—(Loud cheering.) There is nothing, my Lords, which destroys the prosperity of a country to such a degree as civil war—in which the hand of one man is raised against another—in which neighbour strikes at neighbour—in which a son is ranged against the father, the servant betrays his master, and the whole scene ends in confusion and devastation.—(hear, hear!) Yet this is the resource to which we are told to look—this is spoken of as the best resource which we can adopt to put an end to the state of things I have described, if we do not bring forward a measure like that of which I this day render myself responsible.—(Cheers.) But let us look a little further, my lords. If civil war is so bad when it is occasioned by resistance to the government; if it is so much to be avoided, even when springing from such a cause—how much more is it to be avoided when we are compelled to array one part of the people against another, for such a cause as the present. There is not a man who hears me who would not shudder with horror—whose blood would not turn cold, if the proposal was made to him as the course which he out to adopt, at the same time that it is admitted to be our only resource if we continue to pursue the same line of conduct as that which we have hitherto adopted. Let us, my lords, look at the period when this country was before in a position similar to the present. I am old enough, my lords, to remember the rebellion of 1798. What happened then, my lords? Why, in the very next session, the government proposed to put an end to the Irish Parliament, and to unite the two kingdoms, for the purpose—the principal purpose at least—of proposing this very measure, (loud cheering,) which, in point of fact, was the very first measure which was proposed after the legislative union had taken place.—(Cheers.) I say, that, in point of fact, after the union had succeeded, and after the rebellion had been put down, the very first measure brought forward was the measure which I now propose for your lordships' consideration.—(Cheers.) My Lords, I am certain that when you look at the division of opinion which now exists upon this subject in both houses of Parliament—when you look at the division of opinion which prevails in every family in this kingdom and in Ireland, from those of the most eminent station down to the lowest—when you look at the divisions of opinion among even the Protestants of Ireland themselves, you will see the vast difference between a contest now and that which took place on a former occasion. I hope you will recollect, that, when there was a plot against the security of Ireland, in 1798, the Parliament was unanimous in supporting the government; but lately, so far from unanimity being manifested in support of the authority of the Government, in the event of a contest, we must look for feelings of distrust, if not of opposition. My lords, we have lately had a declaration from the Protestants themselves, signed by seven marquesses, seventeen earls, a vast number of peers, and not less than 2000 Protestant gentlemen, asking for this very measure. Under these circumstances, it appears that this contest would be carried on under circumstances totally different from those which occurred on the former occasion. But, I ask, is it possible to believe that Parliament would allow such a contest? that Parliament, having this state of things before them, seeing the opinion of the other House, of a number of Protestants in Ireland, the opinion of every statesman for the last forty years, is it possible, I say, to believe that, seeing all these things, this House would continue to oppose itself to this measure, which so many persons deem to be absolutely necessary? It is impossible we can go on longer in this course without increasing the difficulties that have been brought on the country; and still less is it possible when we consider what are the benefits supposed to be derived from it. The cause for which all these evils are to be encountered is, we are told, the preservation of the principle of the constitution of 1688. The preservation of the principle of the constitution of 1688 is, as we are told, the permanent exclusion of the Roman Catholics from Parliament; and that being permanent, it is necessary that we should incur all these evils to keep up the exclusion. The noble duke proceeded to show, at great length, that the Protestant constitution of 1688 opposed no obstacles to the present measure; and he placed his opponents on the horns of a dilemma, by asking them, if the Oaths imposed on Catholics are permanent, how those appointed to be taken by officers of the army and navy were repealed in 1817, possessing the same character and resting on the same authority with the oaths appointed to be taken by Members of Parliament. His grace avowed the grounds which led him to make his measure as liberal and comprehensive as possible. "I believe," he said, "the bill goes further in the way of concession than any previous measure introduced on the subject. And, my lords, I confess that the reason why I have been induced to accede to such further concession is my knowledge of what followed the concessions granted in 1782 and 1793. My lords, I have observed, that, so long as any restriction is continued, concession not only increases demand, but gives increased power to enforce that demand.—(Hear, hear!) I am of opinion, that, if we are to grant concessions, these cannot be too wide or too general [illegible] the country.—(Hear, hear!)" This is the best answer to those who urge the dissatisfaction of the Catholics as an argument against further concession. If they wished to have gone no further, they should not have gone so far. I am aware, my lords, that there are many noble and honorable members of this and the other House of Parliament, as well as many respectable individuals out of doors, who are opposed to this measure, and who think that at least some securities ought to be given for the church besides the oaths which Roman Catholics will be called upon to take upon entering Parliament. I confess, my Lords, that I myself at one time, entertained a similar opinion. But on looking more minutely over the acts of Parliament than I had previously time to do, I found that no security was required, inasmuch as no danger was to be apprehended. I shall in a few words, to which I beg your Lordship's attention, explain my ground of objection to securities. If the Government of this country were to enter into a concordat with the Pope, we must give the Pope a power in these realms, or we might ask for a concordat in vain. This is a power which we, His Majesty's Government, can never yield.—(Hear, hear, hear!) My lords, it is the duty of His Majesty's Government, to keep the Sovereign clear of any such Contract.—(hear, hear, hear!) We could not even grant a veto without infringing the dignity of the Sovereign. It has been said that the King might appoint the bishop who should pronounce the veto. But if the King appoints the Bishop, he must give him a diocese, and I should be glad to know what spot in England his Majesty could appoint to such a diocese in conformity with his oath? The King is bound by his Coronation Oath to preserve the property of the church, and the property and privileges of the clergy inviolate. Now, could His Majesty under such an oath, provide a diocese for a Roman Catholic Bishop? and if he could, would not the Church lose more than they could possibly gain by such a procedure? I agree with the noble lord who has said, he has a right to ask me upon what grounds I expect that this measure will be attended with success. To that question I mean to answer, that my expectations arise from what I have seen take place in all parts of Europe;—from what took place in a part of this kingdom at the time of the revolution. At that period, when it was proposed to establish the Presbyterian religion, the Episcopalian Church petitioned Parliament against the measure. I hold in my hands one of these petitions, which was sent to me today. This Petition expresses alarms and prognosticates dangers which never took place; and I have great hopes that, after this bill has passed, and when the public mind is reduced to a calm and quiet state, such as that which has prevailed in Scotland during the last century, it will be found, that the fears and alarms now entertained, will prove equally unfounded.—(Hear, hear!)—But, my Lords, there are still other reasons which afford ample ground to hope for its success. After the bill shall have passed into a law, the Roman Catholic will find that he has no separate interest from his brother Protestant, either in or out of Parliament. Members of the established Church will, of course, look to the conduct of Roman Catholics in Parliament with respect to Ireland, in the same manner that they watched that of the Scotch Members, when first introduced with respect to Scotland. I call upon your Lordships to judge what will be the result of this measure as it affects Ireland, from what you have seen of the results of another measure as it affected Scotland. I do assure your Lordships, that, if I should be disappointed as to the result of this Bill, I shall not feel the slightest scruple in coming down to your Lordships, stating the case, and calling upon you to enable His Majesty to allay the danger to which it had given rise.—(Hear, hear, hear!) And this I should do with as firm a reliance upon the confidence and support of your lordships, as I now entertain with reference to the measure before you.—(Hear, hear, hear.] My lords, having shortly explained to you the grounds upon which I propose the measuse, namely, the present state of Ireland; the state of the Irish Church; the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of devising any other remedy for existing as well as prospective evils in that country; the state of public opinion;—having, I say, stated these to you as the grounds upon which I act, I shall not trouble your Lordships further than to entreat, that, that you will take the measure into your consideration with all that coolness and consideration which a subject so important deserves.—[The noble duke sat down amidst loud applause.]

FRIDAY, APRIL 2.

The adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of the Roman Catholic relief bill was resumed.

The Archbishop of YORK said, that, after the fullest attention and most mature deliberation, he grieved to say, he could not support the present bill. The securities which it proposed were not sufficient to allay his fears for the Protestant Church in Ireland.

The Bishop of DURHAM owned, that, after the best consideration he had been enabled to give the Bill, he could not bring himself to think that such a measure as was now before their Lordships could be carried without great danger to the Church.

The Duke of SUSSEX supported the Bill in a long speech, in the course of which a slight misunderstanding arose between him and Lord Kenyon, which ended in the Royal Duke apologizing for the mistake which he had committed.

The LORD CHANCELLOR addressed the house at extraordinary length. He defended his character from the aspersions which had been thrown upon it; supported the measure as imperatively necessary for the pacification of Ireland; showed that the constitution of 1688 was no bar to the present bill; and declared his firm and decided opinion, that the dangers which some persons thought they saw in concession were merely imaginary.

The Earl of FALMOUTH opposed the bill, and twitted the noble and learned Lord with a sudden change of opinion on this question.

The DUKE OF WELLINGTON having giving a short explanation, the question was put by the Lord Chancellor, and the decision was pronounced to be in the affirmative, when,

Lord GODERICH rose, and supported the measure at considerable length.

The Earl of MANSFIELD opposed it, characterising it as a monument of our folly and a bitter legacy to our posterity.

The Marquis of ANGLESEY supported the Bill in an able speech. He viewed the question in three points of view, politically, religiously, and military. With respect to the political view of the question, he said, that, the moment the bill was passed, he should consider the regeneration of Ireland complete. Ireland wanted repose, which she had for several months enjoyed. The consequence was, that her gaols were empty, her police idle, and her military unoccupied. This bill would make such a state of things permanent. Tranquility would produce prosperity. British capital would flow into Ireland; the poor would find employment; and the absentees would return. With respect to the religious view of the question, he maintained that the Irish Church was now in danger, but that the passing of this Bill would strengthen it in the minds of the people, and would better maintain its security than all the penal enactments which the utmost ingenuity of Legislation could devise. Then, with respect to the military view of the question, the noble Marquis spoke as follows:—"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, that would be an improvident government which did not immediately add a force of 15,000 men to the previous military force: 40,000 men, I should say, would be barely sufficient, under such circumstances. I say there is a nucleus of mishief for the disaffected of that Country in America. I say that there is a focus of insurrection for it always existing in France. I will suppose 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 [illegible] try 50,000 able-bodied men, and, what is better, willing-hearted men, who will traverse the continent, or 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 far more, and I do not wish to exaggerate, than 100,000 bayonets.—(Great Cheering.)

The Duke of NEWCASTLE moved the adjournment of the debate till Monday. The Earl of Roslyn thought that the adjournment had better be till one o'clock on Saturday. The motion for adjournment gave rise for some discussion. In the sequel, the motion for adjourning till Saturday was agreed to, amidst a scene of confusion and uproar unparalleled in the House of Lords. The House rose at a quarter past two o'clock, in the morning.

SATURDAY, APRIL 3.

The debate was resumed at one o'clock precisely.

The Earl of GUILDFORD opposed the bill contending that it would, if passed, subvert the civil and religious liberties of the country. Popery was unchanged.

Lord LILFORD supported the measure, from which he was convinced, the happiest results would arise.

The Earl of WESTMORELAND spoke, at considerable length, in favour of the bill, contending, that, whilst it would lessen the power of the Catholic, it would increase that of the Protestant Church.

Lord SIDMOUTH opposed the measure in a long Speech, stating his conviction, that the wiser course would be to resist encroachments when we were able to do so, than at a future time when we would be in a worse condition to resist.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL also opposed the Bill, and defended the memory of his brotner in reference to this subject.

Lord TENTERDEN delivered a long and argumentative Speech against the measure.

Earl GREY spoke at considerable iength, and with his usual ability in support of the Bill.

The Earl of ELDON rose after the cries of "Question!" had continued for some minutes—The noble and learned Lord then proceeded to address the house against the Bill, though, he confessed, he had nothing new to offer to their Lordships. His Lordship declared the securities quite inadequate.

Lord PLUNKETT replied, in a powerful speech, to the noble and learned Lord.

Lord FARNHAM opposed the bill.

The Duke of WELLINGTON rose and replied shortly. The following is the only important passage of his reply:—"My Lords, another charge is the one against my colleagues and myself, made by a noble Earl (Eldon) on the cross benches, of want of consistency. I certainly admit that many of my colleagues as well as myself did heretofore vote against measures of a similar description with this. I must likewise say, that we all felt, when we adopted this measure, that we were sacrificing ourselves and our popularity to that which we felt our duty to our Sovereign and Country. We know perfectly well, that, if we had chosen to put ourselves at the head of the cry of Protestantism, we should have been much more popular than even those who have excited the cry of popery against us; but we should have left on the country a burden, which would have borne it down altogether, and we should have deserved the execration of the country for it.—(Hear!)

The LORD CHANCELLOR then put the question, and ordered the bar to be cleared, which was done at precisely half-past ten o'clock.

At a quarter-past eleven o'clock, the Clerk of the House declared the state of the votes to be:

For the original motion,	147	
Proxies, - - -	70	
		217
Against the motion, -	79	
Proxies, - - -	33	
		112
Majority in favour of the second reading of the Bill, - -		105

This announcement was received with tremendous cheers, which lasted several minutes.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY.

Mr. Secretary PEEL moved, that the Roman Catholic relief bill be read a third time. The Marquis of CHANDOS opposed it, and moved, as an amendment, that the bill be read a third time on that day six months. Mr. G. MOORE seconded the amendment. Mr. H. VILLIERS supported the bill. General GASCOYNE spoke at some length against it. Mr. TOWNSEND was favourable to the measuse. Mr. PEARSE opposed and Mr. J. DENISON supported it. Mr. W. BANKES, the Honourable Mr. GUST, and others opposed the bill. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL supported it. If (said he) I believed that these concessions would in the slightest degree weaken the Protestant faith—in which I thank God I have been educated, which in my manhood and maturer age has been my comfort in which I hope I shall die, for which some of my forefathers have suffered, (cheers,)—I should be the last person to advocate the cause.—(Cheers.) It is because I felt well assured, that without this measure the Irish church might fall, and that even the English church was in danger, that I gave my humble assistance in bringing forward this measure. It was on these grounds that I at first gave it my concurrence, and that I now continue to support it.—(Cheers.) Sir C. WETHERELL opposed the bill in a long speech, which was marked by his usual eccentricity. Mr. Secretary PEEL replied in a long speech. After which Sir. R. INGLIS rose to move an adjournment of the debate; but, the house objecting, he proceeded to oppose the bill. The wish of the majority of the house appeared to be in favour of an immediate division, but there was a cry also for Mr. Sadler. Mr. SADLER presented himself to the house, and suggested the propriety of an adjournment.—Vehement cries of "No no!" "Go on, go on!") The honourable gentleman then addressed the house at considerable length against the measure. Mr. V. FITZGERALD, amidst the impatience of the house, replied to the preceding speaker. After a few words from Mr. TRANT and Mr. MORRISON, Sir JOSEPH YORKE obtained a momentary silence, on which the honourable baronet spoke to the following effect:—Sir, at the close of this discussion, I wish to give a Parliamentary toast, "May the sister kingdoms be united, and for ever after live together like two brothers!"—(Roars of laughter.) The gallery was cleared, and the house divided:

For the Amendment.....	142
Against it.....	320
Majority.....	178

The bill was then read a third time.

Colonel SIBTHORPE moved a clause, restricting the admission of Roman Catholics into bodies corporate. Mr. PEEL opposed the clause. The house again divided:

For the Clause.....	17
Against it.....	320
Majority.....	216

Several verbal amendments were proposed by Mr. Peel and agreed to.

The SPEAKER.—That this bill do pass, as many as are of that opinion say aye. (The number and vehemence of the "ayes" absolutely shook the walls of the house.) As many as are of the contrary opinon say no. (The comparatively faint sound of the "noes" excited much laughter.) The ayes have it. [illegible] Secretary Peel do carry this bill to the House of Lords, and desire their lordships' concurrence.

It is impossible to convey by language an adequate idea of the scene which immediately followed this proposition. All the friends of the measure simultaneously rose, cheering, and waving their hats and handkerchiefs in the most animated and enthusiastic manner; and a great number crowded around Mr. Peel, and shook the right honourable gentleman heartily by the hand.

The qualification of freeholders (Ireland) bill was also read a third time and passed.

MR. O'CONNELL'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

"The nations have fallen, and thou still art young,
Thy sun is but rising, when others are set;
And tho' slavery's gloom o'er thy morning hath hung,
The full moon of freedom shall beam round thee yet."

London, 7th March, 1829.

Beloved Fellow Countrymen—It is unnecessary to bespeak your attention—Every human being in Ireland is alive to the importance of the present crisis.

For twenty-five years we have struggled for that equalization of civil rights called Catholic Emancipation. This is not the time to inquire into the causes which retarded, or the men, or the means, that accelerated that great measure. It is sufficient to know that by our own energy, virtue, consistency, and perseverance, we have arrived at the threshold of emancipation. The Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, who were believed to be unreclaimable advocates of exclusion, have yielded to the constitutional necessity of "settling the Catholic question." Whoever created that necessity or however it was created, it is admitted Catholic Emancipation is now about to be conceded.

The plan of that emancipation will be found in what is called a report of a Speech delivered in Parliament by a Mr. Peel, on Thursday the 5th of the present month of March.

The plan consists of two bills; the one to emancipate the Catholics—the other to disfranchise the forty shilling freeholders of Ireland.

The first an act of almost unmixed good—the other an act of, I must say, altogether unmixed injustice. Whilst we anxiously hope the first will pass into law, let us anxiously exert ourselves to prevent the other from being carried into effect.

The emancipation bill is one of almost unmixed good.—Indeed it contains in it matter the most consoling, brought forward with a plain directness of manner, which gives double value to its beneficent provisions.

Its principal and most useful features are these. First—It is founded on the principle of equalization of civil rights to all classes and creeds.—It therefore strikes "ascendancy" at the very root. It does all we require—it puts us on an equality with our Protestant countrymen. We never asked, neither would we accept of "ascendancy" for ourselves. We could not bear that ascendancy in others without manfully struggling to get rid of it. It is, thank God, at an end; we shall hear no more of "Protestant ascendancy," but in its place, genuine conciliation and harmony will be cultivated mutually by Protestants and Catholics, now that the stimulating idol of faction is to be removed for ever. Such is the first great feature of the emancipation bill.

Secondly—The bill removes, by expressly repealing, all the old penal statutes respecting the property of Catholics. This is a most wise and benevolent provision. Perhaps I ought not to praise it so much; because it may be recollected, that this was the course I suggested in 1825—Nay, the draft of the emancipation bill I drew at that time was precisely in this form. Mr. Peel then started with horror at the report that it was confided to me to draw that draft. Our friends therefore abandoned my draft at that period. Mr. Peel now adopts my plan precisely. It will, I trust, be deemed only the more satisfactory to my countrymen on that account. I have the vanity to think that the people of Ireland will like the Bill the better for knowing that it is just such a Bill in respect to property as I would myself introduce, had I the power to turn it into a law.

Thirdly—Catholics can *now*, that is, by this Bill, hold all offices in Ireland, save that of Lord Lieutenant. A Catholic can be Lord Chancellor in Ireland; Catholics can be Chief Judges and Prime Judges, Master of the Rolls, and, to the horror of Master Ellis, he may have a Catholic colleague as Master in Chancery. They can be Mayors, aye, and Aldermen, and Sheriffs of cities and towns, and Common-Councilmen, and Masters and Wardens of guilds, and Sheriffs of Counties; in short, they are put on a footing of perfect equality with their Protestant, Presbyterians, and dissenting fellow-subjects of all persuasions.

Fourthly—Catholic Peers are equally entitled with Protestant Peers to sit and vote in the House of Lords.

Fifthly—Catholics are equally entitled with Protestants to be Members of the House of Commons.—This is the most important concession of all—viz.: the removing all doubt as to the right of Catholics, equally with Protestants, to sit and vote in Parliament.

Sixthly—The horrible declaration that the holy sacrifice of the mass, and the invocation of the blessed Virgin Mary, and other saints, are impious and idolatrous, is abolished for ever. Our Protestant neighbours are no longer compelled to strain their own conscience, and to insult us by such a tremenduous denunciation.

There does not live one Catholic in Ireland, whose heart will not bound with joy and gratitude when he hears of the most conciliatory and consolatory alterations in the laws.

This is all we desired and contended for. This is perfect satisfaction. This is that equality we always required. This is the full measure of our contentment as Catholics.

But these most propitious, wise and salutary measures, have this great and most delightful addition, it is this—

Seventhly—There is to be no veto; no controul over or interference with the nomination or appointment of our bishops; no absurd or vexatious enquiries, as to the spiritual communications, which may be necessary between our Prelates and the revered chief pastor. No payment or salarying of our clergy. Nothing to sever or encumber the tie between them and their people. In short, the Catholic Church in Ireland is left free and unstained by worldly hands, to perform her awful and life-giving functions, in the pure and genuine spirit of faith and charity.

Such are the principal provisions of the emancipation bill. They do away for ever that insulting superiority, which was so often ostentatiously displayed by some of our Protestant countrymen They take away that sense of inferiority, under which the Catholic was compelled to labour in his native land; and by producing equality, they make it the interest, as I trust it will be, the inclination of all parties, Protestants as well as Catholics, to cultivate mutual good will and affection, and to establish domestic as well as national peace, tranquillity and harmony.

It is a pity that there should be any thing in this excellent bill to detract from its utility, as a healing measure for Ireland. But it has two defects.

The first is a studied and most unnecessary insult to our Reverend Prelates—a clause, prohibiting them from assuming the style and title of the Bishops of the Protestant church as by law established.

One is, indeed, sorry, that any of the paltry jealousy of little minds should find its way into a legislative enactment of a character of such utility and magnitude.

But this clause is quite unnecessary. Our Prelates never assumed the legal titles of the Protestant Bishops. The latter are Lords Bishops, having by law the privileges and station of Peers; our Roman Catholic Bishops, claiming no privilege of, or right or title to the Peerage. Their own style and title in the Catholic Church is all they ever claimed or assumed. The Law did not create that title—the law never can take it away. It is not the creation nor the object of legislation at all.

The bill, however, does not in any wise interfere with the exercise of the spiritual functions of our Prelates, nor with their jurisdiction over the Catholics. Let the Law, therefore, call them [illegible] style or title of Protestant Bishops—delivered as it is from the law of the land—but their own proper and distinctive rank—not in the state, but in the Catholic Church, unconnected from the state as it is, and will remain; and we will hold them in the same respect and veneration which we have ever entertained for persons who uniformly exhibit, as they have always exhibited, so much of pious and practical virtue.—Never was there yet any church on the face of the earth blessed with a prelacy, who exceeded in fervour, zeal, meekness, purity, talent, knowledge and utility, the present Catholic Prelates of Ireland. There is not one single dispassionate Protestant in that country that would not admit the accuracy of this description.

The second and only remaining objection to the bill is the clause respecting monastic orders.—These orders in Ireland require nothing from the State, and should not be singled out by the State for the infliction of any punishment. However the Bill is not to meddle with the existing establishments,—they all remain, and the present generation will not be deprived of their most valuable services.

I trust, too, that after the emancipation bill has gone into practical effect, and that Protestants and Catholics live together in that spirit of mutual kindness which prevails between Protestants and Catholics in those Countries where the law does not raise a wall of separation between them, I trust that when our Protestant brethren have leisure and inclination to investigate the facts, and to see the solid and substantial advantages which the poor, the uninstructed, the sick, and the wretched, receive from our monastic orders, these very Protestants will be themselves the first to prevent by new and wiser enactments, the operation of any law which could deprive the people of their services.

It is said that this clause is in an especial manner directed against the Jesuits. Heaven help us, what a sagacious motive of Legislation!—Since the world began, there never was a body of men who were at one and the same time so calumniated and so useful as the Jesuits. They have done more than any other society whatsoever, in the cultivation of literature, in the extension of useful knowledge, in the advancement of the sciences, and in the propagation of Christianity among the pagans.

In the education of youth they have been pre-eminent.—Who are the best judges on this?—Certainly parents are the most interested in judging rightly, and I will say it would be exceedingly cruel as well as unjust to deprive Irish Catholics of the choice of the Jesuits to instruct their children.—The youth who are educated by them acquire an independence in mind and even in person, which is perhaps the most useful portion of education. They are attached through life to their instructors with an affection which is fortified by lasting reflection.

Let us hope, then, that when the excitation of bad passions is at an end, justice may be done to the characters of this much injured class of men. Prejudice and pre-occupation will exclaim at these sentiments—but let me add this fact within my knowledge, that no class of instructors ever left so deep and permanent a religious impression on the minds of youth as the Jesuits; an impression which, though of course liable to be obscured by the incitements of passion, avarice, and ambition, is scarcely ever wholly obliterated; and whilst it remain in many, nay, in almost all, altogether undefaced, it in almost all recurs again in the course of life, and produces ample fruit of religious and moral observance. I submit this fact to the consideration of all serious and sincere christians of all sects and persuasions.

Let no alarm be created lest the measure should reach the convents of those exemplary and pious ladies who edify and instruct the female youth of Ireland. No species of emancipation could be accepted if those ladies were to be interfered with or disturbed by the law. In the sacred silence of those retreats in which they have secluded themselves from the world, to dedicate themselves to God and his poor, they shall be preserved undisturbed, were it to cost us our fortunes, our civil rights, and even our lives. It is not indeed intended by the emancipation bill to interfere with them at all.

You have now the emancipation bill before you—you perceive that it has great, permanent, and most salutary provisions. That, above all, it destroys that odious and once execrable ascendency which has been so long virulently exercised. You perceive that it gives us a perfect political equality. It destroys the vile slavery of inferiority in our native land, and brings us up to the exact level of our Protestant countrymen.

Let us, my beloved friends, act generously and nobly. Our religion commands us to forgive injuries, and to forget insults; our hearts bear responsive to the sacred dictates of that divine religion—let us show ourselves worthy of it. Let us forgive the errors and even pardon the offences of the Orangemen and Brunswickers. Let us invite them to a community of good feeling and to reciprocity of affection; let our darling motto be "happy homes and altars free." Our altars—our holy and unstained altars are free. Let us cultivate those kind, and Christian charities which will give us happy, happy homes.

Oh, Ireland!—Oh, my beloved country! how my heart throbs and my soul expands at the prospect that open before you.

But, alas! alas! there is one dark and murky cloud coming to obscure that bright and brilliant prospect. There is another bill, my countrymen—there is, alas! another bill proposed—a bill to disfranchise the forty shilling-freeholders!!

Let not our exultation at the first bill prevent our decided, determined, energetic, but constitutional opposition to this bill. My own heart is too full of joy at the one measure to allow me this day to discuss the pernicious principle of the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders. I will, to-morrow, address you upon this subject.

In the mean time, let us prepare our firm and constitutional opposition. Let it be not the less active for being accompanied by the concession of emancipation. I conjure the Protestants to assist us. This is their cause as well as ours—Their rights are taken away without cause or pretext. Can they love liberty and refuse to join us in the protection of the valuable right of election?

But I shall not this day dwell longer on this painful subject.—I will for to-morrow's address concentrate all the powers of my mind, such as they are—would they were effective, in order to point out all the legal and constitutional means of resistance to the cruel injustice of disfranchising Protestants who are not accused of any crime: and of disfranchising Catholics who can be accused of no other offence than *this*—that they have acted honorably, disinterestedly, and nobly, for liberty and their native land.

I remain my beloved countrymen,
Your ever faithful and devoted servant,
DANIEL O'CONNELL.

LONDON, MARCH 31.

The King having caused it to be intimated that he had no further occasion for his services to Sir Charles Wetherell on Monday, the following morning Sir Charles ordered the words "Attorney-General," which followed his name on the door of his chamber, to be obliterated.

It is reported that Sir James Scarlett is again to be Attorney-General.

A private letter, emanating from an authentic source, has been received in town from Perth, which states that very great excitement prevails there on the subject of the Catholic Question. The "No Popery" cry had been raised, and the mob had broken the windows of many persons who were known to be favourable to Emancipation. The accounts from the North of Scotland generally lead to the belief that if the measure is passed, disturbances are likely to arise. A very general opinion prevails there that the Bill is against the Act of Union.

The Courier.

SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1829.

Bank of New-Brunswick.

Director next week, - - - *W. Bowman, Esq.*

DISCOUNT DAY,.....THURSDAY.

Hours of business, from 10 to 3.

☞ *Bills for Discount, must be lodged with the Cashier before 3 o'clock on TUESDAY.*

Marine Insurance Office.

Committee of Directors for the ensuing week:
WILLIAM BOWMAN,
GEORGE D. ROBINSON,
JOHN R. PARTELOW,
Office Hours.—From Twelve to Three.

MR. PEEL'S SPEECH AGAIN.—We last week stated that our limits would not then admit of our giving the substance of the *whole* of Mr. PEEL'S Speech of the 5th: we shall now endeavour to attend to the remaining part of it; believing as we firmly do, that from beginning to end, it contains an ample and lucid detail of the sentiments of Government with regard to this important national change.—The causes which have led to unanimity in the Cabinet respecting it; and the advantages which Ministers warmly anticipate, as the result of Emancipation.

Mr. PEEL, having enumerated the offices which Roman Catholics would still remain incapacitated to fill, and which they could not conscientiously accept of if offered to them, they being connected with the management of the affairs of the Protestant Church, stated, that by other clauses in the Bill, they would also be excluded from all interference with the Universities, or Church patronage:—and would not be allowed to advise His Majesty with regard to clerical appointments.

The Right Honorable Secretary, at this point, appeared to make a pause, as if satisfied in his own mind, that the extensive view of the question which he had laid before the House, would be sufficient to bring to a focus, as it were, the substance of all the principal arguments *pro* and *con* which had been, or which probably would be made use of in debate.—As if determined, however, that no member should, at an after day, have room to plead a misconception of any part of the Speech, he deliberately stated, that he was ready to go into any particulars which members might propose for explanation.

LORD NUGENT wished to ask the Right Hon. Secretary, what he intended to do with the elective Franchise.

To this question the Right Honorable Secretary replied, that it was his intention to place the Roman Catholic Electors on the same footing as the Protestant Electors of Ireland, contending that the Roman Catholics had no right to complain of the measure.—The prayer of their petition had been granted—they would now enjoy the same political advantages and influence in the state as their Protestant brethren enjoyed, but they could not in justice expect more than any other class of His Majesty's subjects.

But the alteration which Mr. PEEL intended to propose, proceeded from a belief that it would be followed by positive good to the Roman Catholics themselves both *personal* and *political*.

As to *personal* advantages nothing can be more clear, than that after the Franchise is raised, the possession of it will become an object of ambition among the lower orders, and operate as a stimulus to industry and regular habits, in order to obtain the means of procuring it;—thus will there gradually be an improvement, not only in the condition, but in the manners and habits of a numerous body of the Irish peasantry. They would soon find, that the proper employment of their time, and of the means within their power, were the only legitimate paths to respectability and wealth, and would no doubt set about a reformation without delay.—The progress of this reformation could not, at first, be expected to be rapid or very general, but the force of example would in the end prove almost irristible.—The moral state of the community would wear a different aspect from that which it has heretofore worn, and the face of that delightful country, would on every hand, bear striking proofs of the perseverance, diligence, and activity of its inhabitants.—Instead of seeing the newspapers crammed with the accounts