

GREAT BRITAIN.

[From the Dublin Freeman's Journal.]

THE LORDS'S DECISION.

The Lords teach us the value of moderation! We have been moderate, and we have our reward. How should we have been treated had we insisted upon the full measure of our rights, since, asking the least possible redress of our grievances, we are thus treated? We have fair encouragement to be peaceable and temperate in our future movements? What worse usage have the Lords in store for us, should we turn the submissive request into the fiercer demand, and appear no longer as the mild petitioners for a little relief, but as fierce claimants of complete justice?

Two sessions have passed away; and in all measures and all shapes, justice—mere justice—common justice—has been denied to Ireland. We have asked for nothing unreasonable; we have asked for nothing great; we have asked for nothing unconstitutional; we have asked for nothing violent, nothing revolutionary, nothing preposterous.—We have sought nothing but free institutions; nothing but English institutions; nothing but admission into the pale of British citizenship; nothing but an equal participation in the rights of Englishmen, Scotchmen, Welchmen, the rights of the subjects of the British crown in every other corner of the empire.

England got a corporate reform; Scotland got a corporate reform—we thought it fair that Ireland should have the same benefit—we asked the Commons for it, and they gave it to us freely; we asked the Lords, and they have done more than refuse it—they have refused it with scorn—they have refused it with insult—they have refused it upon the ground that we are Catholics—that we are Irishmen—that we are "aliens in blood," "aliens in language,"—never let the words be forgotten!—"ALIENS IN RELIGION"

People of Ireland! will you endure this treatment? will you tolerate this affront? will you submit to be trodden under foot by the Peers of England—Are you worthy of the rights of Englishmen? Are you worthy of the privileges of Scotchmen? Are you worthy of the liberties of Welchmen? The Lords say that we are not. The Lords who have given free corporations to England, Scotland, and Wales, deny them to Ireland. If you submit to the Lords you acquiesce in the degrading sentence they have passed upon you, you acknowledge that you are unworthy of British institutions, you plead guilty to the false accusations of Lord Lyndhurst; you justify your libellers, you acknowledge that your religion is a crime, you admit your country to be a disqualification; you confess yourselves fit objects for any further contumely or outrage which it may please to offer you, if indeed further outrage or further contumely is within the range of their power.

But you will not submit to the Lords—we are sure you will not—you are too enlightened—too proud—too Irish to submit to them; you are accustomed to injury—you are habituated to grievance—but you are not yet so injured to contumely as to endure the despotism of Lord Lyndhurst.

Lord Lyndhurst embodies and represents the vice of the assembly, of which, as being the most profligate public man in the empire, he is the natural and fit leader. Against that institution you must direct all your energies—upon that institution you must bestow all your efforts. Call upon the Reformers of Great Britain to aid you in remodelling it—insist upon its re-construction—believe us when we tell you that you must walk over the cornet and the mitre to obtain any thing that deserves the name of justice for your country. We

have already stated the alternative—we state it for you again distinctly. The alternative for Ireland is this:—REFORM OF THE LORDS OR REPEAL OF THE UNION.

Irresponsible power is tyranny—hereditary legislation is humbug—nothing but mischief has ever proceeded from the Lords; they are incapable of wisdom or of justice by the very principle of their constitution—by the fundamental laws of their being. To you—to Ireland—they have been especially detrimental and malignant. Hatred of your name—animosity to your liberty—intolerance of your religion—have uniformly governed them in all their Irish legislation. The last is but the crowning insult—the climax of oppression—it is nothing new in their policy—no novelty in their course—it is but the last term of a long increasing series of outrages upon your rights and liberties, your rights of conscience, and your rights of citizenship. They never did you the smallest justice—the smallest justice you will never get at their hands. They protect the church—they protect tithes—they defend the magistracy—they sustain every corruption and every enormity in the country. If we are to remain in legislative union with England, it can only be by their reformation. The constitution contains within it the necessary powers and resources for reforming them. Let us call upon the people of Great Britain to aid us in calling those powers into action. If they prefer the Lords to Ireland, we have no remedy but repeal.

[From the N. Y. Transcript, Aug. 23.]

Late from Europe.—We have received London and Liverpool papers up to the 22d ult., by the arrival from the latter place of the packet-ship Columbus, Capt. Palmer. There is no news of any especial interest from any part of Europe. We subjoin the only paragraphs of intelligence worth extracting:

The bill for the reduction of stamp duties on newspapers, was again under discussion on the 15th of July in committee. A clause allowing 25 per cent. discount on the penny stamp, to the Irish newspapers, was agreed to. The size of the sheet, hable to the penny stamp, was fixed at 1530 superficial inches. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that he had under consideration a plan for securing the copyright of original articles published in newspapers.

Mrs. Norton has, it is said, instituted proceedings against her husband, in the proper tribunal, for a separation.

The wealthy Duke of Somerset, who is upwards of sixty years of age, is about to take a wife in the person of Miss Shaw Stewart, sister of Sir Michael Shaw Stewart, who is less than thirty years of age. The *trousseaux* for the bride, by Madame Devy (the famous *modiste*) will cost £10,000. The settlements are on a magnificent scale.

O'Connell is busily organizing his new "National Association." Spring Rice is going to give it his support in an indirect manner. He has made use, in the House of Commons, of the following words:

"I shall make it a point to visit all the principal towns in Ireland, and I shall then explain to them what we, the Ministers, were endeavouring to do towards the relief of Ireland, and how, and by whom we shall have been disappointed. The people shall have the whole cause before them, and the Lords and the kingdom generally shall then hear the public voice."

In the House of Commons on the 19th, the Bill for regulating the salaries of the clergy was taken up for a third reading, and was vehemently opposed by Mr. Hume, Sir Robert Inglis, and others. Their opposition was so strenuous, that the debate was adjourned to the 22d.

[From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.]

Three days Later.—By the packet ship George Washington, Capt. Holdridge, we have received London papers to July 25th, and Liverpool to the 26th, both inclusive:

The Irish Church Bill, the great Bill of the Session, was read a second time in the House of Lords, on Friday July 22d, and its third reading was then assigned for Monday. There appears to have been a serious dissension in the government ranks as to the provisions which should be insisted on, and the result was extremely doubtful.

The House of Commons, however, disappointed our expectations—not by terminating the debate on the Established Church Bill in a manner different to that we had anticipated, but by cutting the discussion altogether, and, as the phrase is, "making no House." There were but 32 members present at 4 o'clock.

We can, of course, know nothing of the course of this proceeding, so particularly ominous on a Friday night. It is said, however, that there was a "Little go" in the morning at the Foreign Office, at which the Radicals took the Ministers so severely to task, that even Lord J. Russell threatened to resign. Mr. O'Connell appeared in the character of a peace-maker, and dragging his wig about as usual and pulling up his coat-collar, blarneyed away in favour of Government to a degree that made even Mr. Spring Rice declare that he thought Daniel had really earned the subscription that Ministers are making for him. Lord John Russell, however, persisted in adhering to the bill, and a majority of the Radicals persisted in their threats of opposing it.—*Times.*

The following paragraph from the London *Courier* of the 22d, gives some further particulars in regard to the Administration Caucus:

Lord John Russell invited the members of the House of Commons who support the Administration, to a meeting at the Foreign office at one o'clock to-day, to talk over the discussion which will this evening take place in the House of Commons on the Established Church Bill. We are friends to bit by bit reforms, where searching reforms cannot be obtained, and we all know, that at the present moment the House of Lords will not pass any bill relating to the church or church property which is not approved by Sir Robert Peel and the Tory party. The ultra Liberals of the House of Commons, as well as many of the Scotch members, cannot be brought to believe that a third or half of the Archbishop of Canterbury's proposed income of £15,000 a year would not be better bestowed on the working clergy and curates than on his Grace, and will, we understand, decline to give any countenance to the bill. The meeting had not separated when we made enquiry at the Foreign office, a few minutes before three o'clock. We understand that Mr. Hume, Mr. T. Duncombe, Mr. Buller, and other members, intimated their intention to oppose the measure. Lord J. Russell expressed his intention to press it. Mr. O'Connell advocated the necessity of supporting it on account of the imminent danger to Ireland from any appearance of division in the liberal party. The general feeling of the meeting seemed to be to support Lord Russell's views.

LIVERPOOL, July 25.

We regret to say that a very serious difference has arisen between Ministers and some of their warmest friends as to the English Church Bill, but we cannot bring ourselves to believe that any real Reformer will be so insane as to drive Ministers to a resignation, merely because a measure does not go so far as he may desire. Ministers are now committed to the measure past a possibility of retreating, and must carry it or retire; yet we have no apprehension that they will be driven to the latter.