

THE EXAMINER.

No 123. SUNDAY, MAY 6, 1810.

THE POLITICAL EXAMINER.

Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few. SWIFT.

No. 121.

MINISTERS AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE past week has presented a series of bitter doings. The Ministry and the Commons, united more firmly than ever, not only by the old spirit, but by all the sympathies arising from bad reputation, go hand in hand in disgracing and defending each other:—abuse follows abuse in endless continuity, and before we can count the links, we feel ourselves basely fettered in the chain. In the space of a few days, the public have seen one of the most disgraceful appointments in the history of official corruption; they have seen also, in an Assembly consisting but of sixty-four persons, the rejection of Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY'S proposed reform in the Criminal Code; they have seen a grant of seven thousand pounds a-year made to another of the King of England's relations, upon the plea, that the said relation has been fighting BONAPARTE to no purpose;—and finally, they have seen the House of Commons complaining of indignity, and rejecting the Middlesex Petition for wanting that respect for them in words, which they have never shewn for themselves in deeds.

1. And first of the appointment. Of all resentments, that which is the most unjust and the most foolish can find no better malice than in the repetition of a gross error. By this repetition it hopes to display at once its powers of provocation and its contempt for advice, always forgetting, that like a stubborn child, whose resentment acts in the very same way, it is laying up for itself a store of future chastisement, either from its own follies or from the passion of its indulgers. The Ministers therefore, stung through all their little souls at the contemptuous treatment which Mr. YORKE experienced at Cambridge, meditated how they might best exhibit their contempt in return, and after revolving the matter as calmly as their fury would allow them, bethought themselves of an expedient, which in the happiest manner might at once display their rage and their want of policy, and at the same time, insult the good sense and provoke, if such a thing can be provoked, the indignation of their countrymen:—the plan was carried into execution with a vigour proportioned to its magnanimity: Lord MULGRAVE, who like an humble friend, can sleep any where, removed his night-cap to the Ordnance; and Mr. YORKE became First Lord of the Admiralty. Here the feelings of the public and those of the Ministers are completely at issue; for whatever popularity the latter may impudently boast of

possessing, or in other words, whatever apathy the people may have exhibited respecting them, Mr. YORKE'S proceedings can certainly boast of no such popularity and even of no such apathy. They offered too immediate a violence to popular custom, not to meet with instant and unequivocal disgust; and therefore the present proceeding of the Ministers is not and cannot be misconstrued. It is a sheer piece of ill-temper and revenge, for Mr. YORKE has exhibited no talents whatever for such a situation, and the revenge is at once the more complete, foolish, and monstrous, inasmuch as it is an injury as well as insult to the nation. Personal quarrels of this nature, the effect of bad measures and little-minded rulers, have been one of the greatest curses of the present reign, and will ever be one of the greatest of blessings to our enemies. They influenced the disastrous war with America, the disgraceful and unconstitutional struggle with WILKES, and the entire abandonment of rule to Mr. PITT; and they have had the same influence, I believe, in no common degree, on the proceedings against Sir FRANCIS BURDETT.—If public odium is to recommend to public trust—if the sure road to royal confidence is the want of popular confidence—if to be driven with ignominy from an independent country is to be the immediate passport to high office—the dignity of the English people has become a jest too gross even for our farces.

2. But favouritism, it may be supposed, must stop here,—it cannot go beyond the encouragement and enrichment of the most obnoxious men. Alas! not so:—every thing else that is obnoxious to the people or to common reason, becomes a favourite with such a government; it is enough that some person, enjoying the people's confidence, brings forward a proposal for their good, and it is instantly rejected. If a Member of Parliament wishes to punish the guilty, he meets with the most rancorous opposition; and if, on the other hand, he wishes to lessen the severity of criminal punishment, it is just the same:—it is all attributed to the little principle of gratifying the people, and the Ministers, without considering whether the gratification is just or not, whether the principle is noble or not, incontinently set their faces against it. Thus the proposal of Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY to amend our Criminal Code, the disproportionate severity of which has so long been a just and singular reproach to the nation, had little more than threescore members to settle it, so confident were its opponents of dismissing it with contempt. This confidence however almost overreached itself, and the Bill was thrown out by 33 against 31 members—a majority of two. Here we have 64 persons discussing and determining the most important legislative questions, and 33 against 31, a majority the most insignificant, and not to be compared in point of talent with the opposite side, stamping

new the sanguinary character of our criminal code. So mere a matter of indifference is the question of life and death, and so sure is the quack who kills, to get the majority over the physician who saves! In the list of this wholesome multitude of lawgivers, nobody, that has ever beheld HOGARTH'S *Progress of Cruelty*, is surprised to see Mr. WINDHAM, the bull-baiter, prize-fighter, and cock-fighter, or Sir VICARY, the dealer in sanguinary opinions, and the promoter of bloodshed by "analogy." That a man or woman should be hung for stealing two or three guineas, may reasonably appear to them a trifle,—a salutary enjoyment for the mob,—a mere *jeu-d'esprit* of the executioner:—and yet any person, at all versed in the mysteries of the times, may be surprised that the very Members of Parliament, who take every opportunity of screening notorious delinquents, should be thus eager to patronize the gallows! Sir VICARY sees no crime in the reckless sensuality of a Royal Duke, who suffers the profligate to feed upon his country; but the wretch, who should steal a looking-glass from one of those profligates, he would punish with death! Mr. WINDHAM, when Secretary at War, gives a carte-blanche to a creature of his to exempt him from unpleasant questions respecting the use of 159,621l.; but then if any one were to steal the hundredth part of this privileged sum, he would fain have the rascal put out of the world! Mr. PERCEVAL scatters thousands, and sees them scattered, with the most courtly indifference; will not have the Ordnance censured for suffering its treasures to be embezzled; defends every species of waste, provided always it proceed from great men; screens CHATHAM; screens CASTLEREAGH; screens himself; but then let a human attempt a little corruption, or a pauper steal a few loaves, and see what an example he will make of him!—O impartial Legislators! O dignified and disinterested Senators, who would fain exercise the triple power of accusers, judges, and executioners! O Ministers of honest and enlarged souls, acting upon such broad principles for the benefit and astonishment of your country!—never, without thinking of your merits, can I pass by those noble walls yeilded NEWGATE, fit palace for heads as thick and hearts as hard, or as the poet calls it, that

Celebrated place,

Where angry Justice shows her awful face;

Where little villains must submit to fate,

That great ones may enjoy the world in state."

EARTH.

3. Charity however covers a multitude of sins; and the People of England, after having their taxes wrung from their fingers ends, and seeing their blood and treasure wasted on the Continent, must be wonderfully soothed to behold a grant of seven thousand a year to his Majesty's Nephew the Duke of BRUNSWICK, particularly as the said Duke is one of those unhappy Princes whom we encouraged to expose BONAPARTE, or in other words, to ruin himself. That the Duke deserves succour from his encouragers, there can be no question: the only circumstance to be la-

mented, as Lord HOLLAND and Sir JOHN NEWPORT ventured to mention, is that the grant can come from no other pockets than those of the People. The KING, in fact, is very poor: there can be no question about the matter, or his Majesty, being as he is the "the Father of his People," and feeling, as the pathetic *Post* assures us, their late disquiet so deeply as to lose his eye-sight in consequence, would never have requested of them a pension for his own Sister—not to mention that the promises respecting the Prince of WALES would not have been so utterly broken, or that the Duke of SUSSEX would never have had an execution in one of his father's Palaces. To be sure, Lord HOLLAND did say something about the Civil List and the Droits of Admiralty; but, lord, the Civil List is only 1,200,000l. a year, and the Droits of the Admiralty consist of nothing but a few indefinite millions! One should truly consider these matters and make every possible allowance for a Monarch so situated; and it will be hard, if we do not come to a right comprehension and appreciation of the business. In the mean time, it will become us to consider, what dish we must leave off, or from what possible part of our being we can contribute a new tax, in case any more of his Majesty's relations shall do us the honour of coming to live with us.

4. There is but one more species of charity, which the Ministers want, and that is, a little charity for this all-paying and all-patient country. At any rate, if they and their friends the Commons are not too proud to screen delinquency and corrupt the Constitution, they should not be too proud to be told of it. They have rejected the Middlesex Petition, because it is "insulting" to their "dignity," that is to say, because it tells the truth in a plain manner, and generally speaking, omits the epithet *Honorable* as applied to their House. But what were the practices that taught the Middlesex Petitioners so to feel and to speak? What were the practices that denied their indignant feelings the use of ceremony, and led them to omit an epithet which those practices contradicted? Let the House ask themselves these questions, and then trace the insult to its first and only cause. Mr. PERCEVAL, by his affected readiness to receive the Westminster Petition, which was not less severe, though less abrupt than the Middlesex, thought to throw a damp on the ardour of public remonstrance; but he finds himself mistaken, and flies into a passion. His name, and the unconstitutional practices of himself and CASTLEREAGH will be repeated in every honest paper of the same description; and he ought to see with remorse instead of rage, the contempt and disgust which such practices have excited against all whom they concerned. The House now perceives what it has brought upon itself by sanctioning such practices and submitting to be ruled by such men;—but it is not resentment that can do away insult; it is Reform that must do away the cause of insult. What! Have the Members consented to take a practical insult from the powerful, and do they affect so high a tone at a verbal insult from the weak? Can they consent to be like those

servile wretches, who will smilingly take a blow from a lord, and resent one from an inferior only? Can they bear their honours to be marketed, their seats to be bought and sold, the admission to their House to be played with like a key on an idle finger,—and yet summon up so high an aspect, so dignified an indignation, when they are barely told of it?—Why, they tell this important secret to each other twenty times in a month: the Outs, whoever they may be, pass the most eloquent part of their time in reviling the Ins, and telling the House how it is degraded and lost; and they will not do away the remembrance of these truths by any ridiculous coquetry to which a fellow-feeling may incline them.—The whole truth is, that the necessity of Reform grows more manifest every hour; and in so doing, it irritates those who have denied it, and alarms every bad conscience which it exposes.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

PARIS, APRIL 25.—Marshal Massena is going to take the chief command of the army of Portugal, consisting of the corps of the Duke of Elchingen, the Duke of Abrantes, and Gen. Regnier.

According to the latest advices from Spain, Gen. Sebastian was at Malaga on the 1st inst, together with his headquarters. The greatest tranquillity prevailed there.

The 6000 marriages of soldiers ordered to take place here in commemoration of that of his Majesty the Emperor and King, were celebrated yesterday in the various parish churches and chapels.

APRIL 26.—Their Imperial Majesties, on their way to Antwerp, will take a view of the Canal of St. Quentin.—The Duke of Rovigo left Compeigne on the 22d inst. for Antwerp, to make preparations, in concert with the Prefect, for their accommodation. The most splendid fetes are to take place, in a style suited to the maritime situation of the city, and the object of the Empress's visit.

An article from Bayonne, of the 19th instant, says—“The Madrid Gazette of the 13th contains advices from Grenada, dated the 28th of March. The greatest tranquillity now prevails in that kingdom, which was so recently a prey to disturbances, and torn by different factions. The inhabitants, undecieved, think only of henceforth living peaceably under the paternal government of the King. His Catholic Majesty still remained at Grenada on the 28th of March, where he issued a decree, abolishing, in conformity to the Constitution, the exclusive privileges and personal rights established by the ancient Kings of Spain.”

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

In the Sitting of the 21st of April, Count Roznault de St. Jean d'Angely, Countellor of State, closed the Session with a Speech, of which the following are the principal passages:—

“GENTLEMEN—The labour of your double Session, the events which have preceded and accompanied it, will leave to the nation great recollections and high hopes. The Civil and Financial Legislation has, during ten years, advanced by an uninterrupted progress towards perfecting the principles and completing the system of the former, and alleviating the weight of the contributions imposed by the latter. The internal organization is ameliorated, industry has followed in the course of

former success. The plans for all the great public labours and the means for their execution have been decreed. Great political views have extended, with wisdom and moderation, and always with advantage, the limits of the empire. The Continental Peace, which before rested only on treaties and the perpetuity of the dynasty, which had for its foundation only the genius of a hero and the power of a great nation, has now for its basis a prosperous, holy, august, and eternal alliance. You have witnessed, Gentlemen, the Senatus Consultum which unites to the French Empire the City of Rome, the ancient patrimony of the Cæsars and of Charlemagne. This act of the Constitutions of the Empire, inspired by history, counselled by policy, and decreed by genius, joins parts of the Western Empire which have long been separated, and establishes an alliance between the Tiber and the Seine—between Paris and Rome. Finally, this act respecting the authority, a ways sacred, of the Church, and preparing the true glory of religion, secures the independence of Thrones and the respect of Sovereigns. A new Department will be formed, under the name of the Department des Rouches du Rhin; and the remainder of the ceded territory will be united to the Department of the Deux Nethes, which will thus be rendered one of the most considerable, most important, and most wealthy of the Empire. Meanwhile, the Confederation of the Rhine has its consideration increased, its power confirmed, and the ties which unite its members drawn closer. If the tumult of war is still heard in those regions, the pernicious power of reaching which the English yet retain, it is either at such a distance, on the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire, that Europe cannot long suffer from it, and Asia none is menaced (unless the Divan return to better principles); or, for but a short period, beyond the Pyrenees, until the ports of Spain shall be open to our arms and closed to England. From that moment, the peace of Europe may be regarded as secured by the sincerity of treaties, the extent of power, the conformity of interests, and the superiority of genius. You have seen an august Messenger of Peace, a sacred pledge of eternal alliance, arrive in the heart of France, which has thereby been intoxicated with joy, and transported with love. It has been your destiny to be witnesses of the solemn bonds which will for ever unite Napoleon and Maria Louisa, and have at the same time united the interests of France, and the interests of Austria, for the happiness of the two nations, and the tranquillity of the world. All the allied nations bless an event which completes the establishment of their power, and cements the ties which unite them. Enlightened policy, and consoled humanity, give it equal applause; the reason of Europe sanctions it, but it belongs in particular to France to feel all its value.”

GERMANY.

AGRAH, MARCH 23.—The following is said to be the occasion of the hostilities that have taken place on the frontiers of Croatia. Pursuant to ancient treaties, the Porte ought to have ceded to Austria some fortresses, castles, and districts on the frontiers of Croatia; but this stipulation had not been carried into execution. This part of Croatia having been ceded to France by the Treaty of Vienna, the French Government enforced its rights to the places in question, and demanded the cession of them on the part of the Porte.

PROVINCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

Last week, at Lingfield, in Surrey, the wife of a labourer, named Davis, having gone out early in the morning, left an infant 14 months old in the cradle. On her return, she found the child dreadfully mangled; one eye torn out of the socket, its arms, face, and neck, much lacerated, and struggling for breath, as if oppressed with a weight. On striking down the clothes, the agonised mother perceived that it was occluded by the tail, which with her kitten had found the way into the cradle, and probably being annoyed by the play fellows of the infant, had reduced it to the above state.

On Thursday se'night, one of the London coaches from Liverpool unfortunately overturned by the breaking of a wheel, near the house called Mock-beggar-Hall, on the Prescot-road. The inside passengers escaped with little injury; but one of the outside passengers, Mr. Owen, attorney of Staffordshire, was bruised so dreadfully by the coach falling on his breast, that he survived only an hour afterwards. He was taken into a house by the road-side, where he had just time to state who he was, and dictate a few lines, as his last will and testament, which, at his request, was transmitted to his friends.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR APRIL.

The fine weather towards the close of this Month has been very favourable to the young wheats in most places, having tended much to recover those of the late sown kinds in different situations; but the great destruction of plants in many cases render them thin upon the ground, and backward in growth. Vegetation in general has been greatly pushed forward within the two last weeks, as is constantly the case after such cold, wet, late seasons. The putting in of the seed was perhaps scarcely ever more retarded, from the constant wetness and general unfavourableness of the whole of the last and the beginning of the present month. Much work of this sort is in consequence still to be performed, especially in the more low districts. Green crops, as we long since suggested, have almost wholly failed, especially turnips of the common kind; this has been particularly the case in many parts of Norfolk, and the neighbouring counties, from which great losses and vast expence have been sustained in the sheep stock, for the purchase of other necessary articles. This must of course enhance the price of mutton and lamb, unless the season becomes very fine and warm. The supplies of wheat have lately been much on the decline at the market in Mark-lane, but the further importations that may now be expected from Holland, will most probably obviate the inconvenience and keep down the price, which must otherwise have advanced. The backwardness of the season has, in some degree, rendered the supplies of fat-stock, particularly sheep and lambs, less abundant than is mostly the case at this period of the year.—The price of hay has lately been somewhat higher in the London markets.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, May 2.

Lord LIVERPOOL presented a Message from the King, recommending a Pension to his Nephew, the Duke of Brunswick; for which see the Commons.—Adjourned.

Thursday, May 3.

Lord LIVERPOOL moved the Order of the Day for taking his Majesty's Message into consideration. His Lordship talked about the gallant and heroic conduct of the Duke of Brunswick in defence of his own dominions, as well as for the independence of Europe, which, he said, exceeded even the measure of his misfortunes.—He concluded in the usual way, by proposing an Address of acquiescence to his Majesty.

Lord HOLLAND did not wish to oppose the Address; he thought the unfortunate Prince had claims on the generosity of the country; but when he recollected the frequency of such applications to Parliament, and considered that this would be an additional and grievous burthen on the people, he could not but think that some other source of supply might have been resorted to. He thought that some such funds as the Civil List, Four per Cents, Droits of Admiralty, &c. might have furnished the means, and have altogether prevented this fresh demand on the public purse.

The question of the Address was then put and carried unanimously.—Adjourned.

Friday, May 4.

Nothing of importance occurred in the House this day.—Lord HOLLAND gave notice of a motion for Friday next, respecting the inferior Clergy.—Adjourned to Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, April 30.

A new Writ was ordered to be issued for the Election of a Member for the County of Gloucester in the room of Admiral Berkeley, who has accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

ROYAL MESSAGE.

Mr. PERCEVAL delivered to the House a Message from his Majesty, which was read by the Speaker from the Chair.

“G. R.”

“His Majesty finds it necessary to communicate to the House of Commons, that in consequence of the continued occupation of the territories of the Duke of Brunswick Wolfenbuttel, on the Continent, and the unfortunate events in the year 1806, which were attended by the lamentable death of his illustrious father, his Serene Highness has, after a series of the most gallant but unsuccessful exertions, been obliged to seek an asylum in his Majesty's dominions. His Majesty, under these circumstances, recommends that the House will make some provision for his Serene Highness, until such time as the state of the Continent may enable him to return to his own dominions. His Majesty relies on his faithful Parliament to make a provision suitable to the rank and fortune of a Prince so nearly allied to his Majesty's Throne, and for whom his Majesty's feelings are so strongly interested.”—The Message was referred to a Committee.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, after a very few words, not audible from the Gallery, moved that a sum of 400,000*l.* be granted to his Majesty, to make good his engagements with his Sicilian Majesty for the year 1810.—Agreed to.—Adjourned.

Tuesday, May 1.

Mr. PETER MOORE presented a Petition from Mr. Sheridan and other Proprietors of the late Drury-lane Theatre, for re-erecting the Theatre, and for the benefit of all parties concerned, which was laid on the table, and leave given to bring in a bill accordingly.

Sir Wm. CURTIS brought up the Report of the Committee on the Bill for erecting a New Stock Market, which stated, that on a division on the preamble of the Bill, it was negatived, there being for it 24, against it 23. He observed, that a Member came in just as the division was about to take place, who requested that the question should be read, and afterwards gave the casting vote.

The SPEAKER decided that the Hon. Member was perfectly competent to vote. The Bill was consequently lost.

SICILIAN TREATY.

Mr. LUSHINGTON brought up the Report of the Committee of Supply, for granting 400,000*l.* to his Sicilian Majesty.

Mr. LAMBE opposed the grant. Every article imported by us into Sicily is liable to a very heavy duty, so great as almost to prohibit any idea of trading there. Thus, though we protect them at an immense expence, in return we do not receive the smallest favour. The inhabitants of the country were discontented, and declared that we are drawing on them the hostilities of France. There are now stationed there 10,000 British troops, and it is rather mortifying to reflect, that they are not there merely for opposing the French, but are instruments in the hands of the Sicilian Government, for oppressing the people, and of course maintaining dissensions.

Mr. PERCEVAL said, that exclusive of the importance of Sicily, this country was obliged, consistently with good faith, to render every service to his Sicilian Majesty. He would not contradict the Hon. Member, that notwithstanding all the violence of France, there may still be persons in different parts of the Continent still attached to the French Ruler. There were even in this country, some persons who wildly thought that even we had nothing worth fighting for against the domination of France. If, then, in Great Britain there were a few impregnated with such notions, it was not surprising that there should be some in other countries. If any thing was to be done with respect to reforming any abuses in Sicily, it should be done by way of advice, and not by controuling those whom we had as-

isted. This Treaty had underwent a discussion here, between his Majesty's Ministers and the Ministers of his Sicilian Majesty, who had no doubt the treaty would be acceded to, and he saw no good reason why the House should withhold the grant.

General TABLETON observed, that nothing had been said with regard to the defence of Sicily. Instead of 10,000, he believed there were 15,000 men locked up there: this was not a wise measure. The manner too of transmitting this grant in money he conceived to be injurious to this country; such an expenditure was not justifiable; he therefore moved as an amendment, "That instead of 400,000*l.* in the Resolution, 300,000*l.* should be inserted."

A division was called for, when there appeared—for the Resolution, 65—For the Amendment, 25—Majority 40.

PRIVATELY STEALING BILL.

Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY moved the further consideration of the Report of the Privately Stealing Bill. The amendments being agreed to, he moved that they and the Bill should be engrossed.

Mr. HERBERT deemed the terror of death salutary in preventing crimes. Blackstone, he said, disapproved of the alteration of capital laws. For these and other reasons, he felt it his duty to negative the engrossment.

Sir J. NEWPORT said, that the mass of mankind were injured by so bloody a system. Many cases could be adduced to prove that the severity of the law is not so much feared as the certainty of it. If a criminal is allowed to calculate on his chances, the certainty of punishment is taken away. He was well aware that solitary imprisonment is worse than death;—yet, he believed, it would be of good to the community;—for then the prisoner, when left to commune with his own thoughts, would come out reformed, and not, as now, instructed in the profligacy of others. He, at present, would never cease to say that the Criminal Law was defective; and hoped his Learned Friend would continue his career of humanity until he had established his principles of capital punishment on a rock never to be shaken.

Mr. D. GIBBY approved of the necessity of certainty in punishment; he thought however it should be united with severity.

The MASTER of the ROLLS supported the Bill. Without entering into an examination of the general opinions upon the subject, he would shortly state his reasons for thinking it desirable; indeed he believed that it was agreed on all hands that it was so, the only question was, whether if any other punishment was marked out instead of death, it would have the effect of deterring persons from the commission of crimes, were the laws effective in their operation? Now what had the Learned Gentleman who brought in this Bill said upon that head? Why, that in many cases they were not operative; for, that where the crime was punishable with death, the punishment in very few instances had been carried into effect. The inference was, that either the law, or the practice of it, was wrong. Which ever was the case, the truth was, that the laws were not efficacious in preventing the crime. The infliction of death being abstained from, he apprehended that the practice is right; because, if the law in itself was wrong, it would most assuredly have been noticed as such. If the practice then was not blamed, and no fault had been found with the Judges or the King's advisers, for not enforcing the law, it clearly shewed that the public opinion was, that the law is too severe, and is not adapted to the offence. There seemed indeed to be a sort of universal confederacy in the people to abrogate the law. In some instances prosecutors did not like to go on to conviction, because of the penalty to the offender. Juries would in other cases exempt the offender from the capital punishment, so that it might not be left in the breast of the Judge to execute it; nay even the Judges and the King's advisers were of the same opinion, and did not think it advisable to inflict a punishment which the law had expressly defined. With respect to the law then being effectual, offenders were prosecuted, and Juries were induced to acquit in many instances, not that they did not think the offender guilty, but because they thought the offence was to be too severely punished with death. The law, therefore, was not

good which left to the discretion of Juries to give a verdict contrary to their oaths, or as Blackstone very emphatically termed such decision, which placed Juries in the situation of "committing pious purjuries;" because it was adverse to their feelings of justice. Ought the Law to stand which men could not conform to without sacrificing their feelings or their consciences? In answer to those who objected to any general innovation of the laws, he would reply, that if laws were, from the change of circumstances and opinions, fallen into disuse, would it not be wiser policy to make new laws more conformable to the times? He would agree to the Bill, because it was an experiment he thought might be safely tried, and which, in his humble opinion, would prove efficacious.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, it had been argued that the present law prevented offenders from being brought to punishment; that it deterred prosecutors; that it biased witnesses; and that it influenced Juries. As far as his experience went, his conclusions were of an opposite nature. While he admitted that few instances of conviction were followed by the punishment of death, he denied that the possibility that such a punishment might follow did not deter from crime. It was the misfortune of those who thought with him, that they could not point out the mischief which had been prevented by the fear of capital punishment, because that which was prevented could never be seen; but the fact was not the less indubitable. He did not find, that any communication had been had with the Judges on the subject; nor had he reason to believe that their experience would lead them to conclusions similar to those of his Hon. and Learned friend. It was no disparagement to either of his Hon. and Learned Friends to say, that they could not be so well qualified to form an opinion of the law in question as those who were in the daily habit of administering it. He was adverse to the Bill.

Mr. MORRIS declared, that he had spent a great part of his professional life in Criminal Courts, and that his experience was in direct opposition to that of the Hon. and Learned Gentleman who had just spoken. He had known many instances in which the criminal was redeemed from the capital part of the charge by perjury on the part of witnesses and the Jury. This perjury had come to be considered as a sort of amiable weakness; he was desirous, however, that such morbid sensibility should be excluded from our Courts, and confined to our Circulating Libraries.

Mr. FRANKLAND deprecated any attempt to alter that system under which British freedom had flourished. In other countries the hand was watched while it was writing; the act was checked before it ripened into crime. But such a system would injure the manly spirit of the British character, to prevent any one from doing that which he did at his peril. Where there was little preventive justice, there must be much penal. He did not wish to see the actions of Englishmen too much controuled. Nothing could tend more to injure the happiness of this country than the introduction of a system by which the penal code would be weakened.

Mr. WILBERFORCE could not conceive that our liberties could be infringed, or our happiness diminished, by a mitigation of the penal code. Two hundred years ago that penal code was much more rigidly enforced. Since that period the number of capital punishments had gradually decreased, and yet our liberties had been more generally diffused—more deeply founded, and more thoroughly understood. The question before the House was, whether the punishment of death ought to be annexed to the crimes under discussion? In his opinion it ought not. He thought that the eyes of the country were gradually opening to the defects of our criminal law; and, he trusted, that by the adoption of the confinement of criminals in penitentiary houses, crimes would be more frequently prevented, and criminals rendered less injurious to society. He thought a case had been fairly made out for the interference of Parliament, and he should therefore support the Bill.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL asked, if any one could state a case in which a prosecutor had been deterred from proceeding for fear of bringing the criminal to a capital punishment? (Hear, hear!) It might be so; but until such a case was

stated, he would not believe its existence. If a prosecutor were desirous of avoiding the capital part of the charge, he had nothing to do but to abstain from stating that the robbery took place in a dwelling-house, or that it amounted to 40s. in value. It was an exaggeration therefore to say that the present law led to perfect impunity. It had been said that the law indeed witnesses to perjury themselves. This was all imaginary, and he was sure that no practical man would state that as his opinion. He allowed that juries might occasionally be inclined to indulge a latitude in valuing the articles which were the subject of a prosecution. This was censurable, but what followed? Perfect impunity? By no means. The criminal was subject to the same punishment as he would be were the offence made a chargeable felony. Under all the circumstances he thought the present system better than that proposed.

Mr. CANNING thought that it would be desirable to remove from juries any temptation to perjury, however benevolent their motives might be; and it would be better not to preserve in a system affording such facilities for escape, but doing away the severer punishment, increase the probability of the offenders being visited by the lesser. In acting thus they would run the risk of shaking the whole system. No dread of innovation could be felt, equal to that which might have been entertained when the law was made, after it had been seen that in the course of a century the crime and the punishment were so seldom found together.

Mr. PERCEVAL did not think the Bill would have a tendency to prevent the commission of crimes; he did not know that more persons were deterred from prosecuting than from committing the offence by dread of the punishment. The prosecutor and the juries might be affected by the severity of the punishment, but he did not believe the felon would commit an offence from an idea that that circumstance would screen him from punishment. If such inconveniences arose from the conflict of prosecutors and juries, might not the end of the Hon. Gentleman be answered, by increasing the sums necessary to constitute a capital offence? The effect of the Bill would be to make the offence more frequent, and he cautioned those who might be disposed to support it, lest in consequence it should become necessary for them again to have recourse to the legislature, and not only revive the law, but put it in execution.

Sir S. ROMILLY hoped Gentlemen would not oppose the Bill, because they might differ from him in sentiment. It was not, as had been said, founded on theory, but on practice. House robbing had considerably increased for some years past. This no one had thought proper to deny. He could only impute this increase to the circumstance of the law not being enforced. It had been said to disprove that, that the prosecutor not wishing to edge the death of the offender, might prosecute him for a minor offence. It was not proper that it should thus depend upon an obscure individual, whether or not a man should be tried for his life. In those cases where the Hon. Gentleman opposite thought the offence the greatest, that of servants robbing their masters, the parties offend most. He knew of instances of that nature. He knew too that juries in many cases doubted where no doubt would exist, if they were averse to punish with such excessive rigour. A year ago a woman was tried at the Old Bailey for stealing a ten pound note from her master. She had stolen nothing beside, except the box in which it was enclosed, which was worth but a penny. The Jury convicted her of stealing to the amount of 30s., and thus sunk the capital part of the charge. Many similar cases might be found in recent Sessions Papers. Juries ought not thus to be led to slight their oaths. Judges had also been thus influenced; they had frequently carefully avoided asking the value of things in order to shun the capital part of the charge. Dr. Paley, by whose authority the Solicitor-General attacked the Bill, spoke of the certainty of punishment as the only way to give the laws to have effect, as those who were most likely to offend were most likely to offend under the authority of the Magistrates he contended they had not enforced the law

as it stands. The frequency of executions took away from their effect, and rendered them more cruel. No one could witness the ceremony of passing sentence of death upon criminals, and hear the solemn prayer with which it concludes, without being affected, were it not considered as being a idle form. Not one-tenth part of those thus sentenced to death being executed, it almost degenerates into a solemn mockery. The individuals knowing this, still continued to be bouyed up with hopes of escaping, each hoping it will not be his fate to suffer, till at length the fatal order arrives, and he all hurry has little time to prepare for that world into which he is about to pass.

A division took place, when the numbers were—for the Bill, 31—against it, 33—majority against the Bill, two only.—Adjourned.

Wednesday, May 2.

The Portsmouth Water-works Bill, on a division on its re-committal, was thrown out by a majority of 52.

MIDDLESEX PETITION.

Mr. BYNG presented the Petition from the County of Middlesex, agreed to at the Hackney Meeting, on the 26th of April,—which appeared in the *Examiner* of last week.—The Petition having been read, Mr. BYNG moved that it do lie on the table.

Mr. MELLISH, though he would second the motion, did not feel himself bound further to support the Petition.

Mr. PERCEVAL (the Petition having been again read by his desire) then observed, that he was sure, from the conduct he had observed on a former day, when a petition was presented from the electors of Westminster, containing expressions so strong and so reprehensible, the House would not consider him as indisposed to entertain a petition coming from any class of his Majesty's subjects, if couched in terms at all consistent with the respect due to the House. However convinced he was that the Westminster Petition contained expressions that ought to have been omitted, he did not object to let it lie on the table. He trusted the House would see from that instance, his earnest wish to recommend to them every possible forbearance, consistent with the maintenance of their own dignity; but when he considered the language of the present Petition, he conceived it impossible to consider it in any other light than that of a deliberate and unparalleled insult to the House. He did not conceive that the object prayed by this Petition was of itself a sufficient cause to warrant its rejection. But he would appeal to the House, whether there was any Member who heard this Petition read, that did not conceive it to be rather an experiment to try how far the forbearance of the House would go in the sufferance of language such as it contained; or whether it could have any other object than to insult, when it went to a direct and a declaratory censure, from the mere authority of the Petitioners, upon the conduct of that House, in exercising its authority towards the person named in the Petition, by committing him to confinement for a violation of its privileges? Upon that part of the Petition which commented upon the manner in which the Officer had proceeded in executing the Order of the House, he should at present forbear to say any thing, as any error or irregularity on the part of that Officer in executing the warrant, might be for the future consideration of the House. But the Petition, in other respects, was totally different from the usual style and language of Petitions. It did not appeal respectfully to the authority of the House. It did not ask for any revision or reconsideration of the circumstances of which it complained; but the Petitioners protest against such an exercise of the privileges of the House, and charge it with assuming and exercising powers contrary to law. The measure which the petitioners urged might take place at some time, if the wisdom of Parliament should deem it fitting. But was the language of a petition, from any class of subjects, to charge that House with assuming illegal privileges, or to dictate to them how they should act in the exercise of their rights and privileges?—There was nothing in the Petition which approached in any degree to the character of a respectful appeal to the authority of Parliament. It did appear to him, therefore, that considering the language in which



a former petition was couched, considering the language held out of doors to depreciate the character and authority of that House, and seeing in the language of this petition a proof that the forbearance of the House from time to time served but to encourage new insult, it was high time that a line should be drawn somewhere, and the present was a fit occasion for that purpose. He therefore submitted whether the present petition ought not to be rejected.

Mr. Alderman COMBE said, he understood the petition was unanimously voted by a very numerous and respectable body of freeholders; and as he did not know to what consequences its rejection might lead, he should vote for its reception.

Mr. CALCRAFT did not view the petition in the very objectionable light stated by the Right Hon. Gentleman. He thought it the duty of the House of Commons to throw open a wide door for petitions, instead of evincing a disposition to reject them upon the mere ground of a vulgar or objectionable word. When he considered how the House of Commons was composed, and the opinion generally entertained by the country or the state of the representation, if something was not done to reform that representation, the House must expect to find the language of petitions not very flattering. The present petition he did not think such an one as ought to be rejected. There were several petitions received before by the House, containing expressions full as strong, and yet they were not rejected upon that account; and so long as these abominations were suffered to exist in the present state of the representation, so long would it be impossible for that House to command respect from the people.

Mr. GIDDY said, the petitioners had dressed up as a petition, a paper, not by which they expected any redress of grievances, but by which they presumed to dictate to the House what they chose to think right. As to any Reform, or rather an alteration in the constitution of that House, a representation to a delegation, he had no hesitation in declaring his opinion, that it would not tend to the advantage of the people. He objected, therefore, to Gentlemen taking that for granted which had not been proved, and was not conceded to them. The words of the petition were disrespectful in the highest degree. It did not contain such a prayer as the petitioners could expect to be granted; and to allow it to lie on the table would only lead to the presenting of others still more offensive. The House must make a stand against such a practice at some time or other, and it was better to do so now than at any after period.

Mr. HAWKINS BROWNE thought the words of the petition shewed that it was not the object of the petition to procure the liberation of Sir F. Burdett, a Reform in Parliament, or any other specific object. The petition was only made the vehicle of conveying gross insult to the House, and a dogmatical denial of its privileges.

Mr. HUBERT said, that the petitioners were not, like the majority of that House, convinced of the constitutional authority of its privileges. They, on the contrary, denied that authority, and more particularly questioned the legality of those acts in which it had recently been asserted. Allowance was to be made for men warm with such a subject. The passage which had been so much objected to, would be found at last to be no more than the most brief, abrupt, and somewhat coarse declaration of the opinion of the petitioners, which they must either have indulged, or have no ground for petitioning at all. He should vote for receiving the petition.

Mr. BARHAM wished, as the present was a question of very great importance, that time should be given for consideration, and that there should be a fuller attendance in the House than there was at that moment.

Mr. H. SUMNER conceived the paper now under consideration had nothing in it of a petition but the name. Such a practice ought to be checked; and he saw no occasion for delaying till to-morrow what they ought to do to-day.

Mr. LAMBE could not conceive any thing stronger than the Petition by the Inhabitants of Westminster, who had told the House that they had offered a gross indignity to them. He thought the House had better agree to the proposition of his

Honourable Friend (Mr. Barham), that they might deliberately consider how far they would allow that power to be stretched, which certain persons had instilled into the minds of the misguided people they had a right to carry to any length, by filling them with wild and absurd ideas of their rights. There was a disposition to deny that the House, as it was at present constituted, afforded a legal representation of the people. Against such a doctrine he protested, and contended that it was equal to the discharge of those duties which it owed to the country in the consideration of its affairs both abroad and at home.

Mr. WARDLE could not agree that any insult was meant to be offered to the House by the present petition. The petition which had been received from Westminster contained no prayer; the present contained not only a prayer, but an earnest request that the House would comply with the object of the petition. — He had used the freedom in that House to go the full length the petitioners now did in expressing their opinion. These sentiments he still entertained. He had presumed to deny that Parliament had the right which it had assumed and exercised. He had been allowed to express that opinion; and he submitted that the Freeholders of Middlesex had the same right to express their opinion on the subject. The petitioners here had only candidly declared their opinions, as subjects of this country were entitled to do. To his (Mr. Wardle's) mind, these sentiments were true throughout. He trusted, therefore, that the petition would be received.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE was of opinion the petition ought to be received. If the petitioners were of opinion that the House had acted illegally, he did not see in what other terms they could have expressed themselves, than by declaring that such was their opinion.

Mr. STURGEY thought the words of the petition conveyed a studied insult to the House. It would be strange if this House, the Majesty of the People, was the only body in the kingdom which could be libelled with impunity; nay, which receiving petitions insulting to themselves, must be compelled to become the servile instruments of their own degradation and disgrace. He recommended to the House to adjourn the debate. So delicate a question should be discussed in as full a House as possible. It appeared to him that Gentlemen should not present petitions in which they saw any thing very objectionable. He did not conceive that a Gentleman should continue a member of a body which he despised. If there were any Gentlemen in that House who thought it so constituted as some persons represented, he was surprised they did not resign their seats.

The question for adjourning the debate was put and agreed to.

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

The Estimates presented by Mr. Wharton having been ordered to be referred to the Committee of Supply, the House resolved itself into the said Committee.

On the motion of Mr. WHARTON, a number of Resolutions were agreed to for granting to his Majesty various sums of money for different miscellaneous services; but such was the rapid and inaudible manner in which these were read by the Mover, and repeated by the Chairman, that, with the most painful attention on the part of the Reporters, they were not enabled to collect them, with sufficient accuracy, to lay them before the public.—This is an evil, the existence of which we are frequently compelled to lament.—Adjourned.

Thursday, May 3.

MIDDLESEX PETITION.

Mr. BARHAM moved the Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned debate on this subject. He expressed his regret, that the attendance of the House was not such as it ought to be on a question of so much importance. There was no man who would vote with greater satisfaction for the attainment of any public advantage than himself, but he lamented that he was now constrained, from every sense of duty, to vote against the reception of the petition. That which now formed the subject of debate, was not a petition, but a protest—not an application, but a menace. Nothing could be more base, gross, or

dangerous, than the attempts which were now made to impress on the people that the House of Commons were maintaining their own privileges against the public rights. The House held its privileges for the people and not for themselves, and it became them to preserve those privileges with the utmost tenacity. Those men who suffered themselves to be made the tools of such base misrepresentations, and who raised a ferment by their mischievous doctrines, would find, were their party successful, that they would themselves be swept away like chaff before the wind. If the privileges of the House of Commons were taken away, its substance would be gone, and its shadow only remain. The effect would be, that the House would no longer be able to limit the power of the Crown, and to protect the rights of the people; liberty would no longer exist, and absolute monarchy would take the place of the present Government; that would soon terminate in a Republic, and the Republic would end, as all such systems had ended, in a Military Government. It would be impossible, therefore, to pursue the path chalked out by those wilful deceivers or voluntary dupes, who lent themselves to the propagation of principles so fallacious and injurious to the State, without meeting a like fate. He could not refrain from attributing all the blame of these painful circumstances to Ministers. They pursued the same contemptible arts, the same system of sham inquiries, but did nothing towards the ultimate interests of the country; and by their conduct the House was deservedly marked with public animadversion, and through their impotency popular feelings became irritated. Could there be any necessity for heaping rewards on a man like Mr. Yorke, or was this the time for granting him promotion and aggrandisement? Ministers, in fact, had furnished language against themselves; and this was held forth by the demagogues who had prepared the petition. He had stated the grounds upon which he conceived the petition ought to be rejected, and had drawn up a few lines for the consideration of the House. The Hon. Gentleman then read the following Resolution:—

“That the House ought at all times to receive Petitions from any part of the People, but that it cannot receive a Protest or Menace against its proceedings.”

Mr. GRENFELL expressed his perfect concurrence with the observations of the Hon. Gentleman. If the petition was received, the House would in a short time be loaded with insult from those persons who were now so much disposed to degrade it. That there was great and just cause for dissatisfaction, he was ready to allow; but he believed that one principal cause of dissatisfaction arose from the tyrannous, oppressive, and vexatious manner in which the taxes were collected. If a Revolution ever took place, he firmly believed that it would arise more from the manner in which the taxes were collected, than from the burthen of their extent. He had not so much fear from the meetings in Palace-yard, or at Hackney, as he had from the silent operation of the Board of Taxes.

The Hon. Mr. WARD, having opposed the reception of the petition of the Westminster Meeting on a former night, thought it necessary to say a few words. It was no mean part of the dignity of the House to be consistent in its proceedings; and as, upon a fair comparison between the Middlesex and Westminster petitions, both seemed equally insulting, he could not see why one as well as the other should not be received. If changes were to be made, which he did not mean to deny were sometimes necessary, he thought the House should at least be guided by common sense, and not be changing from week to week, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a little more political courage one day than he had on the other. He had the same unaltered detestation for the persons by whom the petition had been prepared, who he believed were too ready to diffuse the most wicked doctrines. But upon the grounds of consistency only should he vote for the petition being laid on the table.

Mr. R. DUNDAS said, that granting it was wrong to have received the first of the two petitions, this was an additional consideration why they should now pause, since, convinced that there was a course pursued to insult and to degrade the House, it was full time for them to interfere, and to stay the mischief,

Repeated charges had been made against Ministers, which were equally unfounded with the misrepresentations and calumnies preferred against the Representatives of the Country in Parliament. Certain he was, notwithstanding such misrepresentations, that the House had not lost the confidence of the country, whatever a set of people out of its walls thought fit to urge to that effect. Another of the dissatisfactions imputed to Ministers was the Board of Taxes; yet that House, having voted taxes, and not the Board, were to blame; and even the Hon. Gentleman (Grenfell) must be contented to participate in the common odium attached to taxation.

Mr. PONSORNY could see nothing more offensive in the Middlesex petition than what had been previously entertained in the Westminster petition; but, were it worse, mere words, words of form, ought to be no bar to its reception. What the present petition said about the assumption of privileges on the part of the House was, though he could not join in what was thus said, no more than the petitioners had a right to say, if they thought it true. Ignorance of the Constitution was the principal of their offences. The right of petitioning was one which the House was most bound to support; and therefore he would have them construe the petition favourably, and should himself vote for its being laid on the table.

Colonel WARDLE (adverting to some allusions, that he did say that some Hon. Gentlemen, even on his side of the House, were much pleased at the committal of Sir F. Burdett to the Tower) said, he had said this; and whether in the House or elsewhere, he should always deliver his opinion as he felt. He thought the petition should be received by the House; having received the Westminster Petition, notwithstanding its offensiveness, he could not see how they could consistently bar the reception of the present.

Sir J. ANSTRUTHER contended that the House had not transgressed one iota of the Constitution, in the recent exertion of its privileges, which were necessary to its very existence, as well as its independence. Objections were made, however, to Ministers. He would use his endeavours to remove them in a constitutional way, but only in this way. Government had much better remain in the hands of the present Ministers, than be destroyed, in order to obtain their removal.

Mr. W. SMITH denied that consistency was compulsory on them to receive the petition from Middlesex, because they had received the one from Westminster. Offensive passages were in the first petition of a kind to be explained; while the language of the present petition was not only more offensive, but, he thought, was intended to insult and defy those to whom it was addressed. One Hon. Member (Wardle) had charged his side of the House with rejoicing in the committal of Sir F. Burdett; but how could the charge be made out, when 152 Members on his side, most of them his friends for years, had voted against it? Perhaps the House had lost, too justly lost, the confidence of a great part of its constituents; yet it should still exert all its due privileges. Reform was, however, necessary; nor would that House till then possess the confidence of the people. He was still the same friend to proper reform as he had long been; but respectability was not to be sacrificed to consistency, and, in the case before them, he must vote against the feeling of the day.

Mr. M. FITZGERALD deprecated the consequences that might ensue from their hastily rejecting the petition, and thought that policy dictated forbearance in the present exercise of their privileges. He denied the right exercised by the House in the committal of Gale Jones, as well as the propriety of their proceedings in the case of Sir F. Burdett. Evidently there remained now nothing to be done but to put an end to the power of petitioning. The answers returned to the petitions against the disgraceful Convention of Cintra, and the disastrous Expedition to Walcheren, sufficiently demonstrated what it was in the contemplation of Ministers to do. He was free to own that he did not like the language of the petition, nor the taste in which it was written; but, were they to dictate language to public bodies of men? The present petition stated a grievance, and concluded with praying a remedy. Had not the petitioners

full right to do this? Dignity would be best consulted by that House if they entertained the petition.

Mr. WILBERFORCE declared that the petition was apparently contrived to degrade the House; and if this was the complexion of any petition, the House should take care how it was received. Considering the importance of the case, he could have wished for some Resolution to have been made, like the one proposed by his Hon. Friend (Barham), explanatory of their sentiments respecting it.

Mr. ELLISON did not think that the House was degraded in the eyes of the country; if he did, he would not have a seat in it. As to the Middlesex petition, it began with insult, and was full of falsehoods.

Mr. MORRIS thought that if the petitioners were sincere in the opinion they had expressed, the petition could not be rejected on the ground of its being an insult to the House; and it was impossible for him to say, that they were not sincere in that opinion. This country had an interest in all classes of persons speaking their minds freely; it was part of the safety of the State; for men would naturally love the Government under which they spoke their minds freely, and he had rather see the table of the House covered with petitions expressive of the discontent of the people in all quarters, than that they should brood in private over their discontents, and let them rankle in their minds. It would be the shortest way for the House to receive this petition, since, if it was rejected, the probability was, that the Freeholders of Middlesex would hold another meeting, and frame another petition on the same subject.

Col. WOOD was for the rejection of this petition, as being one of the most improper petitions that ever was presented to the House of Commons. It was signed by no more than eight persons; and the place where the Meeting was held was so near the metropolis, that hundreds attended it who were not Freeholders of the county of Middlesex, and they overwhelmed every thing they heard if they did not like it. He approved of the conduct of Ministers in causing Sir F. Burdett to be apprehended, and he believed that event met the general approbation of the country.

Lord ARCHIBALD HAMILTON thought it odd, if nine out of ten of the Freeholders of Middlesex were against this Petition, that some of them did not attend to oppose it; instead of which it was carried without a dissenting voice. He was friendly to receiving the Petition, the rejection of which he should regard as an alarming measure, under all the circumstances.

Mr. STEPHEN said, that this Petition, as it was called, went broadly to deny the legality of the commitment of Mr. Gale Jones and Sir Francis Burdett. Had the Petition only said they believed such proceedings to be illegal, and had, in temperate language, prayed the House to revise their judgment, the petition would have been entitled to a favourable reception; but here the petitioners broadly said at once, and without any qualification, that the conduct of the House was illegal; and it would be pusillanimous in the House to entertain it, for it would be receiving its own disgrace, by putting such a paper on their Journals.

Mr. BYNG thought this petition ought to be received. It had been said that this was not the act of the Freeholders of the County, and that nine out of ten of the real Freeholders would vote against this petition. He did not find it so when it was agreed to. It denied the right of the House to commit for a libel, or for any thing but obstruction or contempt. In that the petitioners were right. It was his opinion that the House of Commons did not possess the right they had assumed in the commitment of Mr. John Gale Jones or of Sir Francis Burdett. He was therefore, from the conviction of his own mind, following the direction of his constituents in presenting this petition.

Mr. MELLISH had promised to assent to the presenting the petition, and should vote for its being received; he regretted that he was not heard at the Meeting when he attempted to deliver his sentiments. While he said he should agree to the petition being laid before the House, he was listened to; but he no sooner said he was independent, and wished to be left to his

own judgement, than he was immediately drowned by clamour.

The House then divided—For the petition being received 58—Against it 139—Majority 81.

GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND.

Sir JOHN NEWPORT then called the attention of the House to the abuses in the Government of Ireland, which had cost this country such a sum as 100,000*l.* and upwards, in a few months. He imputed to two gentlemen in Ireland that they had been superannuated in their offices, and an additional allowance made to them and to their clerks, under the head of extra services, where they were not given for any thing but corruption, they having done nothing out of the ordinary duties of their offices, except that of applying the interest of the public money in their hands to their own private emolument. He then moved a string of resolutions, the effect of which was to censure those proceedings.

Mr. FOSTER opposed the motion, and defended strenuously the individuals complained of.

Mr. CROKER defended the conduct of his father.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought that Mr. Croker had great ground of complaint against the Commissioners of Inquiry.

Sir J. NEWPORT expressed his satisfaction at the explanation that had been given, and withdrew the two Resolutions relative to Mr. Croker.

The second Resolution relative to Mr. Forward, late Treasurer of the Post Office in Ireland, was then discussed.—After which a division took place—In favour of the Resolution, 26—Against it, 88—Majority against it, 57.—The discussion was then postponed.—Adjourned.

Friday, May 4.

TAXES.

Mr. C. DUNDAS alluded to the grievances complained of respecting the collecting the Assessed Taxes, and said he should shortly make a motion on the subject; when Mr. PERCEVAL observed, that he had prepared a Bill on the matters complained of, which he should shortly submit to the House.—Mr. GRENFELL also had a proposition to bring forward respecting the Property Tax, but he should wait to see Mr. Perceval's Bill.

CRIMINAL LAWS.

Sir S. ROMILLY moved for various Papers relative to the Criminal Laws, for the purpose of renewing the measure which he sincerely deplored had miscarried on Tuesday evening. It had been lost by a majority of two only, and he therefore thought it entitled to a more enlarged discussion.—Sir Samuel here alluded to the deplorable thinness of the House on Tuesday evening:—had the subject been the Highgate Archway, the Lambeth Water-works, or the Committal of J. G. Jones, the benches would have been crowded; but a question of the utmost national importance, was treated with the most culpable neglect.—The motion was agreed to.

KING'S MESSAGE—PENSION TO HIS MAJESTY'S NEPHEW.

Mr. PERCEVAL moved, "That his Majesty be enabled to grant out of the Consolidated Fund a sum not exceeding seven thousand pounds per annum, to his Serene Highness the Duke Brunswick."—Mr. Perceval commented upon the gallant conduct of the Duke, his attachment to this country, &c. &c. &c.

Lord MILTON, Mr. H. MARTIN, and Sir J. NEWPORT, made a few remarks: they did not oppose the grant, but thought that it ought to be taken out of the Droits of the Admiralty, and not from the pockets of the people.

The Resolution was then agreed to *nem. con.* and the House adjourned till Monday.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

Whitehall, May 1, 1810.

The King has been pleased to grant to the Right Hon. Henry Baron Mulgrave the Office of Master-General of his Majesty's Ordnance of the United Kingdom.

The King has also been pleased to constitute and appoint the Right Hon. Charles Yorke, Sir Richard Bickerton, Bart. Vice-Admiral of the Red Squadron of his Majesty's Fleet, Robert Ward, Esq. James Buller, Esq. William Donett, Esq. Vice-Admiral of the Blue Squadron of his Majesty's Fleet, Robert Moorson, Esq. and William Bowther, Esq. (commonly called Viscount Lawther) to be his Majesty's Commissioners for executing the Office of High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the dominions, islands, and territories thereto belonging.

[This Gazette contains an account of the capture of the Grand Napoleon French brig, of 16 guns and 124 men, by the Helena sloop, Capt. Worth.—Likewise the capture of L'Alcide French cutter, of 4 guns and 30 men, by the boats of the Surly, Firm, and Sharpshooter, under a very heavy fire of musquetry from the shore, by which one Englishman was killed and one wounded.]

BANKRUPTCIES ENLARGED.

- W. C. Cox, Nether Knutsford, Chester, innkeeper, from May 1 to 14, at six, at the Angel Inn, Knutsford.
A. Castle, Farnival's Inn, money-scrivener, from May 8 to June 26, at ten, at Guildhall.
W. Shaw, Long Acre, cheesemonger, from April 25 to June 12, at ten, at Guildhall.

BANKRUPTS.

- S. Tomkins, Worcester, hat-dresser.
A. Matthew, Shaftsbury, Dorsetshire, ironmonger.
W. Foster, Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire, merchant.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

Downing Street, May 4, 1810.

The King has been pleased to appoint Vice-Admiral Sir J. T. Duckworth, K. B. to be Governor and Commander in Chief of the Island of Newfoundland.

BANKRUPTS.

- R. G. Dyson, Rosemary-lane, victualler.
J. Wood, White-Cross-street, victualler.
J. F. Veichtner, Throgmorton-street, merchant.
W. Robinson, Little Barnhurst, Staffordshire, butcher.
T. Steevenson, Snowsfields, Bermondsey, woolstapler.
W. Hallen, Wolverhampton, woollen-yarn-manufacturer.
R. Jackson, Mill-street, Hanover-square, china-seller.
J. Oran, High-street, Southwark, cheese-monger.
W. Williams, West Smithfield, cutler.
M. and P. Sherwood, Knottingley, Yorkshire, hardywaremen.
J. Sayer, Sherston, Wiltshire, linen-draper.
J. Tyndale, Chelsea, commission-broker.
C. H. Kaufman, Crutched-Friars, merchant.
S. Edwards, Philpot-lane, Mincing-lane, merchant.
T. Goodall, Philpot-lane, Mincing-lane, merchant.
R. Smith, Liverpool, upholsterer.
J. Raitt, Dartmouth-street, Westminster, victualler.
G. Lee, Sunninghill, Berkshire, builder.
W. E. M. V. Doornik, E. Griffith, and J. Donovan, Wellclose-street, Wellclose-square, manufacturers of patent-soap.
J. Davenport, Gracechurch-street, tavern-keeper.
F. Crankshaw, St. Mary-le-bone, painter and glazier.
D. Mahony, Tottenham-court-road, victualler.
W. Johnson and N. Browne, Fish-street-hill, grocers.
R. Reeve and W. D. Jones, St. Mary-le-bone, stationers.
G. Fenwick, St. Mary-le-bone, veterinary-surgeon.

CLAUDIO tells the Editor that certain Magazine copy without acknowledgment the Theatrical Articles out of the EXAMINER. The Editor is used to this species of compliment, and cares so little for it, that he does not even think of returning it.

E. C. is requested to accept the Editor's thanks for his Poem. The Editor received the sincerest pleasure from the Letter of Mr. J. S. of Liverpool, every way considered; and has put it among his most valued memorials.

The instances of the use of the past tense for the participle, my friend BAURUS should quote, for I cannot discover them. As to his objection to the phrases "If it is" and "Though it is," he quarrels with them as if they were essentially erroneous, whereas they are right or wrong, just as the doubt they imply happens to regard the present or the future. A familiar exemplification will suffice—A person tells me the Theatre is full; I answer, "If it is full, I shall not attempt to get in," using the present tense in speaking of a present contingency. Another tells me, the Theatre will be full to-morrow night:—I answer, "If it be full, I shall not attempt to get in;" using the subjunctive in speaking of a future contingency.

THE EXAMINER.

LONDON, MAY 6.

THE Livery of London assembled in Guildhall last Friday, to consider the late Proceedings of the House of Commons, and passed a series of Resolutions and a Petition to the House, worthy of the best times of English liberty. A curious trick was attempted by the Jobbers to counteract the effect of the meeting. Handbills were circulated the day before, requesting, in general terms, the assemblage of the Liverymen "on business of great importance," and on Friday evening a meeting was obtained in consequence at the London Tavern. The obscurity of the invitation, however, which, it was thought, would be obeyed by those only who chose to understand its real meaning, did not hinder others from coming; and the result was, that Mr. WAITHMAN and his brother Reformists astonished the Jobbers by entering the room, carrying all before them as they had done in the morning, and passing a string of Resolutions in condemnation of this clandestine and petty stratagem. The Jobbers therefore mustered what they could of their baffled forces, and retired to another Room, where they drew up a sentimental Address to their fellow-citizens, beginning with a charming piece of grammar—"At a period when attempts are made, &c. —the Undersigned Liverymen appeal to their fellow-citizens on the necessity of recording their sentiments on the occasion;—That they view, &c. &c." This Address was signed by 30 persons, including the BRICKWOODS, JACKS, KEMBLER, DIXONS, &c. and nothing remains, to complete the glory of the manoeuvre, but that Mr. SAM. DIXON, the XENOPHON of the exploit, should celebrate, in all due English, this brilliant Retreat of the Twice Forty.

The House of Commons rejected the Middlesex Petition chiefly on the ground of its being rude and unceremonious; and the consequence is, that the London Petition, in adopting a politer air, has an effect twenty times more severe. A decent Address is all that the House can expect, when the subject is of such a nature; for it would be as dishonourable as it would be absurd to treat diminished respectability with undiminished respect; the House cannot suppose, that the people are to say to them,—“Having a profound respect for the conduct of your Honourable House, we beg your Honourable House to reform your

said conduct altogether." However, they will still quarrel with the manner for the matter's sake: the skipping and skulking Counter-meeting will be quoted in behalf of their non-reception of the Petition; and irritation will come upon irritation, till it be seen whether their obstructions will not do us more good than any affected compliances. The Corruptionists and the People begin to be openly and knowingly at issue, and however the former may keep their resolutions, REFORM will work its own way, if the latter keep their eyesight and their temper.

Yesterday arrived a Gottenburgh Mail. The only intelligence it brings is, that the Russians have made themselves masters of the Isle of Ostrava, on the Danube, and have thrown a bridge from thence to both banks of the river. They have also formed a junction with the Servians.

"It is acknowledged that his MAJESTY has totally lost the use of his eyes—and we hear that his Physicians have recommended the operation of couching. No doubt his MAJESTY feels the necessity of trying the experiment, that there may at least be a chance of preserving to the Country the continuance of his paternal discharge of those important functions of Royalty which require his own cognizance and personal act.—It is a most delicate subject—and every man devoted to the Constitution—who respects the Throne—and who is attached by duty and affection to his MAJESTY'S Person and Family, must fervently pray that that predicament may be averted in which a question would arise on the most important duties of the Executive Power. We know that it is at this moment the topic uppermost in every loyal mind—and which engages the consideration of every political company."—*Morning Chronicle*.

The *Morning Post* contains the paragraph below. Now it is well known that his MAJESTY'S sight has been much impaired for many months. How "the almost total loss of sight" can therefore be attributed to the late disturbances is really somewhat curious; but the "loyal" *Post* has ever some canting falsehood with which to amuse its "loyal" readers:—"No person in the Kingdom was more affected by the late disturbances in the metropolis than our most Gracious Sovereign. So unhappy was his MAJESTY on that occasion, so alarming to his subjects, that he was indisposed for some days, and the effect was the almost total loss of sight. But it is with very great pleasure we add, that his MAJESTY is now perfectly recovered, and in as good health as he ever enjoyed. His MAJESTY is now obliged to avail himself of external assistance in his occasional walks, which was not the case before the unfortunate events alluded to. His medical attendants have, we understand, declared that his eye is now fit for the operation, whenever he feels himself disposed to submit to it."

The disinterested Mr. CHARLES YORKE now takes from the pockets of the plundered people the following sums:—as Teller of the Exchequer, 2700l.; First Lord of the Admiralty, 5000l.; Colonel of the Cambridge Militia, 1000l.; making a total of Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Pounds!!!—all given him for having called the people Jacobins, and for endeavouring to prevent them from knowing what their Servants in Parliament were about.

If a Reform in Parliament were to take place, and the people really allowed to chuse their own Representatives, such men as Mr. YORKE, Mr. WINDHAM, &c. would never obtain a seat in Parliament. Both these selfish politicians have been rejected by the people. The borough of St. Germain's, which the brother of the new Teller of the Exchequer vacates, in order that he may sneak into Parliament, returns two Members, and contains twenty Electors; the patronage is vested in Lord ELLIOT, as is also that of Grampound, which has fifty Electors, and Liskeard, which likewise has fifty Electors. Thus we see six Members returned by 120 Voters, which 120 Voters concentrate in one Peer!!

According to letters from Paris of the 18th ult. General WIRION, the late Commandant of Verdun, committed suicide on the preceding day. This Officer had been ordered to Paris to answer some charges of extortion and embezzlement of their property, preferred against him by Capt. Sir THOMAS LAVIE, and other British Prisoners at that depot. It appears, that some days before, he made an application, through a third person, to Sir T. LAVIE, to soften the evidence against him as much as possible, promising, on that consideration, to restore the property purloined.

On Wednesday, at one o'clock, Mr. Sheriff WOOD, accompanied by Mr. BYSS, one of the Members for the County of Middlesex, went to the Tower, to present to Sir FRANCIS BURDETT the late Resolutions and Address of the Freeholders at Middlesex. The procession was attended by a vast concourse of people, and cheered as it passed along, by enthusiastic plaudits, and repeated shouts of "BURDETT and the Constitution!"

Mr. WALTER HOWARD, the person who considers himself entitled to the Norfolk estates and title, is still left to pine in the utmost indigence. There can be little doubt that this unfortunate Gentleman belongs, directly or indirectly, to the HOWARD family. He says that the Duke of Norfolk has repeatedly promised to provide for him in some way, and yet has never fulfilled those promises;—that all he now wants is a decent maintenance, for which he would gladly give up all his rightful claims. If such be the facts, it is really surprizing that his Grace should suffer Mr. HOWARD and his wife to wander about upon the miserable pittance of 40l. a-year, which he enjoys under the will of the late Duke EDWARD,—a pittance that in these times, as his Grace must well know, will hardly keep soul and body together.

The Coroner's Jury who returned a verdict of "justifiable Homicide" in the case of poor Bryant, who was killed by a Life-guardsmen, was composed of old and infirm paupers in Whitechapel Workhouse, with the addition of the barber who is employed in the London Hospital to shave the dead!—What a mockery of justice and decency is this!

Sittings appointed in Middlesex and London before the Right Honourable EDWARD LORD ELLENBOROUGH, Lord Chief Justice, &c. in and after Easter Term, 1810:—

IN TERM.			
MIDDLESEX.		LONDON.	
Monday	May 14	Wednesday	May 16
Saturday	19	Monday	21
Saturday	26	Monday	28
Friday	June 1	Saturday	June 2
AFTER TERM.			
Tuesday	5	Wednesday	6

On Sunday afternoon five of the Life Guardsmen, who were walking together at Prinrose Hill, were assailed by a number of people collected there, in so serious a manner as to endanger their lives. They backed up against a ditch, and defended themselves with their swords until 25 of their comrades arrived to their assistance, and rescued them.

NATHANIEL JEFFERY.—**GEORGE HASSELL**, a mariner, who arrived at Liverpool on the 4th of April, has made an affidavit before the Mayor of Liverpool, that in March 1809, he conversed with **JEFFERY**, (the sailor left on the barren island by Capt. LAKE) at Beverley, in the State of Massachusetts;—that **JEFFERY** told him of his having been put on shore for taking some spruce beer; that he remained on the island for three or four days, and subsisted by eating crab-fish that happened to be washed on shore, and getting water to drink from the cavities of the rocks after it had rained;—and that he had been taken from the island by the Betsey schooner, Capt. FRANCIS, of Marblehead, in America.—**ANNE LINE**, the Aunt of **JEFFERY**, who resides at Fowey, says she was told by two of her nephew's comrades, that when they were rowing him to shore in the boat, he begged they would drown him; but they said that Capt. LAKE's orders must be obeyed. When the boat reached the shore, **JEFFERY** clung to it, but they forced him on the rock. They gave him a few biscuits, and a piece of beef; and Lieut. MOULD would have given him some money, which he refused—but accepted the boat-hook and three handkerchiefs, to hoist as signals.—A person of the name of **WATT**, who was on board the *Recruit* when **JEFFERY** was sent on shore, says that he saw him in Barbadoes, in January, 1809: he then appeared in very bad health, and shewed his arms, of which the unfortunate man had been compelled to eat, having been ten or twelve days without food.—These statements are not all likely to be true; but it is to be hoped, if the injured man be really alive, that he will shortly make his appearance in England, where a Jury of his countrymen would give ample damages for the cruelty practised upon him by his unfeeling Commander. The thing that chiefly surprises us is, that Englishmen could be found barbarous enough to put such savage orders into execution.

FINE ARTS.

ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION.

No. 24. *Christ teacheth to be humble.*—**B. WEST, P. A.**—In works of art, judicious choice of subject is of more importance than talent in the executive departments of it. Valuable as it is to indulge the eye or captivate the fancy, it is infinitely more so to regulate the morals and improve the heart. Superior genius in poetry and painting is therefore engaged suitably to its dignity, only when it becomes the handmaid to virtue, and impresses on the mind her invaluable lessons. It is highly agreeable to peruse the animated descriptions of exterior nature from the pen of **THOMSON**, or to gaze on the blooming and graceful forms traced by the pencil of **CORREGGIO**; but on reading the narration of noble deeds by **HOMER** and **MILTON**, or viewing them as depicted by **RAFAELLE**, the heart catches the sacred fire from the consecrated flame of genius, and glowing with the love of fellow man, and inspired by its true dignity of nature, the ingenuous minded spectator resolves to "live o'er each scene, and be what he beholds."

It is this choice of elevated subject which has conferred so much value on the best productions of Greek and Italian art, while it is much to be regretted that a very considerable portion of the genius of both countries was degraded on the decline of that art by attention to negative objects of mere exterior grace, and to baneful ones of superstition. No painter has a greater claim to the praise attached to a judicious, pure, and noble choice of subject, than the President, **MR. WEST**. His elevated genius has been for half a century past actively exercised on themes which inform the understanding and mend the heart, and none more so than in this picture of Christ teaching the inestimable virtue of *humility*, the possession of which is not only one of the brightest ornaments of our nature, but perhaps more conducive than any other to its happiness, as it is certain that its opposite, pride, produces half its miseries. But the painter has evinced as much skill in the management of the materials of his art, as he has judgment and moral rectitude in choosing the subject of it, and the seed of genius rises out of a pure soil with expansive grace and dignity. The light and shade, the colour, forms, and expressions, are worthy of, and suitable to, its noble designation, and carry the divine lesson of *humility* more forcibly to the heart, by conveying it through the captivated region of the imagination. The picture consists of a group of three figures, Christ, a naked infant, and its youthful sister, supporting the child on one side, and looking with an amiable and affectionate delight on the *Saviour* at hearing his impressive eulogium of her infant brother. The *Saviour* holds the child with one hand, and points upward with the other, in reference to the loveliest example of humility, to Heaven, its eternal reward, and impressive of the excellent words he is delivering. His countenance and form are stamped with the meekness and divine dignity of his character. His aspect is profoundly thoughtful, mild, and amiably dignified, exemplifying his wisdom and purity. He is exhibited, not as discoursing to an individual within the compass of the canvass, but as addressing the spectator. This renders the moral impressive to all, and is agreeable to the comprehensive design of the *Saviour's* doctrine, and to his command to his disciples, "Go and teach the gospel to the whole world." His drapery, elegantly simple in the direction of its lines, and broad and massive in its folds, is suited to the serious gracefulness of his character. The drapery of the infant's sister is, on the contrary, more playfully broken, undulating, and varied in its colours and shapes, and is thus cheerfully accordant to the beauty and vivacity of youth.—The complexion of the *Saviour's* flesh is a deep-toned richness and warmth; that of the female is effeminately delicate. The child's possesses the utmost degree of polish, tenderness, and brilliancy, as well from its receiving the strongest light, as from the superior delicacy of the infantine age. Like the best and most brilliant of **TITIAN's**, its body is one breadth and gradation of colour, undivided by various half tints. It is the true local colour of flesh. This simple undivided breadth of colour pervades the piece, as does a similar principle of light and shade, thus aiding, by the simple grandeur of their principles, the elevated character of the subject; for a variety of little lights and shadows and tints of colour, are adverse to dignity, which is only produced by broad and unbroken masses. The group is placed within an archway, whose simple and at the same time graceful

sweep of form, harmonizes with the other lines of the picture. The three primary colours, red, blue, and yellow, are admirably balanced; and if the piece was not most estimable for its expression of mind, it would be invaluable for its harmony and brilliancy of tone in the clear obscure and colour. In fine, this noble picture takes its station in the highest school of art.

The rapid production of such a work, the figures of which are much larger than life, has justly excited the admiration of professors, being painted within eighteen days; but painted, we must recollect, by a mind strengthened to its most vigorous tension by fifty years incessant contemplation and practice of the noble principles it develops.

BRITISH INSTITUTION.

Lord EGREMONT has purchased Mr. ARNOLD's pleasing painting of an *Effect on the River near Gravesend*, and Mr. HARE TOWNSEND the poetical painting by Mr. HOWARD of *Pygmalion's Statue animating*. Mr. HOWARD shews much taste in his choice of poetic subject, and a lively and elegant imagination in the display of it. That his cabinet picture of the *Mermaid on a Dolphin's back*, in which the stars Mercury and Venus are so vigorously personified as shooting from their spheres, should remain unsold, would be surprising, if any thing could be so in a country which can tolerate the rule of men, who, after sacrificing thousands of its people in foolish expeditions, and after protecting from deserved punishment the vendors of seats in the Legislature, have the modesty to pretend indignation at insults offered to their dignity!

R. H.

The Marquis of STAFFORD's grand collection of Pictures will be kindly exhibited to Amateurs and Artists, every Wednesday in May, June, and July.

It will be gratifying to all lovers of Art, and particularly that of ENGRAVING, to hear that a Meeting of Noblemen and Gentlemen, at which his Highness the Duke of GLOUCESTER will preside, is to be held on Tuesday, to take into consideration the best means of carrying into effect a plan for the rescue of Engraving in the grand walk of art, from total decay in this kingdom, and for establishing it (like our great rival France) upon a national and a permanent basis. The patriotic spirit already displayed on this occasion by some nobly liberal amateurs, will doubtless secure success to a measure which will raise Engraving above the petty views of the selfish, rear a national establishment for a much neglected art, and give its professors once more an opportunity of exerting all their powers. Certain mercenary individuals, with mere trading views, may perhaps strive to throw obstacles in the way of its advancement; but the real friends of art will be on their guard, and see its genuine interests in a measure truly national—in a plan the objects and ends of which are worthy of those Noblemen and Gentlemen who have so honorably espoused it.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The Fifth Report of the Finance Committee, which has just been presented to the House of Commons, exposes the great default of the Hon. Mr. Villiers; and likewise develops such a system of negligence in the great offices connected with the Navy, as must tend highly to aggra-

vate the present disgust of the country towards that class of people by which its affairs have been unhappily conducted.

The amount of Mr. Villiers's defalcation is upwards of two hundred and sixty-four thousand pounds; towards the reduction of which there may exist, of his own property, about one hundred and seven thousand pounds; so that, upon this statement, if no other funds are produced, the ultimate loss of the nation will probably be above one hundred and fifty thousand pounds. This is of itself bad enough, as an effect; but when coupled with the causes which have occasioned it, and for which other persons are to blame—such as the omission of the proper investigation of his accounts by the department to which they were amenable, the neglect of taking securities, of carrying into execution regulations previously proposed, &c. it is, indeed, most offensive. The Board of Admiralty that re-appointed Mr. Villiers took no security: the Commissioners of the Navy, that should have enforced the regular production of his accounts, "neglected to do so:" the late Comptroller of the Navy was content with "assurances" from Mr. Villiers, that his accounts should be more regularly delivered in. But the most melancholy part of the whole statement (and which must, indeed, almost make the country despair of any good ever resulting from the Reports of Committees upon any public abuses whatsoever) is as follows: It appears, that so long ago as the year 1787, a Committee had declared, in one of their Reports, that this very office of Paymaster of Marines, in which there has been this enormous defalcation, was useless, and ought to be abolished, and the business carried on at the Treasurer of the Navy's Office. Who, then, we ask, after this, can expect that greater benefit will accrue from other Reports of similar Committees? But this is not the whole: in the year 1787, there was an Agent as well as a Paymaster of Marines, the former executing the whole duty of the office. The Committee then recommended that the efficient officer should be retained with a salary of 600l. per annum, and the inefficient one discontinued: in direct contradiction to which recommendation, the Admiralty continued the inefficient and more expensive one, and pensioned off the other. These are the things that make the hearts of Englishmen sick, in their reflections upon the state of their country, and the conduct of those by whom it has been governed. One method to secure the public from losses of the nature here described (if we were not, from the example just cited, as well as many others, induced to despair of the efficacy of any method) would be, to render the property of members composing superior offices liable for the defaults of sub-accountants, in instances where due diligence in the superior would have checked the irregularity of the inferior department. For example; the Commissioners of the Navy, who neglected to enforce the delivery of Mr. Villiers's annual statement, should be liable in their own estates for the defalcation, which by the punctual discharge of their duty they might have prevented.

It remains now to be seen, what will become of this same office of Paymaster of Marines. It has been declared, during the course of twenty-three years, to be useless.—The public is likely to suffer a loss of upwards of 100,000l. under the mal-administration of this useless Office; yet no sooner was Mr. Villiers removed than another Paymaster, the brother of

was (without the slightest consideration of this declared inutility of the Office, or of the loss sustained through its existence) substituted in his place. Will he be continued? We look with anxiety to the solution of this question. Will an useless Office be maintained, and the country again exposed to the hazard of future injury by the administration of it?—*Times*.

FASHIONS FOR MAY.

PROMENADE HABIT.—A round robe of jaconot muslin, with high French ruff, and appliqué border of narrow lace round the feet. A cassoc coat or demi-pelisse of verulean blue shot sarsnet, finished round the bottom with a basket border, extended on white satin, confined at the bottom of the waist with a silver or steel clasp, and to the bottom with three regular divided silk cords and tassels. An Austrian tippet of white satin, with full floss binding, and tassels to correspond. Arcadian hat, composed of the same materials as the coat, and ornamented with full curled white feathers. The hair in ringlet curls, with caul of white or amber net; a small spring flower is occasionally added. Half-boots and parasol of cornelian blue *en suite*. Gloves of lemon-coloured kid.

Rather a novel article has appeared for **MORNING DRESSES**; a corded muslin, the cord about the size of a fine twig; no alteration has taken place in the formation of these dresses; they are still worn high in the neck, with collars and long sleeves, edged with lace, of a walking length. Caps are in high estimation, ornamented with blossoms and flowers.

White satin **HEAD-DRESSES** are a great relief to the dress, and display more taste than a cap exactly similar with the pelisse. White chip hats, with rather high flat crowns, and broad flat brim, bound with ribband, is a most fascinating article for the promenade. There is a close bonnet called the *Malmaison*, which, with the Shepherd's hat just described, is much recommended.

For **DINNER** and **AFTERNOON DRESSES** sarsnets are much worn; the waist a moderate length; the trains about a quarter and half a yard; long sleeves are by no means laid aside; the lavender blossom is a very favourite colour in this style of attire.

For **EVENING**, or **FULL DRESS**, nothing has appeared to rival the Imperial net, figured gauzes, sarsnets, satins, India muslin, embroidered round the bottom, the flowers interspersed with lace; all of which are held in equal estimation. All dresses are made in the French style, just above the rise of the bosom before, and the backs not quite so high as formerly.—Gold bands, bandeaus of coloured stones, foil wreaths, small caps, lace handkerchiefs, and artificial flowers.

The Hair is worn in full curls on one side of the head, the ends brought forward and intermixed with the front hair.—Feathers are now scarcely seen.

No variation whatever has taken place in **JEWELLERY**.—Girdles for the waist and bands for the hair, of every coloured gem, multiply amazingly.

There are no novelties in **SHOES**; the pale lemon-coloured half-boat, the Morocco tie, the black kid slipper trimmed and lined to correspond with the pelisse, are all worn.

The prevailing Colours are pea green, violet, primrose, bloom pluk, lavender, jonquille, pale blue, and deep lilac.

CITY.

MEETING OF THE LIVERY OF LONDON.

About one o'clock on Friday, the Liveries of London, to the amount of nearly three thousand, assembled in Common Hall, pursuant to requisition,—when the **LORD MAYOR** stated to them the business for which they met, and bespoke an impartial hearing for all the speakers:

Mr. FAVELL addressed the Meeting; if the people, he said, were not active, vigilant, and vigorous, they must now bid adieu to free government, for its enemies were quite in earnest. The people were now treated with contempt, as had been said

that "they had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them;" to which may be well added, that they had nothing to do with the taxes but to pay them.—(a laugh!)—The question, however was, not whether they should obey the laws, but whether they should surrender to a vigour beyond the law?—(Bursts of Applause, and cries of No! No!)—The doctrine maintained by the House of Commons was, that every man might be seized at their will and pleasure, for they sent Sir Francis Burdett to the Tower for no other offence than that of supporting the Rights of the People. Here Mr. Favell read an extract from a celebrated speech of Col. Barre in the House of Commons, in which the intrepid Colonel said, "after assuming an arbitrary dominion over law and justice, you issue orders, warrants, and proclamations, against every opponent, and send prisoners to your Bastille all those who have the courage and virtue to defend the freedom of their country. But it is in vain that you hope by fear and terror to extinguish the native British fire; the more sacrifices, the more martyrs you make, the more numerous the sons of Liberty will become; they will multiply like the Hydra, and pour vengeance on your heads. Let others act as they will, while I have a tongue or an arm, they shall be free, and that I may not be a witness of these monstrous proceedings, I will leave the House; nor do I doubt but every independent, every honest man, every friend to England, will follow me—these walls are unholy, hateful, deadly,—while a prostitute majority holds the bolt of parliamentary power, and hurls its vengeance only upon the virtuous."—Colonel Barre and the Opposition then rose and left the House.—(Loud Applauses!)—Mr. Favell then introduced the subject of reform, and instanced the conduct of Mr. Perceval and Lord Castlereagh, who, when charged with trafficking for a seat in the Honourable House, defended themselves by saying that though the thing might be wrong, yet "it was not completed." If this defence, said Mr. Favell, was a good one, Guy Faux might have pleaded it in his defence, for his gunpowder plot had not succeeded! Mr. Favell concluded an animated speech by proposing fifteen Resolutions for the consideration of the Meeting, which it is not necessary to give, as the Petition, which is given below, was founded entirely upon them, with the exception of the sixth and seventh, which conveyed the thanks of the Livery to Sir Francis Burdett, for his patriotic conduct, which thanks were to be conveyed to him in the Tower.

Mr. WAITHMAN seconded the Resolutions, maintaining that all the proceedings of the House for the last forty years, had completely proved the absolute necessity of a Reform.—He alluded to the cry in the House of supporting its dignity, but thought they took a singular mode of doing so, by imprisoning those who spoke freely—by passing over all the scandalous failures and desperate delinquencies of Ministers, by suffering them to attempt with impunity to make a traffic of seats in Parliament, &c. &c. Mr. Waithman here very pertinently alluded to Mr. Yorke's exaltation, in utter defiance of the opinions of the People, and asked whether such advisers of the Crown could possibly possess the confidence of the People?—(Cries of Bravo! Bravo! and No! No!)—He concluded his speech by saying that the nation should never relax in its endeavours to obtain a Reform, which was its just and best hope.

Mr. THOMPSON and **Mr. WADDINGTON** followed on the same side, when the Resolutions were put and carried almost unanimously, only six or eight hands being held up against them, among which were those of Messrs. **KENNE** and **DIXON**, of contracting notoriety.

Mr. QUIN then stepped forward to read the Petition, which, he said, had been a little altered from the Resolutions, in order to insure its favourable reception in the Honourable House. The fate of the Middlesex Petition had shown the necessity of giving it the Corinthian polish, and ornamenting it with the graves of fringe and embroidery. It therefore there was rather a *coarsely style and condescending terms of expression* in this Petition, they would attribute it to the proper cause. **Mr. QUIN** then read as follows:—

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble ADDRESS, REMONSTRANCE, and PETITION of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Livery of the City of London, in Common Hall assembled, the 4th day of May, 1810.

"We, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Livery of the City of London in Common Hall assembled, beg leave, with feelings of the most anxious concern, to present this our humble Address, Petition, and Remonstrance, and we earnestly entreat your Honourable House to give to it a favourable reception, for how can we hope for redress and relief, if the bare statement of the wrongs and grievances of which we complain be rejected? We also beg your Honourable House to believe, that in the language we may have occasion, and are indeed compelled to employ, no offence is intended to your Honourable House.

"The circumstance which most deeply afflicts us, and which most strongly impels us at this time to approach your Honourable House is, what appears to us to have been, on your part, a violation of the personal security of the people of this land. We humbly conceive, that without law, and against law, you have imprisoned two of our fellow-subjects, and that without a trial, without a hearing, you have condemned them. Law requires legal process and trial by jury of our equals. Justice demands that no person shall be Prosecutor, Juror, Judge, and Executioner, in his own cause. We beg leave to express our conviction that this eternal principle of immutable justice cannot be annulled by any House of Commons—by any King—by any Parliament—by any Legislature upon earth. But it appears to us that your Honourable House have, in the instances of Mr. John Gale Jones and Sir Francis Burdett, assumed, accumulated, and exercised all these offices.

"We feel it our duty which we owe to you, to ourselves, to our posterity, to state that in our conception this jurisdiction is unfounded, and we humbly and firmly declare our opinion against the existence of this power in any hands;—a jurisdiction unknown to, a power above the law, and which could be enforced only by military violence, a violence made manifest by the breaking open of an Englishman's castle, and by the preceding and subsequent murder of peaceable and unoffending citizens.

"Permit us humbly to observe, that the construction of your Honourable House prevents our surprise at this conduct of your Honourable House. We will not enter into any details, so often and so ably stated to your Honourable House, by which it appears, that upwards of three hundred Members of your Honourable House, in England and Wales only, are not elected by the People, in any honest sense of the word PEOPLE, but are sent to your Honourable House by the absolute nomination or powerful influence of about one hundred and fifty Peers and others, as averred in a Petition to your Honourable House in the year 1793, and which remains on your journal uncontroverted. This is the great Constitutional Disease of our Country. This is the true root of all evils, corruptions, and oppressions, under which we labour. If it be not eradicated, the Nation must perish.

"In support of this our sincere conviction, we need only refer to the never-to-be-forgotten Vote of your Hon. House, refusing to examine evidence on a charge against Lord Castle-reagh and Mr. S. Perceval, then two of the King's Ministers, for trafficking in seats in your Honourable House.

"We remember well, that when it was gravely averred, and proof offered, in a Petition which stood on your Journals, and the complaints thereof unredressed for more than twenty years, 'That seats for Legislation in the House of Commons were as notoriously rented and bought as the standings for cattle in a fair,' the then Honourable House treated the assertion with affected indignation, and the Minister threatened to punish the Petitioner, for 'presenting a scandalous and libellous Petition.' But we have lived to see a House of Commons avow the traffic, and screen those accused of this breach of law and right, because it has been equally committed by all parties, and was a practice 'as notorious as the sun at noon-day.' At this Vote, and at these practices, we feel as 'our ancestors would have felt,' and cannot repress the expression of 'our indignation' and disgust.

"Under these circumstances may we not be permitted to ask, WHERE IS YOUR JUSTICE, WHERE YOUR DIGNITY? Mr. John Gale Jones is confined within the walls of Newgate, for an alleged offence against yourself, which if committed against any other subjects of these Realms, or even against the King himself, must have been adjudged by the established Rules and Laws of the Land! Lord Castle-reagh continued to be a principal Minister of the Crown, and is now a free Member of your Honourable House! Sir Francis Burdett, dragged by a military force from the bosom of his family, is committed to the Tower for exercising the right of constitutional discussion, common and indeed undeniable to you, to us, to all! Mr. Spencer Perceval continues a Member of your Honourable House, taking a lead in your deliberations, the first Minister of the Crown, and the chief adviser of the Royal Councils!

"Under the agonizing feelings excited by the late imprisonment of our fellow-subjects, can it be necessary for us to recapitulate the many instances, as thus appears to us, of refusals to institute just and necessary inquiry, to pursue to condign punishment public delinquents and peculators, to economise the means and resources of the State, to administer to the people relief and redress for the various disgraces which the national honour has sustained, for the lavish profusion of British blood and treasure, extravagantly wasted in ill-contrived and fruitless campaigns, and more particularly in the humiliating and ignominious expedition to the coast of Holland, in which the greatest armament that ever left our shores was exposed to the scorn, contempt, and ridicule of the enemy; and the flower of the British Army left ingloriously to perish in the pestilential marshes of Walcheren, without succour! without necessity! without object! without hope!

"These and similar proceedings of your Honourable House require no comment; but we cannot by our silence become accomplices in the ruin of our Country, and dare not conceal from you the wholesome though unpleasant truth, that they appear to us to have materially shaken what remained of the confidence of the subjects of these realms in the wisdom of your Honourable House.

"We therefore humbly but firmly entreat you to reconsider your conduct, to retrace your steps, and to expunge from your Journals all your orders, declarations, and resolutions, respecting Mr. Gale Jones and Sir Francis Burdett; and that as Sir Francis Burdett has not been expelled from your Honourable House, he be no longer prevented from exercising therein all the duties of a Member of the same.

"Above all, we earnestly pray your Honourable House, in conjunction with Sir Francis Burdett, and in conformity to the notice he has given, to devise and adopt such measures as will effect an immediate and radical Reform in the Commons House of Parliament, and ensure to the People a full, fair, and substantial Representation, without which they must inevitably cease to exist a great, a free, a glorious, and independent nation."

The reading of the Petition was interrupted at the conclusion of almost every paragraph by the loudest and most enthusiastic acclamations; it was carried in the same manner as the Resolutions, and was ordered to be presented to the House of Commons, and supported by the Members for the City.

Sir W. CURTIS, though he did not altogether approve of the Petition, felt it his duty to present it to Parliament.—Sir C. PRICE and Sir J. SHAW also would present the Petition, though they could not support it. (Hisses.)

Mr. WATKIN was sorry he could only propose a Vote of Thanks to one of their Representatives, for the rest had injured and insulted the Livery by their conduct in the House on the Walcheren Vote of Acquittal.

The Vote of Thanks to Alderman CONNE was then put and carried; when he returned his thanks for the honour done him.—Sir WILIAM CURTIS attempted to justify his conduct, and so did Sir C. PRICE, who said, he would not consent that his character should be taken away by a dark assassin! He did not know that Mr. Watkin was the first man in London who

individual had a right to call upon a Member of Parliament to explain his conduct. If the Walcheren question was again to be agitated, he should vote just as he had done. (*Hisses and shouts of off, off!*)

Votes of Thanks to the LORD MAYOR and SHERIFFS were then carried, who returned their thanks.—Mr. Sheriff WOOD said, he had gone in state to the Tower to present to Sir F. Burdett the Middlesex Address, and he should proceed to execute their wishes on the present occasion in the like manner.—Mr. Sheriff ATKINS said, he should wish to obey their instructions, but he did not approve of going to any individual in the same state in which he would wait upon his Majesty or the Parliament.

This alluded to the 6th and 7th Resolutions, which were as follow:—

“That the cordial Thanks of this Meeting be given to that illustrious Patriot Sir Francis Burdett, for his upright and independent conduct in Parliament; for his truly constitutional and irresistible argument, disproving the power of the House of Commons to imprison the People of England; and for his legal and manly resistance to the Speaker's Warrant, whereby he has given a practical illustration of its inefficiency, and demonstrated that, as there is no legal power without the legal means of execution, it could not be carried into effect without the aid of a standing army, a violation of the ancient Laws and Rights of Englishmen, and which, in his instance, was so lamentably exemplified in the breaking open of his castle, and so fatally preceded and followed by the murder of peaceable and unoffending citizens.

“That this Resolution be communicated to Sir Francis Burdett by the Sheriffs and a Deputation of the Livery, who are desired at the same time to assure him, that, however grateful his release from arbitrary confinement would prove to the citizens of London, his liberation would be no jubilee to the British people, unless obtained by the triumph of those grand principles which in his person have been so shamefully and flagrantly violated.”

The Resolutions, &c. were then ordered to be printed, and at five o'clock the Hall broke up.

COUNTER-MEETING OF THE LIVERY.

The friends of Ministers, having very naturally calculated how matters would be carried in the open Hall, thought fit to meet together in the evening at the London Tavern, in order to protest against the proceedings of their brethren. Of this determination, however, the friends of Reform had due notice, and when Mr. CHRISTOPHER SMITH had been seated in the Chair, surrounded by Messrs. KEMBLE, DIXON, ACHESON, with about 70 of their party,—to their great mortification and annoyance, in walked Mr. WALTHMAN, and a great number of the Livery, who were resolved to take a proper share in the proceedings!—Great tumult ensued. The Protesters contended, that none but those who disapproved of the proceedings of the Common Hall had a right to be present; but the Reformers insisted that it was a meeting of the Livery, and as such they had an undoubted right to be present. Cries of “No Private Committees,”—“No *Clandestine Associations*,” now echoed throughout the room. Mr. Walthman was at length heard, when he exposed the folly of attempting by private meetings to carry Resolutions in opposition to the public and general voice of the Livery, duly assembled in their Hall of business.—Mr. Kemble here said that Mr. Walthman had no business whatever at their meeting; a Mr. Mountford seconded him. Mr. Walthman then attempted to propose several Resolutions of his own, but the Chairman refused to have them put. Mr. Walthman then proposed that Mr. Nicholson should take the chair, which was carried in the affirmative by a majority. Mr. Smith, however, still continuing in the chair, Mr. Nicholson took one on the opposite side, when the following Resolutions were proposed by Mr. Walthman, and carried by acclamation:—

“Resolved, That it appears that this Meeting was privately convened, with a view of counteracting the proceedings of the

Livery of London, this day legally and publicly convened in Guildhall; and that such a measure is highly improper, and deserving of the reprobation of the Livery at large.

“Resolved, That we do highly approve of the Resolutions and Petition this day agreed to at a Meeting of the Livery in Common Hall, respecting the extraordinary power assumed and exercised in the imprisonment of John Gale Jones and Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. and the necessity of a Reform in Parliament.

“Resolved, That Alderman C. Smith, having refused to put the question upon Resolutions repeatedly moved, has acted in a partial and improper manner, and is not entitled to the confidence of his fellow Citizens.

“Resolved, That the thanks of this Meeting be given to Mr. John Nicholson, for his highly meritorious conduct in the Chair.”

The Protesters gradually retired into an adjoining room, where they agreed to an ADDRESS, which was ordered to be left at the Tavern for the signatures of Liverymen. This Address states, that the Undersigned disapprove of the proceedings of the Common Hall;—that they view with sorrow and indignation the attempts made to degrade the Legislature and to alienate the affections of the People from the Government:—That the conduct of these factious individuals is in direct contradiction to the principles they profess, for they refuse to others that freedom of opinion and expression which they exercise themselves without controul;—that their real object is the total subversion of the Constitution;—that their inflammatory proceedings are peculiarly dangerous at this awful crisis. The Undersigned exhort their fellow-citizens to rally round their venerable Monarch;—they state, that they rely with confidence on their Representatives in Parliament, convinced that every necessary retrenchment will be made, and every moderate Reform adopted;—they are convinced that the nation has much to rejoice at and little to regret;—and they conclude with calling upon the Livery to resist all factious attempts at innovation, to place unshaken confidence in the virtues of the King, in the wisdom of the Legislature, and in the purity of the Judges.—

(Signed) Christopher Smith, John Atkins, William Jacob, Henry Blaxland, Jacob Bank, Samuel Dixon, Joseph Welch, Daniel Britten, William Graham, G. Fryer, Wm. Gould, jun. R. Mountford, Ewd. Hughes, N. Brickwood, J. Adcock, L. Sharp, J. Gough, E. Poynder, R. J. Hewatt, T. Beynon, R. Abbey, R. S. Wells, J. Hamman, J. Patterson, R. Jennings, A. Nash, P. Leonard, R. Spooner, J. Champion, Andrew Lawrie, Thomas Laing, Henry Farr, E. Kemble, John Pugh, R. H. Martin, Nathaniel Acheson, J. Blakley, R. Elliott, H. White, J. Leech, R. Knight, W. F. Gardner, M. Lucas, G. A. Nash, C. Horn, J. W. Goss, T. Lott, R. Bulcock, Rich. Bulcock, M. Cutler, W. Reynolds, W. Gould, T. Blaxland, W. Ruston, G. Blaxland, P. Skipper, J. Pettitt, M. Maskew, H. Kemble, J. Ruck, J. Maddox, J. Blades, Jos. Lucas, J. Lucas, W. Dawes, J. Eyken, H. Smith, T. Foster, J. Lodge, D. Gossett, B. Watson, S. Hillatt, R. Dixon, M. Woodhouse, J. Marten, J. Jacks, R. Eyles, J. Young, J. Morris, S. Hale.

DEATHS.

On Tuesday morning, of a rapid decline, in the 15th year of her age, Miss Stuart, daughter of John Stuart, Esq. of Parliament street;—a young lady, whose mind promised to render her an ornament, and whose heart a blessing, to society.

On Tuesday, at Cambridge, Lord Royston, the only surviving son of the Earl of Hardwicke, and the nephew of Mr. Yorke. The Noble Earl has been singularly unfortunate. A year or two ago, his eldest son perished in a storm in the Baltic; his other has just been snatched from him.—Mr. Charles Yorke is now the heir to the Earldom.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER Office, 15, Beaufort Buildings, Strand.—Price 6d