

THE EXAMINER.

No. 129. SUNDAY, JUNE 17, 1810.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

PARIS, JUNE 3.—Their Majesties arrived at St. Cloud in the evening of the 1st inst.

JUNE 5.—The Persian Ambassador has left Paris, together with his suite, which is very numerous. Chevalier Amadeus Jaubert, Master of Requests, is appointed to accompany his Excellency to the frontier.

LETTER FROM THE EMPEROR TO THE MINISTER OF GENERAL POLICE.

“M. Duke of Otranto.—The service you have done us in the different circumstances that have arisen, induce us to confide to your hands the government of Rome, until we shall have taken measures for carrying into execution the 8th Art. of the Act of Constitution, of the 17th February last. We have, by a special Decree, determined the extraordinary powers which with the particular circumstances of those Departments require that you should be invested. We expect that, in this new post, you will continue to give us proofs of your zeal for our service, and your attachment to our person. This letter having no other purpose, we pray God, M. Duke of Otranto, to have you in his holy-keeping.

“St. Cloud, June 3, 1810.

“NAPOLEON.”

LETTER FROM THE MINISTER OF GENERAL POLICE TO HIS IMPERIAL AND ROYAL MASTER.

“SIRE,—I accept the Government of Rome, to which your Majesty has the goodness to appoint me, in recompence for the feeble services which I have been happy enough to render you. I ought not, however, to conceal that I experience a very painful sensation in removing from you. I lose, at once, the happiness and the information which I daily derived from conversing with you. If any thing can alleviate this regret, it is the reflection that, upon this occasion, by my absolute resignation to your Majesty's pleasure, I give you the strongest proof of my unbounded devotion towards your person. I am, with the most profound respect, Sire, your Imperial and Royal Majesty's most humble and most obedient Servant, and faithful Subject,

“The Duke of OTRANTO.”

“Paris, June 3, 1810.”

His Majesty has appointed the Duke of Rovigo successor to the Duke of Otranto, as Minister of General Police.

PROVINCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

WILTS LOCAL MILITIA.—A dissatisfaction has prevailed amongst a few of the non-commissioned officers and privates of the 2d Wilts Local Militia, quartered at Devizes, ever since they have been embodied, which on Wednesday se'night broke out into open mutiny in the person of one of the serjeants, who was committed to the guard-room. After the evening parade, a party of the regiment, with charged bayonets, forced the guard-room, and released the serjeant and two privates then under confinement; but by the assistance of nine troops of the Wiltshire Yeomanry Cavalry, and the Draycot troop of Yeomanry, whom the Mayor called upon in aid of the civil power, the mutiny has been entirely quelled; two of the guilty persons tried by a Court Martial, and the ringleader severely punished. This man was sentenced to receive 300 lashes, 200 of which were inflicted on him, and the remainder remitted. The serjeant was sentenced to be broke and flogged; but in consideration of his good character, the latter part was remitted. The term of service for which the above regiment had assembled expired on Friday, when the men were dismissed, and retired peaceably to their homes.

About 40 Irishmen, volunteers from the Armagh militia, marching through Horsham on Wednesday night, to join a regiment of the line at Steyning, and being without an officer, kicked up a riot at a public house, and beat several of the inhabitants, but were at last taken to the barracks by a party of the 37th regiment.

The *Salisbury and Winchester Journal* states as follows:—

“About a month ago a fine boy, about ten years old, son of Captain John Briton, of the Royal West India Rangers, was murdered at Niton, in the Isle of Wight. The supposed murderer, the father of the boy, absconded. The public will rejoice to hear, that he is now taken, that he may suffer all the punishment which the laws can inflict, if guilty—or may be acquitted of so foul a charge, if innocent. The following circumstances led to the discovery of the place of his retreat.—A letter, under a fictitious name, was received by a gentleman of the island from Wells, in Somersetshire, intimating that Capt. Briton was a particular friend of the writer, who wished to know how the business respecting the youth was settled, and what was become of the Captain. On comparing the writing with that of Capt. Briton, at the Depot, they were found to correspond. Allen, the Sheriff's officer, was immediately sent off to Wells, where he discovered the Captain disguised in the dress of a gardener: he took him into custody, and conveyed him to Winchester. He is committed to the County Gaol for trial at the next Assizes.”

REMARKABLE ROBBERY.—On Friday se'night, so early as half past eight o'clock, Mr. Nicholls, a respectable farmer, of Toft, near Bourn, was stopped, on his return from Stamford market, by a highwayman, who robbed him of about 16*l*. The offender was on foot, and armed with an extremely large cudgel, which Mr. Nicholls, as he approached him on the road, (near the sixth mile stone from Stamford) observed with some surprise. On the two meeting, the robber seized the reins of Mr. Nicholl's horse, and demanded Mr. Nicholl's money. The latter hardly believed, that at such a time of the evening, at such a season of the year, and in so frequented a place, the man could be in earnest, and said, “Poh, poh, you don't mean to rob me;” to which the fellow replied, “I do, Sir, your money or your life I will have; I am in distress, and have not a farthing to help myself with.” After some farther parley, in which the man spoke threateningly, but never swore nor used gross language, Mr. Nicholls delivered his pocket-book, containing about 28*l*. The robber opened the book deliberately, looked over the bank-bills, and, upon Mr. Nicholl's representing that was all the money he had to assist him on his journey, and begging to have some of it returned, gave him back two one-pound bills!—He then quitted his hold; and the parties had proceeded 20 or 30 yards in opposite directions, when Mr. Nicholls called to the robber, that he might as well give back the pocket-book, which would be of no value to him. “Well,” said the fellow, returning to meet Mr. N. “there it is; and here's a ten pound bill too more than I want.” He actually thereupon re-delivered the book and bill, and soon after was out of sight, Mr. Nicholls riding to his house, about a mile and a half off, to raise his friends in pursuit.

OXFORD, JUNE 11.—The Chancellor's Prizes of this year have been adjudged as follow:—To Mr. Whately, A. B. of Oriel College, for the English Essay.—To Mr. Miller, A. B. of Worcester College, for the Latin Essay.—To Mr. Coleridge, of Corpus Christi College, for the Latin Verses; and Sir R. Newdigate's Prize for English Verse, to Mr. Chindery, of Christ Church College.

SHEFFIELD MEETING.—About seven or eight thousand of the inhabitants of this town and neighbourhood assembled, on Wednesday last, in Paradise-square (the Town Hall having been found not sufficiently commodious to contain so great a number), “to take into consideration the assumption of Pri-

vilege by the Honourable the House of Commons, in imprisoning his Majesty's subjects for offences cognizable in the usual Courts of Law; to consider the subject of a Reform in the Representation of the People; and the propriety of returning thanks to Sir Francis Burdett for his great and unremitting exertions in the service of his country." Mr. EBENEZER RICHES being unanimously appointed to fill the chair, he addressed the Meeting in a very moderate and sensible speech, and concluded by offering to their consideration the following Resolutions:—

"1. That the subjects of these kingdoms are entitled to personal liberty and security as their unalienable birthright, transmitted by their ancestors, and confirmed by many venerable statutes; a high and sacred trust which they are determined, if possible, to leave unimpaired to posterity.

"2. That no privilege subversive of these rights can co-exist with the statutes which enacted and confirmed them; and while we fully acknowledge the competency of the Commons House of Parliament to punish contempt and to remove obstructions to public business, we most solemnly maintain that it has no power to dispense with the unrepealed statutes of the realm, by punishing at discretion such offences as cause no actual interruption of its proceedings, and are cognizable in the Courts of Law.

"3. That feeling the most ardent attachment to the constitution of our country, and jealous of the least infringement upon those laws to which we owe our dearest enjoyments, we have observed with unaffected sorrow and alarm some recent proceedings of the Honourable the House of Commons, by which it has assumed the power of depriving us of our personal liberty, contrary to the letter and spirit of many excellent statutes, which enact that 'no Freeman shall be imprisoned but by the lawful judgment of his equals or the Law of the Land.'

"4. That, in our opinion, a Judge and Jury form the only proper and legal tribunal in cases of libel; and were the power now assumed by the House of Commons, of deciding in all cases upon the nature and extent of their own privileges, confirmed, it would have a fatal influence upon the liberty of the Press, and might, in the hands of a corrupt and unprincipled administration, become a dreadful engine of despotism, and finally subversive of the English Constitution.

"5. That the fatal wars in which we have been engaged, the lavish expenditure of public money, the exercise by the House of Commons of illegal unnecessary privileges, its approbation of ruinous expeditions, its support of weak and arbitrary Ministers, its refusal to enquire into the shameful practice of trafficking for seats, and to adopt any plan of Reform, and all the other numerous grievances under which we have long been labouring, are entirely owing to the want of a well-organised, and more extended Representation of the People in Parliament.

"6. That in order to arrest the progress of our national calamities, and avert those dangers which threaten the destruction of the state, it is our decided opinion, that the House of Commons should be restored to its constitutional dependence upon the people, whom it is its proper function to represent; that we highly approve the Petition to the Honourable House now read; that the Chairman and Requisitionists be authorized to sign it on behalf of this Meeting, and that it be transmitted to Mr. Whitbread, who is hereby requested to present and support the same.

"7. That from a full conviction that the present state of the Representation is the grand source of all our evils, and that no real, substantial, permanent benefits can be conveyed to the people, until they have the power of sending honest and independent men into the House of Commons, this Meeting do most earnestly and respectfully suggest to all the counties, cities, and towns of these kingdoms, the necessity of presenting Petitions to Parliament upon this subject, on the opening of the next Session, and of supporting, by every means in their power, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Brand, and other Gentlemen who may co-operate with them in so important a work.

"8. That from the recent decision upon Mr. Brand's Motion, it is too probable, that the almost unanimous voice of the nation in favour of that measure may continue to be disregarded by the present House of Commons. It is therefore become the duty of the people themselves, independently to exert the power remaining to them in the state, by embracing every opportunity of electing such Members only, as will unequivocally promise their best exertions to obtain that Reform in Parliament, so absolutely essential to the salvation and permanent prosperity of the country.

"9. That the Right Hon. Viscount Milton, when he solicited the honour of representing the County of York, did solemnly declare to the people of the Cloth Hall, in Leeds, that they should ever find in him an active inquirer into abuses, and were it in his power he would root out the very seeds of corruption; but that his Lordship, by his conduct on the motion of Mr. Maddocks, respecting Mr. Perceval and Lord Castlereagh's trafficking for seats, by his vote against the liberation of Mr. John Gale Jones, and more particularly by his vote and speech on Mr. Brand's motion for Reform, has insulted the people of England, and rendered himself unworthy of the confidence of his Constituents.

"10. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Mr. Brand, for his motion and speech in the House of Commons in favour of a Parliamentary Reform; to the 114 Members by whom that measure was supported; to Lord Erskine and Sir Samuel Romilly, for their manly and eloquent defence of the good old Laws of England, and the rights of their fellow subjects; and to Mr. Whitbread, for his unremitting attention to his duty in Parliament, and his constant support of every measure favourable to the interests of the people.

"11. That the warmest acknowledgments of a grateful people are more pre-eminently due to Sir Francis Burdett, for his prompt and generous attention to the case of Mr. Jones; for his eloquent, learned, and constitutional argument against the power assumed by the House of Commons of imprisoning his Majesty's Subjects contrary to the laws of the land; and for his noble, his virtuous, his unremitting exertions, "through evil report and good report," in Parliament and out of Parliament, in support of the grand National Cause in which he is engaged.

"12. That the Address to Sir Francis Burdett, now read by the Chairman, expressive of the sentiments and feelings of this Meeting, be by him transmitted to the Honourable Baronet without delay.

"13. That as the respectable men who are now uniting in the cause of Reform have been the subjects of much calumny and abuse, and their motives most unceasingly and ungenerously misrepresented, we cannot separate without solemnly declaring our inviolable attachment to the Government of this Country as by law established; that it is our firm determination equally to support the rights of the Crown, the just privileges of the Commons, and the liberties of the people; that we want no impracticable plans, no fanciful theories, no vain speculations; that the sober and rational Reform for which we contend has been declared necessary for the salvation of the State by the most virtuous Patriots and most enlightened Statesmen; and finally, that the whole extent of our demand is "the Constitution, the whole Constitution, and nothing but the Constitution."

"Resolved,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Chairman, for his manly, able, and independent conduct in the Chair.

"That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the twenty-four Gentlemen who signed the Requisition for calling together the Inhabitants of the Town upon this important occasion."

These Resolutions being approved of, they were carried in a most triumphant manner, and the people listened with the most attention and satisfaction to the excellent speeches of THOMAS RAWSON, Esq. of Wardsea, MR. JOHN BAILEY, and Capt. WARD, of the Sheffield Local Militia, who, in remarking upon the censure which had been attached to him for venturing to differ with Messrs. Perceval and Co. observed,

"I presume that if we had attended a Pitt Dinner, the case would have been different. Yes! we may shew our approbation of men in power, if their measures be as weak and wicked as the human imagination can possibly conceive. But if we have reason to complain, and dare to express our disapprobation, we are fanged by the illiberal under the banners of party and of faction, are deemed unworthy of our military profession. I pity the ignorance of those who think that a constitutional soldier has nothing to do with politics. What! because he carries a sword in defence of his country, can he have no interest in advising for her welfare?—because he is ready to die for his King and for his native land, has he no right to speak freely and publicly of the crimes of those who have exposed them to danger? Who, then, would voluntarily thus disfranchise himself, and sink the Citizen in the Soldier? But it is absurd to suppose that this, at least in the Militia, is what the Constitution demands of her defenders; and if it be so in the regular army, it is, in my opinion, a strong reason against a numerous standing force, which is thus separated from the great body of the people, and induced falsely to imagine that it has an interest distinct from theirs. It is to my mind a powerful argument for the adoption of that constitutional plan which Major Cartwright has so lately recommended, and which provides for the training to arms of every man in the kingdom. If this were enacted, the Citizen and Soldier would be the same; there would be occasion for only a small regular army; the Minister would not have at his command the means of corruption, in the gift of so many offices; nor could he expend in fatal expeditions so much of our kindred blood."—The Petition to Parliament, and the Address to Sir Francis Burdett, were then read and agreed to, and the People returned to their homes with the utmost order.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, June 13.

STATE OF THE NATION.

Earl Grey addressed the House on the awful State of the Nation, which was governed by men, who, though protected by majorities in those walls, were believed by the whole country to be totally incompetent to perform their duty to the State. He regretted the absence of his Noble Friend (Lord Grenville) on such an occasion; but the motion he had to propose had his full and unqualified concurrence.—His Lordship then proceeded to shew the dangers of the country, the *Annual Expenditure* of which, in the course of the last sixteen years, had grown from sixteen millions to the alarming amount of eighty-five millions.—In looking to such an appalling taxation, and considering the oppressive modes by which it is collected,—keeping also fully in view the awful opinion given by those best acquainted with the subject,—that it has been extended to its fullest scope, and that it was quite impossible to carry it farther,—there appeared but one remedy for the evil,—Peace. At the same time he must confess, that, looking to the system which had been pursued, he was fearful either that it was not possible to obtain Peace at all, or that, if attainable, it would be unattended with those securities with which it only could be valuable. He therefore did not mean to trouble their Lordships on this point, as he had no reason to think that Ministers were indisposed to peace, provided it could be properly attained.—Bonaparte was the Master of Europe; his military glory was unrivalled; and his sole object was the overthrow of Great Britain. Under such impressions, therefore, he should never look upon the restoration of Peace in any other light but as a preparation for a renewal of the contest!—In such a condition, we had nothing to do but to husband our resources, yet this vital polity had been wholly neglected by the Advisers of the Crown, the consequences of whose idly planned and shamefully managed Expeditions the country were now lamenting in tears and blood. Two armies had been sacrificed in Spain,

without effecting the smallest good; a fatal and unjust attack had been made on the independence of Denmark; Sicily was endangered by our bad policy; and our Orders in Council, had they not been relaxed, would have been most disadvantageous and ruinous.—The course now pursued was however a bad one; for the trade was carried on by European Foreign Seamen, to the amount of 68,258, who were completely at the disposal of Bonaparte, to man his fleets whenever he should want them for that object. Such a system went only to the realization of the enemy's wish of Ships, Colonies, and Commerce.—Proceeding to the Domestic Management of Ministers, he found that instead of a system of economy and retrenchment, they had added by their extravagance ten millions to the Annual Expenditure, and not a single step had been taken to provide for such an excess, but it had been met by temporary expedients,—expedients which must produce the most fatal consequences. The evils of the Paper System, too, were universally felt, yet no remedy had been provided.—His Lordship next touched upon the Catholic Question: he indeed felt that other measures were necessary besides Catholic Concession, but that should be the preliminary step. By conciliation to Ireland, instead of weakness and clamour, a new era would arise of recruited strength and renovated hope.—On the subject of Reform, he deemed that a gradual, a temperate, and judicious Reform of those abuses which time and corruption had engendered in the State, should be deliberately adopted, by a strict economy in the public expenditure, and by the suppression and regulation of great emolumentary offices, where no duty was performed. Not indeed that any considerable saving would arise from such a measure, but nevertheless it should be done: at the same time he was convinced that offices of the kind should exist, for the reward of great public services, and that their disposal should also be vested in the Crown.—He had no objection to the legitimate influence of the Crown, but it must be allowed that such influence had exceeded all due limits, arising from the Annual Expenditure of eighty-five millions,—the numerous Public Establishments,—the great increase of Indian Territory,—the corresponding increase of Naval and Military Servants,—&c. &c. On this subject, Ministers had exhibited the most blind and fatal policy: they have defended every abuse, and resisted every proposition for redress; and at the same time, as if for the very purpose of driving the People to despair, they have conferred high rewards upon those who had no claim whatever but their parliamentary services to Ministers.—(Hear! Hear!)—So much for Financial Reform: but he was prepared to go still further; he was anxious to correct those Abuses which had corrupted the practice of our Constitution. In his youth he had been a sanguine advocate for such Reform; he did not say that his impressions on this subject had experienced no change; but upon its great grounds it had never been abandoned by him, though he certainly disapproved of all those fanciful speculations in which some men were now anxious to engage. He had been formerly misrepresented by that description of persons who at this day continue the same course. The folly of the present day was, that every branch and exercise of our Constitution was defined by Law and was to be found in the Statute Book: but he had ever understood that the fundamental blessings of the British Constitution were to be found in the harmony and co-operation of all its powers. This was the opinion of that great man, Mr. Fox, who had expressed his sense of the decided impossibility of providing for all the variety of human wants by any system whatever. In 1792, he had opposed the wild theories of Reform then broached by men with whom he disclaimed all intercourse; and such were the chimeras of those persons with whom he disdained intercourse now. He did not impute motives to any of them, though they had most uncharitably attributed motives to him. He accused no man of bad intentions; although, from the recent exposures and shameful conspiracies every day brought to light, he was almost disposed to think that some of those who were so loud in their cry about public purity, had violated all those principles of honour and morality which form the only sure basis of social life.—As to the Privileges of Parliament, he would say that those Privileges were necessary to support the Legis-

lature in the discharge of its functions against the Crown: they were undoubted; and this was the opinion both of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt.—Sir Francis Burdett says he is a martyr to the good old cause for which Sydney and Russell bled; but Sydney and Russell fell in their attempt to restrain the power of the Crown, not the power of Parliament; and they fell too by the verdict of a Jury, who were influenced by base and profligate Judges. He did not wish to detract from that invaluable institution, the Trial by Jury; but let those who would argue from the abuse of a privilege against the use of it, consider to what an extent that argument may be carried; and he must do this justice to *all Governments* for a series of years back, that *they had evinced no disposition to stretch their power to an extent burthensome to the People!* Such a power, vested in the Crown, might indeed be arbitrarily exercised; but it is *not likely* that the Members of the House of Commons, *who are elected by the people and who to the people must return*, would combine together arbitrarily or tyrannically to exercise a power against the people, by which themselves, *as a part of the people*, must soon be effected! Such doctrines, he knew, may not be *popular*; but he would not sacrifice duty to popularity. He certainly should feel deep regret to be deprived of his popularity by any misunderstanding of his views, and it excited his indignation to be deprived of it by the basest misrepresentations and the vilest delusions, practised by men who, without any regard to truth, sacrifice every really virtuous and patriotic object to the shouts of popular clamour!—To obtain such popularity required neither talent nor virtue. Indeed, men without either are the best fitted to acquire such popularity;—men who, as we see in the present day, set themselves above *all the decencies of private life*,* and above all those *courtesies* which men who really endeavour to do their duty concede even to their adversaries.—Earl Grey concluded by moving a long Address to his Majesty, in substance as follows:—“That in consideration of the present state of the country, pressed as the people were by the accumulation of taxes, the House could not doubt the willingness of his Majesty to conclude an honourable peace whenever an opportunity offered. That they trusted all possible means of defending the country from the attacks of the enemy would be always prepared, although they deeply lamented the disasters which had been brought upon the country by the rash and ill-executed expeditions projected by his Majesty’s Ministers. That they trusted the Orders in Council would be repealed, and others more judicious and efficacious substituted in their stead. That they felt extreme regret at the system of finance which was now adopted in the country, as well as the immense injury that resulted to the country from the great circulation of paper currency. That they regretted that no measure of conciliation had been adopted towards Ireland, nor any public abuses reformed. That to secure the perfect freedom of debate in Parliament, they desired the concurrence of his Majesty, to give effect to such measures as they should adopt in order to secure it.”

The Earl of LIVERPOOL did not mean to follow the Noble Earl through all his speech. It was not necessary, after the repeated decisions of Parliament. He entirely coincided with him on the subject of Parliamentary Privileges, though he as entirely differed with him in his opinion of the conduct of Ministers,—of the war in Spain,—of the Catholic Question,—and of Reform. As to the Public Expenditure, there never was so great a civil government so *cheaply administered* as that of the British Empire!—A Noble Baron (Grenville) unfortunately absent from indisposition, had expressed his abhorrence of distinct and householding Reforms,—of Reforms which substituted the principle of population for that of property.—As to Spain, he (Liverpool), considered the spirit of the people of Spain unsubdued; and, though success was *not entire* on the part of Spain, was there nothing gained in our having prevented the entire success of France—in having neutralised the resources of the foe? It was thus that we were fighting

* Did Earl GREY mean this hit for Colonel WARDLE or his own friend the Duke of YORK?—Exam.

our own battles. Whether he looked to our foreign or domestic policy, the country was in a state of increasing resources, however their Lordships might be called upon to vote the disastrous state of it. Imports and exports were greatly on the increase; the revenue was great; the navy high; the army, notwithstanding disasters, had augmented 27,000 men; the house of Braganza had by our means been *transplanted* to the Brazils; and *Lisbon* and *Cadiz* were in our hands. He, therefore, saw no cause for the sweeping censure which the Noble Mover had proposed against the existing Ministry.

Lord STANHOPE opposed the Noble Secretary, and his blessed administration. Earl Grey’s speech (his Lordship said) would please some, and displease many; while an imprudent Member of the House of Commons (Mr. Wynne) had written a pamphlet, which had made more enemies than friends to the cause of Parliamentary Privileges. He had pricked up his ears, to hear all that could be said on that point; yet such Privileges were, he thought, abominable in point of principle, and dangerous in point of exertion. The Noble Lord then adverted to the divisions supposed to exist among Ministers; and indulged in a humorous tone of observation on the supposed subjects of controversy among each other, which diverted their attention from the more important objects of the government. He imagined one of the Ministers charging another with the defection of Russia; that other charging a third with the Copenhagen robbery and the final subjugation of Austria; a fourth silences his opponent with the ominous mention of the expedition to the Scheldt; while a fifth bears down upon them all with the charge of their weak or treacherous defence of the *Royal Duke and his little darling*. (*A laugh*). No Privilege was answered by No Popery. He did not believe that his Noble Friends (the Opposition) were much vexed by those divisions; (*a laugh*) they were too anxious to serve their country, to disdain to take advantage of them. (*A laugh*). The mutual zeal of the two candidate parties had sometimes, however, produced contests in which the House had abundant opportunity to recognize the civility of Saint Giles and the politeness of Billingsgate. (*A laugh*). The Noble Lord concluded by moving, as an Amendment, “That that House would pledge themselves to maintain the law of the land, to which they deemed the right of the Trial by Jury, and the preserving the liberty of the subject, as indispensable.”

Lord SUFFOLK supported the Address as moved by Earl Grey.

Lord ERSKINE, though he differed somewhat from his Noble Friend (Grey), was happy to support him generally. They had long thus travelled together, and he felt no wish to separate in the end. The hour of Reform would be the hour of strength and power to the country. Parliament, like every other Court, must have the means of asserting itself; yet, for one, he did not like, nor would he defend, an undefined and uncontrollable privilege. How many ardent and patriot spirits had resisted such claims! How much of the best blood of our ancestors had flowed for the same cause! The cause was good, and must be so. He should support the Amendment.

Lord ELDON disapproved both of the Motion and the Amendment, and contended that the House of Commons, like the Courts below, had, as they ought to have, power to commit *instantly*, for disrespectful words, and a libel on the Court.

The Duke of NORFOLK would support the amendment.—As to the Privileges of Parliament, he did admit that they formed a part of the Law of the Land. But he would be understood to mean only those privileges which were consistent and necessary; and, among these, he could not class that *Privilege*, the recent exercise of which had created so much discussion and alarm. Let it be supposed that the House of Commons committed a man for libel written the day after the commencement of the Sessions, and that another man was committed for a still more offensive libel the day before the conclusion of the Sessions—how unequal must the punishment be upon two such offenders; and was it, he would ask, compatible with common sense, that a power of punishing so unequally could belong to any body of men in this or any free Constitution? Yet such was the power claimed and exercised in the House of Commons

—a power of which he could not hesitate to declare his unqualified disapprobation.

Lord SIDMOUTH highly disapproved of the conduct of Ministers, yet could not agree with the Noble Mover on the subjects of Parliamentary Reform or Catholic Emancipation.

Marquis of LANSDOWNE censured the conduct of Ministers, and spoke in pointed terms on the miserable and disgraceful expedition to the Scheidt. He, however, defended the Privileges assumed by the Commons as necessary to the existence of the Legislature.—He should vote for the original Address.

The Earl of BUCKINGHAMSHIRE could not approve of the Address.

Earl SPENCER said that the Address had his most cordial approbation.

Lord DARNLEY spoke in support of the Address.

Earl GREY replied, and the Amendment was negatived without a division.—Strangers were then ordered to withdraw, when a division took place. The numbers were—For the Address—Contents, 72—Non-Contents, 134—Majority against the Address, 62.—Adjourned.

Thursday, June 14.

Several Bills were read a first time; and some conversation took place on the passing of the Scots Court Regulation Bill. An Amendment was proposed by Lord LAUDERDALE, with reference to the case of Mr. Thomas Scott, (a brother of Mr. Walter Scott), who has been recently appointed an Extractor, and to whom a compensation had been awarded by this Bill, to which Lord Lauderdale contended he was not entitled, and that the appointment itself was a mere job.—This opinion was strengthened by the appointment being defended by Lord MELVILLE.—The amendment was negatived.—Adjourned.

Friday, June 15.

There was nothing of moment before the House this day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, June 13.

The Sheriff of the City of London presented a petition from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, &c. in Common Council assembled, praying that their former petition might be received.—Ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS presented an Address from Worcester, expressing their disapprobation of the petition lately presented, praying Reform. The Address was signed by six Magistrates, nine Aldermen, the Sheriff, the Dean and several Clergymen.—Ordered to lie on the Table.

Mr. PETER MOORE presented a petition from the City of Coventry, giving it as their opinion that the House had violated all the fundamental laws in their conduct towards Gale Jones and Sir F. Burdett, and praying for a Reform.—Ordered to lie on the Table.

Lord BINNING presented a petition from the Township and Borough of Haddington, complaining of the present mode of collecting the Land Tax.—Ordered to lie on the Table.

Lord KENSINGTON gave notice that he should early in the next Session call the attention of the House to the Coal laws.

MIDDLESEX PETITION.

Mr. BYNG presented a petition, voted by the Freeholders of Middlesex, at Hackney, on Friday last, which was read; and on the motion that it lie on the Table,

Mr. Secretary RYDER rose to oppose the motion. The petition contained precisely the same sentiments as the one that had been rejected, and was couched in similar language. If the House received this petition they would acknowledge what the petitioners asserted, that the House had, in rejecting their former petition, deprived them of their rights and had subverted their liberties.

Mr. WHITBREAD defended the language of the petition, and contended that the House had violated the rights and privileges of the people, under the colour of privilege. He maintained that the people had a right to say, that the House had violated their privileges, if such was their opinion. In his opinion there was no occasion for rejecting the petition on the ground of the

words therein contained. The conduct of the House since Sir Francis Burdett had been committed to the Tower, with respect to petitions to them, had been full of contradiction and caprice. It was impossible for the people to know what language they ought to use in petitioning that House. Petitions had been laid on their Table, containing language more severe, and much more objectionable, than was contained in the Petition then under discussion. It would be well if some of those nice critics, who objected to the present petition, would tell the House and the people what sort of language ought to be used by those who pray for a redress of grievances.

Mr. PERCEVAL said, that those who opposed the present petition, and petitions of a similar nature, disclaimed all pretensions to nice criticism. If he, and those who thought with him, conceived that it was the object of a petition to insult and degrade the House, then they opposed it. He contended that in the present petition there was a laboured endeavour to use all the offensive language that had characterised the former one, with the addition of fresh endeavours to insult the House, endeavours that were worse and more objectionable than their former attempts.

The motion was then put and negatived without a division.

SHEFFIELD PETITION.

Mr. WHITBREAD presented a petition from the inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood of Sheffield, praying that the House would restore Gale Jones and Sir Francis Burdett to that liberty of which they had been unlawfully deprived, and calling on the House to renounce what the petitioners conceived to be an illegally assumed power; stating that all their grievances arose from a weak and intolerant Ministry; praying for a Reform; contending that the disfranchisement of many Boroughs, and the restoration of triennial Parliaments, were indispensably necessary.

The petition being read, and on the motion that it lie on the Table,

Mr. Secretary RYDER thought the petition ought not to be received, on the ground of its language and sentiments.

Lord MILTON said, that the sentiments of the petition were contrary to what he entertained on the subject. Though he did not approve of the manner in which the petitioners had expressed themselves, yet he could not vote for the rejection of the petition; for he knew that they were not of that description of persons that would insult the House.

Mr. WALLACE censured the language and sentiments of the petition.

Mr. CALCRAFT spoke in terms of severity on the conduct of the House, in opposing the petition on such light consideration.

General TARLETON censured the opposition made to the petition.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL disapproved of the petition.

Mr. BARING hoped that the decision of the House would be such, as to prove to the country that they did not look very nicely as to the language and expressions; but that they rather regarded the subject matter of the people's petitions. He thought the petitioners had a right to say what they had, if such were their opinion.

Mr. STEPHEN said that it was quite a new conduct to take notice of Members' speeches in petitions, and commenting on them as unconstitutional and unworthy of attention. The petition, in substance, was intended to insult and degrade.

Mr. WHITBREAD contended, that the petition did not intend to degrade and insult the House. He thought that was no insult to the House to state in the petition, that the petitioners approved of the Argument of Sir F. Burdett. If the House smothered the feelings of the people, they would be smothered in such a manner as probably to blaze forth hereafter, so as to make them sorry for such opposition. He again asserted, he thought the conduct of Gentlemen opposite was capricious in the extreme.

Mr. PERCEVAL said, there was no precedent where the House had allowed any of the speeches of Members to be noticed in such a manner as had been noticed in the petition. The plain object of the petition was, to countenance the conduct and

sentiments of Sir F. Burdett, which alone, he thought, was a sufficient reason for rejecting the petition.

Mr. W. SMITH contended that there was some want of recollection in those who opposed the petition. They had said that Sir F. Burdett had a right to his Argument, but not to the offensive expressions which were introduced in the course of such argument; and such expressions it had been said the House disapproved. The petitioners said, they "approved of the learned Argument," they said nothing about the expressions.—There had not been one satisfactory reason given for rejecting the petition.

Mr. C. YORKE said, it appeared to him, that there was a decided intention in the petition under discussion, and in all those who approved of such sentiments, to undervalue and to degrade that House. The petitioners said, that the petitioners approved of the whole of the Argument as published by Sir F. Burdett. The publication had been determined by that House to be a libel on them, and consequently the petition was libellous. A system existed to delude the people to their ruin, and to expose such delusion had been his constant endeavour.

Mr. W. WYNNE, too, thought the petition contained such language as rendered it unworthy of reception.

A division took place. The numbers were—for the Amendment, 61—against it, 14—majority, 47.

The petition was then rejected.

THE NAVY.

Lord COCHRANE moved for an account of all Danish Ships and Property, and all Prizes brought into this Country before our Declaration against Denmark, &c. and for an Account of Property taken before the 15th of September, 1795, and committed to the care of British Commissioners: which Papers were ordered.

Lord COCHRANE then proceeded to make a motion relative to the Court of Admiralty. He maintained that the whole system was wrong; that the number of English Seamen trading to our own ports was only 16,000, whereas that of Foreign Sailors was 29,000; the British tonnage had decreased from 31,000 tons, to 25,000; whereas foreign tonnage had increased from 417,000 tons, to 560,000. He thought that half our sea forces, properly directed, would conclude the war in a twelve-month's time, and that a sixth part of the force under Lord Wellington, put on board a flying squadron, would keep in alarm all the coasts of France, and oblige the enemy to keep his armies at home, the surest way of ruining him. He also thought that neither the King nor Ministers ought to derive any profit from the war, and he mentioned for instance, of a contrary practice, the Droits of Admiralty, amounting, as he was informed, to 11,000,000l. and the enormous profits of the Registrar's Office, enjoyed by Mr. Perceval's brother, of which he had the reversion. He then went into a long account of the grievances the Navy experienced from the Court of Admiralty, and concluded by moving a string of Resolutions, which were in substance;—

"That the Officers and Seamen of his Majesty's Navy deserved and were entitled to the highest support and consideration of the House, and that every inducement should be held out to encourage their exertions, and excite their emulation.

"That by an order of Queen Anne, after the advice of eminent lawyers, it was directed that the Crown should prosecute in the case of captures, and that the Officers might intervene in the cause for their own benefit.

"That this order was superseded by a decree of Council of the 29th of March, 1779, which vested in the King's Proctor the conduct of all Prize Causes.

"That it is essentially requisite that captors should appear by their own Proctors as formerly.

"And that leave should be given to bring in a Bill for the better regulation of Proceedings in the Admiralty Court."

The first Resolution being put,

Mr. H. THORNTON rose and said, that after the former session, he could not have supposed that any gentleman would have ventured to accuse the Officers of the Navy with a wish to wrong the captors. The

Hon. Gentleman concluded by observing, that the charges were made without the slightest foundation, and could only arise from the malignant suspicion of some secret, but dangerous adviser of the Noble Lord.

Mr. STEPHEN condemned, in the most vehement manner, the introduction of the question under the consideration of the House, and observed, that the Noble Lord had made a pledge which he was wholly unable to redeem. He trusted therefore his Lordship's good sense would induce him candidly to confess his error, and in a disinterested manner retract the charges he had so incorrectly made. The Hon. Gentleman then proposed to negative the first four Resolutions, and in lieu of the last, to substitute one complimenting the Court of Admiralty for the integrity with which it had invariably consulted the public interests.

Capt. BERESFORD bore testimony to the honourable conduct of the King's Advocate on all occasions.

Sir C. POLE said a few words in support of the Resolutions.

Mr. RUSE said there never was a more unfounded charge than that submitted to the House by the Noble Lord.

The House then divided. In favour of Lord Cochrane's Resolutions, 6—against them, 76—majority, 70.

After a short conversation, the second Report of the Committee appointed to seek for Precedents relative to the case of Sir F. Burdett was ordered to be re-committed, in consequence of the erroneous manner in which it had been prepared.—Mr. Wm. Wynne was added to the Committee.—Adjourned.

Thursday, June 14.

On the motion of Mr. PETER MOORE, the Drury-lane Theatre Bill was read a third time and passed.—There seems to have been no opposition to this Bill, which is to raise a large sum of money, but the public will be cautious into whose hands they trust their subscriptions.

The Assessed Taxes Bill was passed, after some observations of Sir Thomas Turton, who gave notice of his intention to bring the shameful inquisition of the Income Tax before the House next Session.

The East India Loan Bill was read a third time, notwithstanding the opposition of Mr. Creevey, Sir T. Turton, and others. Sir THOMAS said, that he saw no hope of the money ever being returned. The Indian embarrassments had increased with their conquests, and though he saw some Gentlemen smile, he could point out how Indian Princes had been hung up at their own doors, and their heads fixed on the walls of their own palaces. But these things excited no interest here.—Mr. C. DUNDAS defended the Company's Government in India, and denied that such scenes of rapine prevailed there.

The Report of the Bill for regulating and reforming certain Offices in the Admiralty Court was brought up and agreed to, after some opposition, during which Mr. H. MARTIN declared, that the Bill should be called a Bill to prevent all regulation and reform in those offices while Charles Lord Arden and the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval held offices, with large emoluments attached to them, in that Court.—Mr. PERCEVAL of course defended the Bill; he admitted, however, that his brother derived 7800l. a-year by the interest of money in his hands belonging to the suitors in that Court.—Mr. W. SMITH strongly deprecated a system which offered large premiums to officers holding high situations in the Government to keep the country in a state of war.

The Poor Settlement Bill was thrown out.—Adjourned.

Friday, June 15.

A Petition and Remonstrance from the Borough of Southwark was brought up by Mr. H. THORNTON, on the subject of Sir F. Burdett and Reform,—which was ordered to be laid on the Table, after some remarks by Sir T. TURTON, approving of its objects.

J. G. JONES.

Sir J. HALL moved, "That J. G. Jones be forthwith discharged from his confinement in Newgate."—Sir James pressed his motion by observing, that he knew nothing whatever of the individual, but merely regarded him as the victim of severity.



Mr. PETER MOORE seconded the motion, which being opposed by Mr. Secretary RYDER, it was negatived without a division.

SLAVE TRADE.

Mr. BROUGHAM informed the House that notwithstanding its vote for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, that infamous traffic was still carrying on, not only in Spain, Portugal, and America, but even by British Merchants, who had not only purchased Slaves, but also had fitted out vessels from this country for carrying on the traffic.—To put down such proceedings, he had to move an Address to his Majesty, stating that early next Session they would pursue such means as should prevent the daring violation of the laws directed against the Abolition of the African Slave Trade.

After a few remarks, the motion was agreed to *nem. con.*

VOTE OF CREDIT.

Mr. WHITBREAD, seeing that they were on the eve of an Adjournment, he thought the Vote of Credit implied too much confidence in the present Administration. The Session, though a laborious one, had been but short. The case of Jefferies had occupied their attention, but Jefferies, he had heard, was now alive at Beverly in America, working at the trade of a blacksmith. The Exchequer Funding Bill had been carried through with much busting. The only expectation which had been disappointed was that of the dissolution of the present Ministry. The Sidmouth party had gone out on a majority of 31; but the Perceval party, thinking it the post of honour, kept its place upon the narrowest majorities, sometimes indeed in minorities, which proved beyond all question that the Influence of the Crown could support any composition of Ministers against the opinion and confidence of the House of Commons.—Ministers of this sort now came down for a vote of three Millions!! Our domestic situation was full of alarm; the approaching Harvest threatened us with famine, though he hoped our wants could be supplied from abroad, particularly from America. Mr. Whitbread here took a view of the situation of Spain and Portugal. In Spain, as it was now certain that the Spaniards were not true to themselves, he thought it impolitic to grant them further assistance. He wished the British troops were out of a country where such horrid scenes were permitted. Mr. Frere had talked of 700 French prisoners being massacred in cold blood with astonishing indifference; and at Malaga many French prisoners had been starved to death!!—A victory now could only produce barren laurels.—In Europe, every thing was gone; but in South America, if Ministers properly conducted themselves, great and beneficial events might take place. The independence of that country ought to be secured immediately.

Mr. CANNING contended that the vote was necessary for any existing Administration, and as to Spain, he repeated the sentiments of the Marquis Wellesley on the policy of continuing the war.—Mr. W. SMITH opposed it; but the Bill was passed.

The Admiralty Registrar's Bill, and the Salaries Account Bill, were then passed; the Canal Robbery Bill was thrown out, and the House adjourned to Wednesday next.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTCY ENLARGED.

J. F. Veichtner, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street, merchant, from June 16 to August 4, at ten, at Guildhall.

BANKRUPTS.

T. Wells and G. O. Take, Bankside, Southwark, timber-merchants.
W. Bowler, sen. Castle-street, Southwark, hat-manufacturer.
C. Say, Falmouth, biscuit-baker.
T. Bainbridge, Manchester, muslin manufacturer.
J. Symton, Ross, Herefordshire, innholder.
T. Richardson, Waterside, Yorkshire, dyer.
W. Oakley, and Co. Southwark, woolstaplers.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTCY ENLARGED.

R. Newman, Oxford-street; linen-draper, from June 19 to July 27, at ten, Guildhall.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

W. Weaver and J. Holt, Spring-Gardens, patent musical instrument makers.

BANKRUPTS.

J. Wightman, George-street, Foster-lane, haberdasher.
L. Whittam, Newport-market, potatoe-merchant.
C. Farrell, Gosport, Southampton, slopseller.
B. Tabait, Bond-street, bookseller.
W. Whittingham, Lynn, Norfolk, printer.
W. Pownall, Bristol, dealer and chapman.
T. Dougan, Bread-street, warehouseman.
E. Routledge, sen. and E. Routledge, jun. Barrocksid, Camberland, drovers.
J. P. Scott, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, grocer.
J. Dutton, Hillsley, Gloucestershire, shopkeeper.
T. Gaithness, New Bond-street, watchmaker.

PRICE OF STOCKS ON SATURDAY.

Cons. for Opening.....71½ | Omnium.....1

An apology is due to the readers for the omission of the present week's POLITICAL EXAMINER respecting Mr. WINDHAM. It grew to such a length under the Editor's pen, that it was found impossible to insert it with proper allowance of room for the late interesting Trial.—It will appear next week.

A SOUTHWARK ELECTOR,—A REFORMIST,—AN INHABITANT OF WESTMINSTER,—&c. &c. shall have place next week.

THE EXAMINER.

LONDON, JUNE 17.

A DEBATE on the State of the Nation took place on Wednesday last in the House of Lords, but produced nothing remarkable either from the Opposition or the Administration. Earl GREY, in a long speech which any body might have written out without hearing him, went over the leading points of accusation against Ministers, and with a consistency peculiar to the modern Whigs, at once praised Reform and abused the Reformists. That he had confessedly lost his own warmth in the cause, was no hindrance to his abuse of those who were still warm. To be sure, he imputed "motives" to none of the Reformists,— "accused no man of bad intentions,"—but then he "disclaimed all intercourse with them," because they were vile and unprincipled men, who sacrificed truth, patriotism, and decency, to a false popularity! Reform he thought should be "gradual, temperate, and judicious;" that is to say, by such petty, inefficient measures, as the Foxites should bring about in the House of Commons;—but alas! the Foxites can do nothing, and the Ministers, as the House is constituted, can do what they please. The Opposition are in a terrible strait between the Ministers and the Reformists. In order to annoy the former, they are inclined to make matters appear as corrupt as possible, and to represent the nation as on the brink of despair; but the recollection of the Reformists comes over them, and turns their vehemence into "moderation," and half their de-

pondency into promise. In such a situation, it is in vain that they talk of the bad motives of the Reformists. Have the Reformists ever been in power and disgraced it? Have they ever approved the sinecures of 20,000l. a year enjoyed by useless courtiers? Have they allowed men to be auditors of their own accounts? My Lord GREY had better go and take another dinner with his friend the Duke of YORK, call for handkerchiefs for two, and weep for the degeneracy of virtue in private.

The reader will peruse with much interest the Trial of Mr. COBBETT, for a "libel" published last July respecting a mutiny that was quelled by the assistance of the German Legion. It was expected that the charge against him would have been for his objections to the *unconstitutional* employment of foreign troops, for by the *Bill of Rights* no foreign troops whatever were to be introduced into this country; but an Act of Parliament has since declared otherwise. This, however, was not the best way of putting the matter, and therefore Mr. COBBETT was charged by the Attorney-General "with impugning tyranny, cruelty, and injustice to the Government," and thereby inciting against it the public indignation. Upon this charge he was found guilty. His defence was fluent, and for the most part as spirited as his best manner of writing; but it is a pity that he defended himself on the grounds of having written the article in "haste and passion," and of not having attempted to excite the public indignation against the present system of things. Haste and passion are no excuse for such a strong publication, if the principle of it is wrong; and they are at best unnecessary excuses, if the principal is right. The introduction of foreign corps into this country, though sanctioned by Parliament, is contrary to the *Bill of Rights*, and therefore strictly unconstitutional; and Mr. COBBETT, I think, would have made a more politic, more consistent, and more noble defence, had he frankly and fearlessly acknowledged that his object was to excite the public indignation against the present system of things,—not for purposes of rebellion,—but that the country might grow more and more ardent in the great cause of Reform. A man in such a situation, especially with Mr. COBBETT's powers, ought to have but one glorious and absorbing consideration before him—the love of truth.

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF KENT.

[The following Communication was yesterday forwarded to the *Examiner* for insertion:—]

"Castle Hill Lodge, 16th June, 1810.

"The Duke of KENT having seen a recent publication, entitled *The Rival Princes*, in which he is charged with having sanctioned and encouraged the adoption and prosecution of measures tending to the manifest injury of a brother's honor and interests, it is impossible that he should not feel anxious to counteract immediately the im-

pression which must dwell with the country while such foul and unmerited aspersions remain unnoticed. To remove, therefore, from his character that stigma which would justly attach to it, if it were not in his power to prove that there has not at any time existed the smallest foundation for a charge, at the very idea of which every honest man must recoil with horror and indignation, the Duke of KENT has determined to lay before the public the following declaration which was made and committed to paper by Captain DODD, on the 26th July last, in presence of the Earl of HARRINGTON and Colonel VESEY, and which was delivered to him to be used at his discretion. At that period the Duke was induced to require this declaration, with a view to his own satisfaction, in consequence of various reports and insinuations which had gained circulation; the communication of it was consequently confined to his own family and to some of his friends; and he had flattered himself that it would be unnecessary to make any appeal to the public upon a matter which affected himself exclusively; nor is it without sincere concern that he now finds himself under the necessity of entering thus publicly into a vindication of his conduct. He is however confident that every liberal mind will give him credit for taking a step which he feels to be due to his own character, to the honour and dignity of his family, and which marks his anxiety to stand well in the opinion of the country in general."

QUESTIONS put to Captain Dodd by his Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, and his Answers thereto.—26 July, 1809:—

Q. Have I either directly or indirectly sanctioned, advised, or encouraged, any attack upon the Duke of York to your knowledge?

A. Never.—J. DODD.

Q. Have I had to your knowledge any acquaintance or communication with Colonel WARDLE, or any of the persons concerned in bringing forward the Investigation respecting the Duke of York's conduct which took place in Parliament last winter, either direct or indirect?

A. I feel confident that your Royal Highness has no such knowledge or acquaintance.—J. DODD.

Q. Have I to your knowledge ever had any acquaintance with, or knowledge of, Mrs. CLARKE, or any communication with her, direct or indirect, upon the subject above named, or any other?

A. I am confident your Royal Highness never had.—J. DODD.

Q. Have I ever expressed to you any sentiment which could induce you to believe that I approved of what was brought forward in Parliament against the Duke of York, or to any proceeding that would tend to his obloquy or disgrace?

A. Never: I have heard your Royal Highness lament the business *viva voce*, and you made the same communication to me in writing.—J. DODD.

Q. Have you ever to your recollection expressed yourself either by word or in writing, either to Colonel WARBLE or to Mrs. CLARKE, or to any other person connected with the investigation of the Duke of YORK's conduct, in any way that could give them reason to suppose that I approved of the measures or would countenance those concerned in bringing it forward?

A. Never; but I have on the contrary expressed myself, that your Royal Highness would have a very different feeling.—J. DODD.

Q. What were my expressions upon the subject of the pamphlet which appeared, passing censure on the conduct of the Duke of YORK and others of my family—and holding up my character to praise; and what have been the sentiments which I have uniformly expressed on similar publications, whether in the newspapers or otherwise?

A. I have invariably heard your Royal Highness regret that any person should attempt to do justice to your own character, at the expence of that of the Duke of YORK, or of any other member of your family.—J. DODD.

Q. During the ten years you have been my Private Secretary, when in the most confidential moments I have given vent to my wounded feelings upon professional subjects, did you ever hear me express myself inimical to the Duke of YORK, or that I entertained an expectation of raising myself by his fall?

A. Never: on the contrary, I have frequently heard your Royal Highness express yourself very differently.—J. DODD.

The above Questions, written in Colonel VESSEY's hand, were all dictated by me, EDWARD,
In presence of Lord Harrington.

(Signed) HARRINGTON.
J. A. VESSEY.

Lisbon and Gottenburgh Mails arrived in town yesterday morning.

The *Lisbon Papers* speak, with great and increasing confidence, of the favourable situation of the British and Portuguese armies, and of the declining fortunes of that of the French. The army of Lord WELLINGTON is represented to be abundantly supplied with provisions, and the Portuguese army is stated to be "in such a state of perfection, that there is nothing to fear." The French, on the contrary, "continue to retreat; Gen. MASSENA, after reviewing the army on the frontiers, has reported, that it is impossible to attack the Portuguese with a chance of success without considerable reinforcements." This is very fine—but unluckily not calculated to oblige belief. At any rate, it only holds out a hope that the attack will be deferred,

The Livery of the City of London, Friends of Constitutional Liberty and Reform, who intend to appear in the procession on the day of the liberation of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, will attend in their gowns, at Guildhall, for the purpose of proceeding thence to the Tower. The order of the procession will be immediately next to the Members of the Common Council, who will also appear in their gowns.

The French General SARRAZIN, and his black servant, came out of Boulogne in an open boat early on Monday morning, and were picked up by one of our men of war, and carried into Dover. Gen. SARRAZIN has reached London, accompanied by SHAW the Messenger. He was immediately conveyed to the Foreign Office, and is reported to have had an interview with the Marquis WELLESLEY.—He was second in command at Boulogne, and was formerly second in command to HUBERT, when the French landed at Killala, in the autumn of 1796.—It had been thought by some that he is come with dispatches from the French Government; others suppose him to have been apprehensive of being arrested by BONAPARTE, and to have determined, on that account, to withdraw himself from his power. He was in his uniform when he arrived at Dover, but has since changed that dress for a plain one.

DRONTS OF ADMIRALTY.—From the Account laid before Parliament, it appears that the net proceeds from 1793 amount to the enormous sum of 7,344,990*l.* arising chiefly from Spanish, Danish, and Dutch seizures.—Out of this sum, which the courtiers affirm belongs solely to the King, 3,032,990*l.* have been paid for captures, &c.—2,553,261*l.* have been appropriated to the Public Service;—upwards of 100,000*l.* for *Special Services*, among which are 21,610*l.* to Sir HOME POPEHAM: and 171,300*l.* bestowed in gifts to various branches of the *Royal Family*, as under:—

1805. Oct. 14.	Princess of Wales	£26,000
— — — — —	Duke of Cumberland	15,000
— — — — —	10. Duke of Kent	10,000
— — — — —	Nov. 21. Late Duke of Gloucester	19,500
1806. April 8.	Duke of Kent	10,000
— — — — —	Duke of Cambridge	20,000
— — — — —	Duke of Sussex	20,000
— — — — —	Duke of Cumberland	5,000
— — — — —	Duke of Clarence	20,000
— — — — —	July 14. Duke of Kent	6,000
1809. Jan. 27.	Duke of York	20,000
		————— £171,500

Many thousands are still left, yet the people must be applied to in order to pension off the KING's Sister's Son.—Oh, shame, shame!

The following spirited Notice is now in general circulation in the neighbouring Parish of St. Dunstan's in the West:—

"The Householdors of this Parish are earnestly requested to attend a Meeting, to be held according to Notice from the Church Wardens in the Inquest Room of St. Dunstan's Church, at Twelve o'clock next Monday, the 18th instant, for the purpose of taking into consideration a Declaration, signed by the Rev. R. LLOYD, A. M. Vicar, charging all who differ from him on Political questions "with bold and daring attempts to sow the seeds of dissention throughout the country," and declaring their proceedings "proofs of political frenzy or foul sedition." The recollection of the oldest Inhabitant does not afford a single instance of any former civil dissentions in this Parish, which has been proverbial for harmony, peace, and good-will; and it will be for the Parishioners to decide next Monday, whether the Political interference of their Vicar be conformable to the pure charitable and benevolent principles of a Minister of the Gospel, and of the Servant of him whose Kingdom is not of this World." The attendance of the Parishioners, precisely at Twelve o'clock, is entreated."

There was a Meeting on Wednesday of the Friends to Reform in Southwark, at the Town Hall, when Mr. BOYSEWOOD moved various Resolutions, which stated in substance, "That the imprisonment of J. G. JONES and Sir F. BURDETT, without a Trial by Jury, and the forcible

entry of Sir FRANCIS's house, was a violent exercise of power, contrary to the Great Charter; that the House had proved such prompt imprisonment for libel to be unnecessary, by their prosecuting REEVES in a Court of Law; and that public liberty was only to be secured, and the Constitution preserved, by an effectual Reform.—Mr. HAWKINS opposed the Resolutions, which were supported by Mr. SMITH and Mr. KENNIS, who read a Petition to his Majesty on the same subject, which was agreed to, and ordered to be presented to his Majesty by a deputation of Electors, headed by their Representatives, H. THORNTON, Esq. and Sir THOMAS TURTON.—Mr. ELLIS and Mr. H. THORNTON then addressed the Meeting; the latter Gentleman expressed his approbation of a Reform in Parliament; and gave it as his opinion, that the question of libel, as it respected Sir F. BURGESS, had better been sent to a Jury. However well grounded any particular privilege might be, yet, he said, if it were exercised against the opinions of a majority of the people, it had better be given up.—The Meeting then broke up.

FOUR-IN-HAND CLUB.—One of the Members of this Club met with an accident on Thursday, which may possibly teach them all a little wisdom. Lord HAWKE, in going to the place of rendezvous, ran his curriole against a huckster's cart with such violence, that he was thrown out to the distance of many yards. His shoulder was dislocated, and he received many severe contusions. He was taken up, medical aid procured, and a *Bulletin* shortly afterwards was issued; to the following effect:—"Lord HAWKE is as well as can be expected."—"This distressing intelligence," says the sympathetic *Post*, "flew like wild-fire among the assembled spectators, who felt like Britons, and expressed the utmost sorrow at the accident."—"Notwithstanding this "utmost sorrow," his Lordship's feeling companions set off for Turnham-Green, with all their usual ridiculous parade.—One of the spectators, a dustman and a wag, in going home to St. Giles's, having been thrown from his jack-ass, he immediately posted up a *Bulletin*, to acquaint the numerous and urgent inquirers, that "Patrick O'Quiz, Esq. had just had his wounds dressed, and was as easy as could be expected."

BENTLEY v. JACOB.

At the late Hackney Meeting, Mr. BENTLEY, in exposing the tergiversations and apostacies of public men, informed the Meeting, "that one of their principal opponents in the House was an apostate from that cause which he formerly pretended to defend: that he himself once saw this man, in a public company, draw forth from his pocket a book, which he read, in condemnation of every principle of religion and Christianity; and that he had concluded his reading, by declaring that book *his Creed*,—his Bible!"—He had heard the same man, in a public company, give this toast: "May the last of Kings be buried in the guts of the last of Priests!!!"—"No person," said Mr. BENTLEY, "could ever expect that any man who had thus apostatized from his God and traduced his King, would be true to any good cause. No man could suppose such was the conduct of a *Jacob*, but rather that of an *Esau*!"—To this home thrust, poor Mr. JACOB has replied by public advertisement, that the words attributed to him by Mr. BENTLEY are "utterly false; for I never, to my recollection, was in company with that Gentleman

but once in my life, which was at the Canonbury Tavern."—A very pretty conclusion truly! So because a man has never been but once in another's company, he cannot possibly have uttered the most disgusting sentiments. Really, Mr. JACOB, this will never do: you must try again; you must borrow a little more of the Percevalian cant, before you can be mistaken by any body for any thing but what Mr. BENTLEY so clearly proves you to be.

THEATRICAL EXAMINER.

No. 72.

LYCUM.

It is distressing enough, that just as the venerable CUMBERLAND had exhibited a fresh specimen of his inability to do any thing for the drama, the most promising of our young dramatists should have contradicted the hopes entertained of him, and degenerated at once into the common trash. The new Opera, called *Oh, this Love!* which was produced here on Tuesday, is said to have been written by Mr. KERRY; and to the great sorrow and surprise of every well-wisher to the stage, the silence of that gentleman proves him guilty of as ardent a piece of dullness as ever sent one to sleep.

Though I attended to the piece as well as Mr. KERRY would let me, I can very unaffectedly say, that I find it impossible to make an abstract of the plot, or even to give a tolerable idea of the main incidents. The scene is laid in Milan, and the persons consist principally of *Michael Daub*, a fortune-hunting artist, who, though he could make nothing of his art in England, thinks to do something with it in Italy;—two young gentlemen who are in love with two young ladies, but puzzled I know not how, and coquettish I know not wherefore;—a young girl who follows a faithless lover in male attire;—an Italian *Tony Lumpkin*, called *Signor Leo Luminati*, attended by his fond mother;—and *Hector Tornado*, a Tyrolese gentleman, whose object in life is to fight with every body he meets. What the author intended by this last character, who is at once a bully and a generous spirit, a blusterer and a brave man, it is difficult to conjecture:—if he designed to prove that the shew of courage is not incompatible with the possession of it, he has taken the wrong side of this shew, which should be by a proud, not an obtrusive carriage,—by a certain habitual pomp, half ludicrous and half respectable, such as *FIELDING* has embodied so excellently in the person of his *Majesty Bath*. Of the sentiments of this Opera, I cannot collect a single one at all original, forcible, or new; the songs are too dull even to warrant a specimen of their dullness; and our author, so far from shewing that contempt of verbal trifling which people had better to consider as a mark of his good habits and amiable character, has made the principal equivoque in the piece turn upon the painter, to surprise his mistress, secretly down the sign of the Angel from a house opposite his lodgings and paints it afresh; before it is replaced, ever, a lover in search of his own mistress is informed that the poor artist has secured the lady, and seizes her in consequence, with many violent inquiries after his angel; upon which the affrighted painter produces a regenerated sign. The audience had the good fortune to see this neagre trick; indeed the pit manifested a considerable dislike during the last act; and when the

nounced for a second representation, the actor's voice could not be heard. Mr. DOWTON, in *Hector Tornado*, threw as much humour as possible into the empty bluster of his part: wherever there is any thing of rage, natural or artificial, he is sure to give us some inimitable touches of expression; but it is ever to be lamented, that the very talents which render such actors fit for the most genuine comedy, mark them out as recommendatory vehicles for all sorts of nonsense.—Mr. OXBERRY represented *Signor Leo*, with all proper vacancy of face and helplessness of gesture:—a feeble simpleton is the exact pitch of his powers; and where the character does not require much study, there is a maudlin something in the broad enjoyment of his smile and the antique cut of his visage, which possesses unrivalled imbecility. The music, by Mr. KING, is quite poor enough and old enough for the writing, so that the singers had no opportunity to distinguish themselves. Mr. PHILLIPS exhibits the same style as he did last year, sometimes elegant, always playful, but a little too obtrusive. Mr. HORN does not improve either in power or expression, and as his novelty wears off, his mediocrity becomes more apparent. The curiosity of the evening was the appearance of Miss GRIGLIETTI from the Opera. The part allotted to her was sufficiently insipid to favour a want of exertion, and her manner was both indolent and timid, except when she was singing, and then she gave us all the pomp and affected emphasis of her Italian stage. Timidity in a female performer is what, I confess, I am not yet critic enough to wish altogether absent, but it is not so easy to tolerate indolence and that kind of inattention to dialogue which your fine singers are apt to indulge or to affect from their exclusive regard to the music. At the Opera Miss GRIGLIETTI's acting was of course overlooked and her powers may not have been very effective, but on a little stage like that of the Lyceum, some acting is very requisite, and the audience would be content with less powers of singing, or rather with less shew of them. The Italian gesture and expression may be very well in Italians, whose climate renders them more impassioned than ourselves, and whose want of sincerity compels them to make a greater protestation of it; but this style will always contain something very ridiculous to the judgment and feelings of Englishmen.

†

FINE ARTS.

ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION.

In the course of my remarks on works of Art, I feel much mortified that the various topics of a Weekly Paper necessarily confine me to a cursory review, and especially to-day, when at the close of the Exhibition I am allowed a space in the *Examiner* which will contain little more than the names of the many excellent landscape and fancy pieces which I have not yet noticed.

Mr. LOUTHERBOURG's landscapes always display the vigorous hand of a master in the beauty and grandeur of the objects which he selects, in the pencilling and general composition; but his colouring, though clear, has an abruptness, a want of a more general diffusion of different hues, which are kept too distinct from each other, so as to produce a harsh and unnatural, though brilliant effect. Mr. WARD's *Cattle in a Storm*, No. 11, from its strong,

master light and rich colour in the centre, gradating into the surrounding shadowy gloom, has a powerful effect. The pencilling and forms are peculiarly vigorous: indeed, he carries this excellence to an excess, which borders on rigidity of manner, and is a departure from the unassuming energy of nature. All his animal pieces have great merit. His *Landscape and Figures*, No. 108, is a good imitation of the touch, tone of colour, disposition of object, and general effect, of some of RUBENS's pieces. Mr. WARD should attend to RUBENS less and to Nature more. His pictorial powers are sufficiently strong without leaning on those of others.—Mr. T. DANIELL's *Mausoleum of the Emperor Shere Shaw, at Sassarem*, and his *Fort of Gingee, in the Carnatic*, present his usual magnificence and tastefulness of composition, and East Indian truth of object.—There is much spirit in Mr. R. B. HOPNER's sea-pieces. His dark grey tone of colour is well managed, but I think it a less pleasing style than any other, as it presents a cold monotony.—160, *View of London from Greenwich Park*, G. ARNOLD, presents one of the noblest scenes in the world, with tastefulness of pencilling, richness of colour, breadth and power of effect.—16, *Distant View of the Islands of Cape Townsend*, W. WESTALL, presents a bright effect of sunshine across an island-studded sea.—Mr. PETER's Moon-light pieces shine with the mild effulgence and soothing solemnity of the lunar season; but his other canvass will not bear the light of day.—96, *Fishermen waiting the return of the ferry-boat*, J. LINNELL, is a delicate, grey toned, cabinet piece. A dog in it is beautifully drawn and pencilled.—It is gratifying to see Miss GOULDSMITH associating with kindred excellence this year, in the large room. She was placed last year outside its door, while a crowd of her inferiors were within, just like a handsome and highly intelligent gentleman in waiting, who, from the vestibule, ushers one in to a titled booby, "a tenth transmitter of a foolish face." Her *Fisherman's Cottage*, 55, is forcible without violence, delicate without tameness, rich without gaudiness, elegant without affectation. Her style is so accordant to the truth of Nature, that though one or two of our best painters possess perhaps more genius, not one of them has so little of what is denominated manner. An unaffected simplicity shines in her delicate pencilling, her deep-toned foregrounds, her light, aerial distances, her silver tinted skies, I say perhaps more genius, because she is at present so youthful that many years must elapse before we can decide on the maturity of her powers. Her colouring is clear, and its various hues so tastefully intermixed and balanced, that there is none of that disagreeable predominance of a particular colour, so common to most landscape painters. The foliage of her trees is variously elegant and tasteful. Her choice of subject is the amenity of rural nature.—Mr. B. BARKER's grey toned landscapes have his usual freedom of pencil, but, surrounded by vivid colours, they have a very cold effect in the Exhibition.—74, *A Landscape*, J. CONSTABLE, is a chaste, silver toned picture. It presents a singular but pleasing view of water flowing between two trees in the middle of the canvass.—In a transparently coloured *View on the Thames, evening*, Mr. BATE has exhibited the gorgeous effect of a declining sun.—There is much character in 194, *Fortune-telling*, A. J. OLIVER, A. but the colouring is dingy.

94, *The Toilet*, A. CHALON, is a rich, warmly coloured, and very characteristic representation of a lady contem-

plating her appearance in a glass with the satisfaction of conscious beauty, with her lover behind her chair, equally pleased.—104, *The Bunch of Keys*, M. W. SHARP, most naturally depicts the endeavour of Papa and Mama to soothe a weeping and bawling darling in arms. The father has just taken the little virago into his arms, and is chirping with pouted lips, while the mother is equally earnest to restore quiet by the jingling charm of a bunch of keys. The air of the figures is admirably characteristic of genteel life; the pencilling and finishing are firm and neat, the drawing spirited, and the piece altogether places Mr. SHARP on a very advanced station in the class of genteel domestic life.—Mr. HOWARD'S *Girl picking up shells on the coast*, proves that he can conceive such subjects with as true an infantine simplicity, as he does poetic ones with suitable elevation and delicacy. On her knees, she smiles with wonder while she listens to the stormy sound of the shell which she holds to her ear.—302, *Boys bathing*, J. J. CUALON. There is a Claude-like elegance in this landscape, with a yellowish suffusion of colour, depictive of the heat of summer, and appropriate to the action of the boys.—406, *View on the Thames*, 407, *Cottages*, and 422, *View from nature*, display Mrs. C. LONG'S superior talent in water-colour drawing; a talent most uncommon in an amateur, and worthy of a first rate professor. The general tone of colour is an intermixture of warm and silvery hues. There is an unusual vivacity and transparency of colour, neatness, and decision of form. Few male Artists exhibit such firmness of hand, none more taste and judgment in the distribution of her lights and shades, and the disposition of the component parts. These pieces are gems in Art, for they literally sparkle with the lustre of diamonds.—397, *The Environs of an ancient City*, J. P. GANDY, exhibit a beautiful and magnificent collection of antique structures, in a rich tone of colour, and a suitable solemnity of light and shade.—Mr. CRANMER'S *Crossing the Brook* has much vigour in the forms, and clearness of colour, but the latter is a little too green.—214, *Scene on the Paddington Canal*, Miss REINAGLE, is clear and forcible. With a few more good landscapes, there is much trash.

The portraits are numerous and excellent by Sir W. BEECKEY, DEVIS, LAWRENCE, NORTHCOTE, OWEN, PHILLIPS, and THOMSON. I think I must add SHEE.—With the portraits I shall finish next week the detail of the pictures, and afterwards endeavour to shew the State of British Art as evinced by this year's Exhibitions.

The friends of Liberty will be pleased to hear, that a large Portrait of the undeviating Patriot, Sir F. BORDETT, is about to be engraved in the first style of excellence, by the very masterly hand of SHARP, from a vigorous painting by NORTHCOTE.

LEWIS SCHIAVONETTI'S FUNERAL.

On Thursday the remains of this Gentleman were deposited in a vault in Paddington Church-yard, with a solemnity worthy of his moral worth, and of his extraordinary and unsurpassed talents in the elegant art of engraving. The chief mourners were his brother N. SCHIAVONETTI, Esq. Dr. BLACK, Rev. Mr. SMITH, — VENDRAMINI, Esq. A. CARDON, Esq. and — PERRY, Esq.—The pall was supported by the President B. WEST, W. SHARP, J. SCOTT, C. WARREN, W. BROMLEY, and E. SCRIVEN, Esqrs. the four latter Gentlemen being the oldest

members of the Chalcographic Society.—The numerous and respectable attendance was indeed a proof of the high and just estimation of his merits; for beside his intimate friends, the venerable President of the Royal Academy, the Royal Academicians TRESHAM and PHILLIPS—the Associates HEATH, FITTLER, and LANDSEER—the Members of the Calcographic Society, J. SCOTT, WARREN, BROMLEY, SCRIVEN, SKELTON, BOND, MIDDIMAN, CHEESMAN, CLINT, WARD, CROMER, Esqrs.; several unprofessional friends to Art attended, to do honour to the remains of a man whose virtues will live in the memory of their hearts, and his works in the respect and admiration of the most tasteful.

R. H.

PARISH MEETINGS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—You have probably heard of the various Meetings that have taken place, and that are still organising, in several Parishes in the Metropolis, to the disgrace of those meddling characters, who are ever on the watch, if they conceive there is a favourable opportunity, to offer incense at the altar of PLUTUS.—As a resident Freeholder in one of those parishes, I have received the inclosed Declaration*, upon which (without any further comment) I have addressed the Rev. Chairman. A CONSTANT READER.

TO THE REV. R. HODGSON,
RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE, HANOVER-SQUARE.

SIR,—If the conduct of the present Administration and the Commons House of Parliament, were not such as to prepare the minds of men for almost every corrupt act within the reach of power, I should feel astonished at your signature to a paper now distributing in the parish of St. George, Hanover-square.

That you, Sir, as a Minister of the Gospel of Christ, (that illustrious patron of humility and beneficence) should so far lose sight of your own rank and character in society, as to become an instrument in the hands of interested and sycophantic individuals, is a circumstance that must be regretted by all honest and independent men.—Is it enough, Sir, that you are solicited to *preside* by a set of men whose very object is *servility*; whose god is *gain*;—arbitrary

* This DECLARATION is not worth insertion. It talks in the usual "loyal" manner of "dangerous principles,"—"factious individuals,"—"glorious Constitution,"—"happy island," &c. &c. If it is the production of the Rector, and he preaches no better than he writes, Heaven help his hearers!—The Parishes in general have not followed this peace-disturbing example; but in two of them, St. James's and St. Dunstan's, similar Declarations are handing about. In the former, the Rev. GERARD ANDREWS has lent his respectable name to the Timeservers; and in the latter, Mr. LLOYD. These reverend Gentlemen have no doubt discovered that "Godliness is great Gain." Of the St. Dunstan's Junta, we know nothing, except that their Declaration is a very silly paper; but the Vestry Politicians of St. James's, are a noisy nuisance, full of the "brief authority" and "insolence of office,"—a low set of purse-proud praters.—Their DECLARATION, in which they have the folly to call the persons who differ with their High Mightinesses in opinion (the great body of the nation) "factious individuals,"—is written in the true trading style, and is thought to be the production of the Great JOHN WILLACK, Esq. Sworn Appraiser and Auctioneer, and Head of the Parish. Head of Confucius! What a solid body that must be, whose head is so empty!—Exam.

Commissioners, insolent Tax-gatherers, Churchwardens, Overseers, &c. &c.—Do you take the voices of these passive creatures of the day to be the sense of the parish? I must beg that you will not deceive yourself: your conduct in this recent instance has exposed you to much severe though just animadversion.—Indeed, Sir, no very favourable idea can be formed of your *understanding*, if you mean to say (which a part of your Declaration states) that *the privileges of the House of Commons are undoubted*.

In this sentence you have committed yourself to an extent that defies explanation. Are not the greatest law authorities which our country can boast, at this instant at issue upon the question?—which question you have had the rashness to pre-*judge*.

If it be possible, retrace your steps and endeavour to discharge those *duties alone* which the nature of your situation requires; for though you may indulge the idea that your conduct will flatter a corrupt Ministry, be assured it will never lead to the possession of a mitre.

You speak of a “desperate faction.” I demand that you explain yourself, and inform those whom you have thus impudently addressed, where this faction is to be found. Do you mean to insinuate that the adherents of Sir Francis Burdett compose that faction?—If so, I answer—the established law of the land is their rallying point; they ask nothing new; they ask only the restoration and free exercise of those laws bequeathed to them by their ancestors.—I remain, yours, with moderate respect,

AN INDEPENDENT HOUSEHOLDER.

St. George, Hanover-square, May 8.

LAW.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

Friday, June 11.

THE KING v. WILLIAM COBBETT AND OTHERS.

This case, which it had been confidently reported had been relinquished by the Government, came on to be tried this day before Lord ELLENBOROUGH, a Special Jury, and an anxious auditory.

THE JURY.

Thomas Rhodes, Hampstead-road.
John Davis, Southampton-place, ditto.
James Ellis, Tottenham-court-road.
John Richards, Bayswater.
Thomas Marham, Baker-street.
Robert Heathcote, High-street, Mary-le-bone.
John Maude, York-place, ditto.
George Baxter, Church-terrace, Pancras.
Thomas Taylor, Red-lion-square.
David Dean, 110, St. John's-street.
William Palmer, Upper-street, Islington.

Wm. West (Tales-man), was about to be sworn; but Mr. COBBETT objected to him, and he was withdrawn without assigning any challenge, on the consent of the Attorney-General.

Henry Faver, a Tales-man, was then sworn, and made up the twelve.—Mr. COBBETT objected to him as being a Foreigner; but declaring himself to be a British born subject, Mr. Cobbett apologized for having been misinformed.

Mr. RICHARDSON stated this to be a Criminal Information against Wm. Cobbett, R. Bagshaw, and J. Budd, for a Libel which appeared in a Publication called *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, on the 1st July, 1809,—and that all the Defendants, except Wm. Cobbett, had suffered judgment to go by default.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir V. GIBBS) stated, that the libel having been published so long ago as July 1809

some reason would be expected for the cause having been so long delayed. Mr. Cobbett living at such a distance, and taking advantage of his just right of deferring his pleadings, the cause was brought forward at the earliest period that the forms of the Court would admit. Threatened with invasion, it was thought proper that a certain portion of the population of England should be trained to arms. In 1798, Lord Castlereagh brought in his Bill by which the Local Militia might be called out for 28 days, though they had only been called out 20 days. When the Cambridgeshire Militia was called out, some disaffected persons in the Isle of Ely caused them to mutiny, and it was found necessary to call in the military in the neighbourhood, when five of the ringleaders were sentenced to receive 500 lashes, part only of which they received. The German Legion who were thus called in, is composed of a body of brave men, who, when Hanover was overrun, quitted their country, and entering into his Majesty's service, have conducted themselves with bravery, and it was no disparagement to the British Army to say, that the German Legion have shared the glory with them. At the battle of Talavera the German Legion took three Standards. No troops had ever conducted themselves in a more quiet, orderly, and sober manner, and he could not find that any complaint had been made against them. Mr. Wardle, in a motion in the House of Commons, had proposed to disband the German Legion, against which Mr. Huskisson offered sufficient reasons. A paragraph soon after appeared in the *Courier*, which he would read—

“The Mutiny amongst the Local Militia which broke out at Ely, was *fortunately* suppressed on Wednesday, by the arrival of four squadrons of the German Legion Cavalry from Bury, under the command of General Auckland. Five of the ringleaders were tried by a Court-Martial, and sentenced to receive 500 lashes each, part of which punishment they received on Wednesday, and a part was remitted. A stoppage for their knapsacks was the ground of complaint that excited this mutinous spirit, which occasioned the men to surround their officers, and demand what they deemed their arrears. The first division of the German Legion halted yesterday at Newmarket on their return to Bury.”—*Courier (ministerial) Newspaper, Saturday, June 24, 1809.*

With this paragraph, as a text to a Sermon, had Mr. Cobbett headed his paper.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL then read the alleged libel:—

“LOCAL MILITIA AND GERMAN LEGION.

“See the motto, English reader! See the motto, and then do pray recollect all that has been said about the way, in which Bonaparte raises his soldiers.—Well done, Lord Castlereagh! This is just what it was thought your plan would produce! Well said, Mr. Huskisson! It really was not without reason that you dwelt, with so much earnestness, upon the great utility of Foreign Troops, whom Mr. Wardle appeared to think of no utility at all. Poor gentleman! he little imagined how a great genius may find useful employment for such troops. He little imagined, that they might be made the means of compelling Englishmen to submit to that sort of discipline, which is so conducive to the producing in them a disposition to defend the country, at the risk of their lives. Let Mr. Wardle look at my motto, and then say, whether the German soldiers are of no use.—*Five Hundred lashes each!*—Aye, that is right! Flog them; flog them; flog them! They deserve it, and a great deal more. They deserve a flogging at every meal-time. ‘Lash them daily, lash them duly.’ What, shall the rascals dare to mutiny, and that too, when the German Legion is so near at hand! Lash them, lash them, lash them! They deserve it. O, yes; they merit a double-tailed cat. Base dogs! What, mutiny for the sake of the price of a knapsack! Lash them! Flog them! Base rascals! Mutiny for the price of a goat's skin; and then, upon the appearance of the German Soldiers, they take a flogging as quietly as so many trunks of trees! I do not know what sort of a place Ely is; but I really should like to know how the inhabitants looked one another in the face, while this scene was exhibiting in their towns. I should like to have been able

to see their faces, and to hear their observations to each other at this time. This occurrence at home will, one would hope, teach the loyal a little caution in speaking of the means which Napoleon employs (or, rather, which they say he employs) in order to get together and discipline his Conscripts. There is scarcely any one of these loyal persons, who has not, at various times, cited the *hand cuffs*, and other means of *force*, said to be used in drawing out the young men of France; there is scarcely one of the loyal, who has not cited these means as a proof, a complete proof, that the people of France hate Napoleon and his Government, assist with reluctance in his wars, and would fain see another revolution. I hope, I say, that the loyal will, hereafter, be more cautious in drawing such conclusions, now that they see, that our 'gallant defenders' not only require physical restraint, in certain cases, but even a little blood drawn from their backs, and that, too, with the aid and assistance of German troops. Yes; I hope the loyal will be a little more upon their guard in drawing conclusions against Napoleon's popularity. At any rate, every time they do, in future, burst out in execrations against the French for suffering themselves to be 'chained together and forced, at the point of the bayonet, to do military duty,' I shall just re-publish the passage, which I have taken for a motto to the present sheet. I have heard of some other pretty little things of the sort; but, I rather choose to take my instance (and a very complete one it is) from a public print, notoriously under the sway of the ministry."

The Jury would observe with how much reproach Mr. Cobbett mentioned the word "loyal." He would not suffer it to be believed that Napoleon would use such means to raise an army. He not only rendered it a vehicle of attack on this country, but as a defence of the Emperor of France; he would not permit the country to believe the tyranny of Bonaparte. So that the author meant to represent that the treatment of Ministers was as tyrannical as the chaining together the conscripts of France. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL charged against him, that he imputed tyranny, cruelty, and injustice, against the Government of the country; that he held out to them that the punishment was undeserved, and held them up to public scorn, for having been base-minded enough to submit to punishment. He had compared this treatment to that of the conscripts by Napoleon. They had mutinied, which rendered it necessary to call in assistance, and they were punished by a regular court-martial; and this he compared to the tyranny of Bonaparte! Against the German Legion, this was as cruel and unjust as unmerited. He held up those who were punished to ridicule, as men who, if they had spirit, would not have submitted, and the German Legion as fit for no other service. It would not have been the part of a loyal subject to animadvert on these foreigners, against whom no demerit could be imputed, except it were that they had preferred the service of their legitimate Monarch to that of Bonaparte. The object of the libel was to give to all men a distaste to that service, into which some must enter, and to persuade people that the tyranny of the measure of the local militia was greater than that of Bonaparte. For these reasons, he felt himself called upon to bring the publication before a Jury. Whatever the author had to allege, he would be patiently heard. He had considered the paper attentively, and could give it no character but that which he had described it to be.

Mr. Thomas Harvey being called to prove the libel, Mr. Cobbett declared himself to be the sole proprietor and author of the paper. He admitted also, that the paper was purchased at Mr. Budd's.—Mr. Lukin being called to prove that there were troops in service called the German Legion, Mr. Cobbett admitted that fact, too.—The libel was then again read, after which

Mr. COBBETT rose to defend himself. He trusted the Jury would not allow themselves to be misled by the hard words and thundering charges of Mr. Attorney-General. In Spain, when an unfortunate person was going to be sacrificed at an *auto-da-fe*, he was marched to the stake in a dress called a *san benito*, on which flames, devils, and other hellish images

were painted, in order that the people might not inquire into the nature of his crime, or feel pity for his sufferings. That he might not suffer in being dressed up this way, he begged the Jury to discard from their minds the far-fetched, forced, and odious constructions put upon his words. Attorney-Generals were not infallible, as a late trial (Mr. Perry's) had fully proved; that person had been charged with even wishing the death of the King, but the Jury had not believed the charge. No man in the world had been more abused and calumniated than himself; and he was ready to state on oath that he believed Ministers were the instigators of those calumnies. The Jury could not have passed through the streets without seeing the walls covered with placards and hand-bills, painting him as one of the most wicked of mankind. One man (Gillray), who had a pension of 200l. from Government (but which Lord Sidmouth took away), had charged him with having received 4000l. from Government to disperse a pamphlet against Reform, but which sum he had converted to his own private uses. This bold falsehood was contradicted by Lord Sidmouth himself, in a letter to him (which Mr. Cobbett read). He had formerly been prosecuted for the publication of a Letter written by a Judge; the Judge was convicted, but not brought up for judgment, and he had now a pension allowed him! On that trial the Attorney-General had charged him with being a libeller in America. It was true, that in America he had attacked the Spanish Ambassador there for encouraging a conspiracy for poisoning the British troops in Quebec. For this, too, he was harassed by seven special juries, and in the end had lost all the property he then possessed, for having exerted himself in the cause of his country. He had been described in caricatures as abominable in private as in public life; but he must say, that in Hampshire he had done all the good in his power; he had protected the poor, and had encouraged the labourers; so much so, that he believed he was more beloved in that county, than any other man of similar means and fortune. When a new military road was to be made, Earl Cavan was referred to him for information, which did not shew that he was the seditious wretch his enemies wished to make him appear.—The charge against him, stripped of all its overwhelming terms, was this, that he had maliciously devised to excite discontent among the people and the army, for the purpose of injuring the country. The Jury must be satisfied, therefore, that he had this criminal intention. The Attorney-General had told them, that he had occasioned the postponement of the trial. This was not the fact. He had no motive for such postponement; for having children just old enough to be alarmed at such an event, and a wife in that state which naturally added to his anxiety, he could have no wish to delay the matter.—Why the trial therefore had been delayed, he could not tell.—The Attorney-General had dwelt much upon his use of the word "loyal," and accused him of employing it as a term of reproach. But the Attorney-General knew that he had not so meant it. He had used it against such men as Hunt, Villiers, and Bowles, who claimed to themselves all the loyalty of the country, and accused all such men as himself, who doubted the infallibility of Ministers, of jacobinism! The Attorney-General knew well that the matter was hyperbolically put, in a hurried strain of irony;—clausily, perhaps, but with no such meaning as that imputed. The whole article was intended as an attack on Lord Castlereagh's Bill. "Well done, Lord Castlereagh," was said, however, not to mean Lord Castlereagh, but the King. Nothing could be more strained and absurd; but it was thought that a Jury would be more likely to think any attack a libel on the King rather than on Lord Castlereagh. He had not mentioned the King. Had the information stated that he meant to excite a dislike to my Lord Castlereagh, it would have been the fact; this was an attack on Lord Castlereagh's pernicious system, not on the Government or Constitution; why therefore did the Attorney-General visit it with such a legal process? Lord Castlereagh, in the House, had lamented, not very decently, that it was difficult to convict for libel. [Here Lord Ellenborough advised Mr. Cobbett to defend himself and not to attack others.] Mr. Cobbett con-

tended that he had not said the Local Militia were treated with cruelty and oppression, but had only deprecated the measure of training that description of force. Neither had he ever said that Bonaparte's Government was no worse than that of this country. The words had no such tendency; they were used to induce certain persons to leave off talking about the enormities of Bonaparte, or to desist from cruel and oppressive practises. If they witnessed cruelty in the military discipline, were they not to speak of it? Because a man had a red coat on his back, was no writer to lift his pen in his defence? This was quite a new doctrine. A poor, ignorant, young country lad, with his frock on his back, might quarrel with his Officers about his marching guinea; but was this to be termed a mutiny? No; it was a squabble, occasioned by Lord Castlereagh's Bill, which made men soldiers enough to disincline them to labour, and left them labourers enough to disincline them to military duty. How came Lord Grenville and Mr. Whitbread, in Parliament, when speaking of the Walcheren expedition, to use such strong language as to the treatment of soldiers? He would read a few extracts—(Here his Lordship interrupted Mr. Cobbett, and said it was not allowable to comment on speeches in Parliament.)—After this second interruption, Mr. Cobbett again continued:—Every species of cruelty, he said, had been ascribed to Ministers in the treatment of the troops sent to Walcheren; and Mr. Whitbread had even said, that the greatest severity, even the generally discontinued practice of picketting, now prevailed in the Duke of Cumberland's regiment. Did Mr. Whitbread intend to excite hatred to the Government?—(Here the Attorney-General interrupted Mr. Cobbett, grounding his objections on the same plea as Lord Ellenborough had done, with which his Lordship concurred.)—This third interruption having taken place, Mr. Cobbett resumed his defence: Had he wished to excite discontent in the army, he should have taken very different methods; he should have distributed placards and villainous hand-bills among them, and not have openly canvassed the question. The *Morning Post*, on a former occasion, when an Expedition was about to sail, had said that the lives and comforts of the men embarked had been wholly disregarded in the transports. For this charge, the late Attorney-General had commenced a prosecution, but his successor had not proceeded in it. He did not blame him for this, as he might have very properly imagined that a writing done in haste, without evil intention, did not merit such severity. The press must be silent, if every figurative expression was thus strained, and meanings never intended thus made out; or if not silent, must only occupy itself in praising men in power. As for the German Legion, he could not agree with the Attorney-General in his eulogy. German troops were always disliked in this country; they were now employed to the amount of 35,000 men, and many of their officers held high rank in this country. Who did not feel indignation that Germans should be employed to lay the lash on the backs of Englishmen? He denied that they behaved well at Talavera. Several officers from Spain had asserted that by their cowardice there they had endangered the existence of a whole brigade of artillery. At Lymington and in the Isle of Wight they had committed every species of brutal excess, and in Saxony the corps of the Duke of Brunswick had acted in a similar manner. He was therefore indignant when such men were brought over to flog our countrymen; they never could feel like Britons: they would always prefer their own country; and in case of invasion, he believed they would join rather than oppose the enemy. They were the Trojan horse, only its belly was filled with Hanoverians instead of Grecians. They were not at all necessary for the defence of the country.—Upon the whole, he trusted he had proved that however incautious he might have been in the construction of his sentences,—and however bad the taste he had exercised in the choice of his words,—they arose from the indignation excited in him by the unnecessary employment of these foreigners, and not from any bad motive. All his prospects in life depended on the tranquillity of the country,—all his prospective advantages,—the success of his publications,—the trees he had planted,—the

ground he possessed,—and could he risk all this, he must indeed be both fool and knave; as well as a beast and traitor, could he do and feel otherwise than he did, which was nothing unworthy of an Englishman. The Jury would make his case their own, and acquit him.

Mr. ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied. He denied that the delay in bringing on the trial rested with the Crown, and he thought the Defendant had better have let judgment go by default, as the other Defendants had done, than have resorted to such a defence. He had given as a reason why he should not be prosecuted, that others had published worse libels than himself—“*Fecerunt alii, et multi, et pajores.*”—A worse libel had indeed been published in the *Morning Post*; but the writer of it was now abroad, and his return was only waited for to renew the prosecution.—The Defendant had complained how much he had been injured and libelled. He (Mr. Attorney-General) was not in the habit of reading the *Political Register*; but he had seen some of them, and he would say, that the Defendant had more sinned than he had been sinned against. He had talked much of his loyalty: at one period his publications might have borne him out in it, but for his present loyalty he must look to his early days. If the Defendant had thought the employment of 35,000 foreign troops dangerous to his country, he had no objection that he should discuss the subject. He should, however, have proposed some better system. But there was not a word of discussion in the article, neither was Lord Castlereagh's name mentioned in it. He would ask the Jury, whether his real object was not to discountenance the plan of the Local Militia, as he would any other that tended to arm the people? A mutiny had been suppressed, and to hold out to the mutineers that they were disgraced by suffering its suppression, could only be to promote discontent among them. His Lordship would tell them, that it was done to disgrace and villify his Majesty's troops. The Defendant, too, had censured the people of Ely for their good conduct. He had said, he only meant to express his indignation that foreigners were called in to flog his countrymen. This was not the fact; they were sent to suppress a mutiny. The writer of such a paper could not be a loyal man; he had called the meeting a mere squabble, when it was quite the reverse; and he was sorry the defendant had been so ill advised as to utter the scandalous calumny against the German Legion, a body of 12,000 men, whose conduct at Talavera could not be produced in proof of their cowardice, as they had in that battle taken three out of four of the standards captured. Their conduct in this country had been generally very correct, although some individuals amongst them might have misconducted themselves. He had no doubt that the Jury, as conscientious men, would find the defendant guilty.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH.—“The Defendant has complained of being libelled and calumniated. If any thing of this nature has reached your ears, you must forget it and consider him as one you never heard of until you were called to decide on the charge left to your decision. The Defendant has contended that he did not consider it a mutiny, but a mere squabble about a marching guinea. It is for you, Gentlemen of the Jury, to consider whether he really had that view. *For my own part, I cannot comprehend that any man could be of opinion that it was not a mutiny, when the privates surrounded their officers and refused to obey their commands. I acknowledge that every subject has a right to decently discuss the expediency of keeping a foreign force in this country. If the Defendant had discussed it soberly, that persons standing in your situation or in mine, which I so unworthily fill, however we might differ in sentiments from it, could say it was a fair, well-collected argument, not hastily entered into or dictated by improper motives,—we should not then have to perform the painful duty which falls to our lot this day. You are to select the intention from the expressions in the publication complained of, and not from the assertions of the individual at the time of peril. It was not a mere casual expression, which might have been made by accident. The Defendant does not attempt to defend himself upon that ground. In the end of his defence he has told you he would not have said so much, if foreign troops had not

been brought to flog the backs of his own countrymen. Such language went to do away with all military discipline, and to break every link of the chain between the officer and the private. Did it go to exhort officers to inflict just punishment?—He would leave it to the Jury to judge whether it was not a reproach to those mutineers for submitting to their punishment, and also to the inhabitants of the Isle of Ely, for having allowed it to be enforced? The defendant has not addressed you to this part of the charge against him; but, sitting in the situation I do, it is my duty to point out to your consideration every part of the case. Is it not a bad moral and political feeling, to stir up an angry sentiment in the sufferer, by comparing the means used to discipline the population of the country to the use of arms, to those used by Napoleon to bring his conscripts into the field? The Defendant, in his defence, has said, he meant, by loyal men, Messrs. Bowles, Hunt, and Villiers? It is for you to decide if such were his intention. It is for you to consider whether the defendant, as he told you, writing with zeal and strength, has not gone over the bounds of moderation, or that it was not his intention to have excited animosity between the different distinctions of his Majesty's land forces? Where I have doubted, I have pointed those doubts out to you, and left them for your decision; but, according to my oath and my conscience, I am bound to declare to you my opinion, which is, that the publication admitted by the Defendant to be sanctioned by him—nay, that, he is the author of it—carries to my mind the certainty of conviction that it is a most seditious libel, tending to the most dangerous purposes, by disuniting the army, on which at this most awful crisis the safety of the country so much depends. Gentlemen, you will consider your verdict."

The Jury deliberated about two minutes, and, without leaving the box, returned a verdict of—*Guilty*.

Mr. COBBETT left the Court as Lord ELLENBOROUGH commenced his Charge.—Westminster-hall was much crowded.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, MAY 25.

[The following case should have appeared in the *Examiner* a fortnight ago, but it then escaped notice, as great pains had been taken to keep it from the public eye:—As Sir RICHARD BRAWLS about liberty, and affects to be a friend to retrenchment and reform, it becomes the peculiar duty of every lover of truth to expose his rotten pretensions, in order that honest men may not be confounded with the vilest of hypocrites and impostors.]

MARTIN AND CO., v. SIR RICHARD PHILLIPS.

This was an action brought by the holders against the defendant, as acceptor of several Bills of Exchange, to the amount of 700l.

The plaintiffs are eminent bankers: the defendant is Sir Richard Phillips, bookseller, late of St. Paul's Church-yard, but now of Bridge-street. It appeared on the statement of the case, and from the evidence, that the Bills of Exchange in question were drawn by Mr. Sullivan, paper-maker and stationer, carrying on business in Cork, but resident, at their date, in London; and that the same were accepted by the defendant, and afterwards indorsed by Mr. Atkins, of Finsbury-square. The bills were dishonoured by Sir R. Phillips, the acceptor; and Sullivan, the drawer, became bankrupt. The plaintiffs, of course, pressed the defendant for payment; but he resisted on the ground that the bills were drawn upon *Irish*, not *English* stamps, and consequently were illegal securities! This fact, evident on the face of the bills, was admitted by the plaintiff; but it was sworn by Mr. Thompson, a clerk of Sir Richard Phillips, that the Knight was present when the bills were drawn in London.

The Lord Chief Justice admitted that the law was with the defendant, while he reprobated the defence as dishonest and dishonourable.—The Counsel for the plaintiffs acquiesced in the doctrine laid down by his Lordship, and consoled themselves for their defeat, as the action had exposed the defendant, and shown him in his true colours.—Verdict for the defendant.

CLERKENWELL SESSIONS.

J. Wharton, Esq. of Grosvenor-square, the Member for Beverley, exhibited on Monday, at Clerkenwell Sessions, articles of the peace against *Rachael Bullock*. The complaint set forth, that the prosecutor was greatly annoyed by the defendant, inasmuch that he became alarmed for his personal safety.—The defendant, when called upon to account for this misconduct, stated, that the prosecutor, after the birth of a child, which she bore to him, and that he has since taken from her, had treated her with neglect and cruelty, and left her to starve. She set forth a great variety of injuries that she had sustained by the prosecutor, and by his means, and that she was totally destitute of friends and relations.—The Court observed, that it was not within their province to take notice of any wrongs of the description of which she complained; she might have redress elsewhere. She was ordered to find bail to keep the peace for one year, herself in 50l. and two sureties in 25l. each.

ACCIDENTS, OFFENCES, &c.

A Coroner's Inquest sat on Monday, at a public-house in Broad-street, Bloomsbury, on the body of Miss Drummond, the daughter of an auctioneer of respectability in the above street. The evidence before the jury was, that the young lady was found dead in a back paved court, immediately under the window of a second floor in which she slept with her head and body shockingly bruised. It appeared that the deceased went to bed at her usual time, and the window was found open in the morning; but whether the act of getting out was accidental, or not, there was no evidence to prove; and the Jury found a verdict that the deceased met her death whilst asleep.

Friday evening, a lad crossing Goswell-street was run over by a cart. He was conveyed to a Surgeon's in the neighbourhood, who was not, or would not be, at home, as they would not permit him to enter the house. He was then conveyed to Mr. Chambers's, grocer, in Goswell-street. A medical gentleman accidentally passing, (Mr. Martin, Surgeon, of Russell-street, Covent-garden,) he very humbly gave every assistance to the poor lad, whose thigh was broken, and he was so much injured in other parts of his body, that it is a doubt if ever he recovers. The Surgeon kindly procured a coach, and had him conveyed to Bartholemew's Hospital. Several gentlemen were present, and saw the transaction. The number of the cart was taken, and it is to be hoped the driver will not go unpunished for his carelessness.

On Thursday, *Joseph Hoult*, a yeoman of the Guard, cut his throat at his apartments in Pimlico. His daughter, a girl of 14, on going into the room, found her father on the floor weltering in his blood. There was no proof that he was deranged. His character was good, and he was in easy circumstances. Mr. Parslow, the surgeon, attended him; and on his telling the Coroner's Jury, that the deceased might have had a sudden attack of brain fever, they brought in their verdict—That the deceased had cut his throat in a sudden fit of delirium.

DEATHS.

On the 27th of March last, at Bagnères (where he had removed from Verdun for the improvement of his health, and had experienced under Mons. Crabère the most humane attention), Mr. John Robertson, prisoner of war, late of his Majesty's ship *Eagle*, and third son of Mr. Robertson, of Welbeck-street, in the 28th year of his age, most sincerely regretted by all who knew him.

On Monday, in Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, Mrs. Holman, wife of Mr. Holman, formerly of Covent Garden Theatre.

On Thursday se'night, the wife of a labouring man, in St. Martin's-lane, Charing-Cross, was delivered of a boy; on Sunday afternoon, of a female child; and on Thursday morning was again delivered of two others. The two former are likely to do well, but the two latter, and their mother, now lay dead.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER'S Office, 15, Beaufort Buildings, Strand.—Price 8d.