

HOUSE OF LORDS.

By a London Correspondent of the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser.

A few days after my visit to the house of commons, I received a note from Lord Lansdowne, whose acquaintance I have had the honor and pleasure to make, communicating an order for my admission to the house of lords. I availed myself, with gratitude, of his lordship's good offices, and spent several hours in studying the proceedings of this distinguished branch of the British parliament. Like the commons, this body occupies a neat but not convenient temporary hall, and will do so until the new Parliament house shall be erected.

That the appearance of this body is more imposing and dignified than that of the house of commons, is what you would naturally expect. Not that lords are generally much better looking than other men, which I have certainly found not to be fact. But they are *en masse*, certainly better bred, and more dignified men in their deportment than the members of the house of commons. Association with the most cultivated society in the realm, and aristocracy of feeling, would be certain to render them such.

With the exception of the lord chancellor, who sits as speaker near one end of the hall or chamber, and the bishops, who are (including the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and four Irish bishops,) twenty &c. in number, the members of the house of lords wear no dress which distinguishes them from their fellow subjects. They are generally older in appearance than the members of the house of commons, and their deportment is far more quiet and dignified.

The bishops, in their full official robes, a conspicuous part of which, you know, is their large white surplice, sit together near the chancellor, and on his right; that is always their place, though that side in the house of lords, as well as in the house of commons, is the side which is occupied by the ministers and their supporters. Most certainly the bishops cannot be charged with the sin of supporting the present ministry although they sit on that side of the house.

The chancellor sits on a great cushioned seat covered with damask, which is really a woollack, immediately in front of the throne, which is very little elevated above his seat, and is only a fine chair, shut up in a gilded enclosure, about six feet square, and three or four high. As there is no support for the back to the chancellor's seat, he naturally assumes a very undignified posture while the business of the house goes on. The present chancellor (lately Sir Peppys) is far from being a first rate man in regard to talents.

The leading men in the house of lords, at present, are unquestionably lord Brougham, when he is there, (but now absent through ill health,) lord Lyndhurst, the duke of Wellington, lord Melbourne, lord Lansdowne, earl Ripon, (late lord Goderich, and formerly Mr Robinson,) lord Glenelg (lately Mr Charles Grant) and lord Holland. The last named is, however, so infirm, that he is scarcely able, with his crutches, to get to the house. Lord Lyndhurst is probably the clearest and ablest reasoner, though he is not equal to Brougham in genius, nor is he equal to him in an effective manner of speaking. The duke of Wellington, for plain and forcible argument—for argument which goes directly to the point—is equal to any man in parliament. As to lord Melbourne, he is not, and never was, a first rate man. How long he and his fellow ministers will be able to retain their present posts, it is difficult to say. The king, who is a decided Tory in heart, and always has been, (though he was friendly to the first reform bill,) would be glad to get clear of them all tomorrow, if he could get along without them. But this he cannot at present do. And yet I will venture to say, that if the parliament would only grant a few things which the dissenters still ask, and ask with justice, they would make the overwhelming majority of the people of England conservatives. And then this ministry might,

and perhaps would go out. And years would roll by before there could be such an opposition got up, (on the remaining catholic grievances or any other grievances,) as would put the government into the hands of a whig-radical ministry.

I heard many of the members of the house of lords speak. The earl of Ripon, lord Lyndhurst, lord Lansdowne, lord Mansfield, lord Glenelg, the duke of Buccleugh, (who is quite a young man in appearance,) and several others, speak very well. Lord Melbourne is not a bad speaker. He has considerable force. The bishop of London and the bishop of Exeter, (Dr. Philpotts,) are good speakers, and are heard with attention.

That any change or reform will soon take place in the house of lords, as Mr O'Connell promises his friends, is a most ridiculous idea. That they will ultimately yield to the decided and clearly expressed wishes of a majority of the people, I think is certain. They should certainly yield to nothing else.

One word as to the argument which some of them use in favor of a hereditary house of lords, namely, that the present house of lords is greatly superior in talent, to the house of commons. It is this:—It so happens, that almost every lord of much talent, has been created such by royal prerogative, and not by inheritance—such as Lyndhurst, Brougham, Wellington, Ripon, Glenelg, Melbourne, &c.

AMERICANUS.

GREAT BRITAIN.

[From Boston Papers to the 13th Sept.]

LATE FROM ENGLAND.—London papers to the 5th August, and Liverpool to the 9th, have been received at New York by the packet ship United States.

The session of Parliament it was expected would be closed about the 23d of August.

In the House of Commons on the 5th, the Church Temporalities Bill (Ireland) after a short conversation, was read a third time and passed.

A duel was fought on the 5th August, between the hon. Grantley Berkley, and Dr. Maginn, editor of Fraser's Magazine.

LONDON, Aug. 6.

The remains of the late Mr. N. M. Rothschild reached London by steamboat on Thursday evening, and were deposited in the house of business in the city, where they will remain till the day of interment. Mrs. Rothschild and family arrived by the same conveyance.

The private fortune of Mr. N. M. Rothschild is stated to have been four millions sterling.—His place in London was to be occupied by his brother Charles, who formerly resided at Naples and more recently at Frankfurt.

BRITISH PARLIAMENT.—MEXICO AND TEXAS.—We alluded yesterday to a debate in the British House of Commons, on a motion for an address to the King, praying that measures might be adopted to secure the States of Mexico against any operations that might be in contemplation to establish slavery. This debate is given below from which it will be seen that there is a disposition existing in Parliament which looks a little towards the accomplishment of one third of Mr. Adams' Prophecy, that we were on the eve of three wars.—*Boston Courier*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Aug. 6th.

TEXAS. Mr. P. Hoyt rose to bring forward the motion of which he had given notice. It was on a subject of the utmost importance to the cause of humanity, of immense importance to our colonial possessions, and to our merchants, who had embarked \$70,000,000 in Mexico. If the United States were suffered to wrest Texas from Mexico, would not Cuba and other Mexican possessions, fall a prey to the United States? The war now going on

in Texas, was a war not for independence, but for slavery; and he would contend that should the revolt of Texas be successful, that province would still be bound by the treaty Mexico entered into with this country when Texas formed part of the Mexican dominions, to prevent the carrying on of the Slave trade within its territory. The number of States in the Union had originally been thirteen; they were now increased to twenty-six, and if Texas were added to the Union there could be no doubt that the basis of the connexion would be to establish slavery and the slave trade permanently in that province. He begged to ask the noble lord opposite, Lord Palmerston, if within the last ten days he had not received an application from the Mexican government for the good offices of this country, to remonstrate with the United States against the gross violation of treaties, and the aggressions of their southern states. The hon. Member read extracts from speeches of Mr. Hushisson and John Q. Adams, to show the importance to America, in a commercial point of view, of annexing Texas to its territory.

It is now for this House to consider whether, after the enormous sums expended in abolishing and putting down slavery, it would render the whole of that expenditure useless, and to allow slavery taking deep root in situations with respect to which this country hath both the power and right of interference in suppressing it. But, supposing the independence of Texas to be established, and that it united itself with the United States, let the House consider what considerable commercial advantages the latter would gain over this country. By that junction the United States would be brought within six weeks sail of China. Neither ought the importance of the possession of the mining districts by America to be lost sight of by this country. Those mines were of immense value, one alone having produced not less than \$30,000,000. Unless Mexico was assisted as she ought to be by this country, she would become so weakened as soon to become an easy victim to the ambition of the United States of America. The motion with which he intended to conclude was, for an address to the crown to take such measures as were proper for the fulfilment of the existing treaty, by which this country was bound to co-operate with Mexico. He was of opinion that England ought not only to remonstrate with America, but to have a naval force on the coast to support Mexico against American aggressions.

The honourable member concluded by moving "that an humble address be presented to the crown, praying that his Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct that such measures be taken, as to his Majesty may seem proper, to secure the fulfilment of the existing treaty between this country and Mexico, and to prevent the establishment of slavery, and the traffic in slaves in the province of Texas, in the Mexican territory."

Mr. H. G. Ward seconded the motion which involved a subject upon which he had been long and was deeply interested. The importance of the Province of Texas was but little known in this House or by the country. The Province itself consisted of a large tract of the finest land; it had numerous good, and only two bad ports; and the possession of it would give to the parties obtaining it the full command of the Gulf of Mexico. The Mexican government on its first intercourse with this country, an intercourse of increased, and still increasing commercial importance to this country, had stipulated for the abolition in its territory of the slave trade, and he (Mr. Ward) could state that this stipulation had been most rigidly enforced and observed, and he did not believe that there was now in the Mexican States, except Texas, 20 slaves. To Texas