

THE LORDS PROTEST ON THE
REGENCY.

THE order of the day being read for taking into consideration the report from the Committee of the whole House appointed to take into consideration the state of the nation, and the resolutions of the Commons relative to His Majesty's indisposition, and the means of supplying the defect of the personal exercise of the Royal Authority arising therefrom, delivered at a conference on the 23d December instant, which were referred thereto. And the report of the said resolutions being read by the clerk:

Moved to agree with the Commons on the said resolutions,

The question was put thereupon.
Resolved in the affirmative.

Dissentient.

1st. Because we adhere to the ancient principle recognized and declared by the act of the 13th of Charles the Second, that no act or ordinance with the force and virtue of a law can be made by either or both Houses of Parliament, without the King's assent, a principle standing as a bulwark to the people against the two Houses, as the two Houses are their security against the Crown.

2dly. Because this principle is tacitly admitted by the third resolution, while it overthrows the practice by the simulate appearance of the Royal Assent under a commission to pass bills, a commission which would be inconsistent with the provisions of an act of the 33d Henry the Eighth, requiring that every commission shall be signed by His Majesty's hand.—In our present unhappy situation that essential requisite being unattainable, we cannot condescend to give a sanction to a counterfeit representation of the Royal signature, and we dare not assume a power to dispense with the law which makes that signature essential to the validity of a commission to pass bills.

3dly. Because we conceive that the unquestionable rights of the people to fallaciously represented as being upheld by these resolutions, are violently infringed by an unnecessary assumption on the part of the two Houses, of powers beyond those which the nation has assigned them. Invariable practices in all good times, and positive laws established by complete Parliaments, truly and constitutionally representing the nation, have defined those powers. And we cannot but regard with the utmost apprehension any proposal to overstep those boundaries, when the conse-

quence of such usurpation is so fatally marked in the history of our country.

4thly. Because it was confessed in the debate, that the powers of this commission were not to be confined solely to the act of appointing a Regent; to what other purposes they may extend, was not explained. State necessity, the avowed ground of the measure, may serve as the pretext to any diminution of the just prerogative of the Crown, and of the liberties of the people, that best suits the designs of ambition. Fatal experience had shewn to our ancestors the boundless mischief of power thus usurped under plausible appearances: And it is particularly the duty of the House of Peers to check the renewal of a practice to assume the name, without the substance of the Royal Authority, by which this House was once annihilated, the monarchy overthrown, and the liberties of the people subdued.

5thly. Because these dangerous and alarming consequences of the measure adopted would have been obviated by the amendment rejected. It proposed to substitute a measure conformable to the practice of our ancestors at the glorious era of the revolution. They seized not upon public necessity as a convenience for the usurpation of new powers, but proceeded in a plain and explicit form to the revival of the Royal Authority with full efficacy, before they entered upon the exercise of their Legislative functions. Pursuing a similar course, the amendment proposed the immediate nomination of the natural representative of the King, the Heir Apparent of the Crown, to whom alone it was universally admitted the eyes and hearts of all men, during the present unhappy conjuncture, were turned: That with a perfect and efficient legislature, such future provisions might be enacted, as the preservation of the full and undiminished authority of the Crown and the liberties of the people may require.

FREDERICK	HENRY
Northumberland	Ponsonby
Suffolk and Berks	Spencer
Maynard	Norfolk, E. M.
Rawdon	Breadalbane
Audley	Malmesbury
Clifton	Rodney
Chedworth	Selkirk
Went. Fitzwilliam	Portland
Walpole	Hereford
Derby	Cholmondeley
Scarborough	Foley
Portchester	Boyle
Southampton	Lovel and Holland
Hertford	Abergavenny
Falmouth	Teynham
	Bedford