ENGLAND.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—May 18.

On the question for hearing Mr. O'Connell being put.

Mr. Secretary Peel observed that the question under the consideration of the House was of material importance as involving the privileges of Parliament. It had been adjourned on the motion of an Hon. Member, because the member for Clare had objected to take the oath of supremacy, and consequently Parliament had hesitated to admit him to take his seat. The real question for their immediate consideration was, whether the member for Clare should be heard at all, and if so, whether he should be heard at the table or at the bar of the House. After having given the subject his best consideration in the short interval between the argument of the debate and now, he had come to the conclusion that it was befitting the dignity of this House to hear the Hon. Member, because the case was a special one, and one which involved a claim upon the construction of an Act of Parliament. It would therefore, be proper to admit the Honourable Member in order that he might state his case. The question then came, at what place he should be heard. He was quite satisfied that it would not be fitting to hear him at the table. It would not be necessary to enter into the whole of the precedents upon the subject further than to state that they were limited to the cases of Lord Fanshaw, Sir Henry Monson, and Cholmondely, who were members of the convention parliament; of Mr. Archdale, who was a quaker; and of Mr. Wilkes, who had been brought up to the bar of the House in custody. On the 1st of March, 1689, an Act passed providing that the oaths of supremacy and allegiance should be taken by the members; about 400 members took the oaths on the 22d, and when the three members in question came up to the table, the oaths were tendered for their acceptance, but they declined to take them, and consequently were ordered to withdraw. Mr. O'Connell had also declined when he was at the table, and consequently he was ordered to withdraw. From the tendency of all these precedents, the question might be determined by the plain dictates of common sense. Assuming, therefore, that the oath of supremacy ought to be taken before the Hon. Member took his seat, and before he put in his claim to be heard, he, upon failure of compliance, could not be allowed to be present at the discussions, and if he had any arguments to address to the House, these arguments must be delivered at the bar. He concluded with moving, that the Member for Clare, Daniel O'Connell, Esq. be heard at the bar by himself, his counsel, or agents, to urge his claim to sit and vote in the House of Commons, without taking the oath of supremacy.

The question was then put and carried. Mr. O'Connell was called in, and appeared at the bar, and the Speaker informed him of the resolution of the House, as follows—"Mr. O'Connell, the House has resolved that you shall be heard at the Bar, either by yourself, your Counsel or Agent, in respect of your claim to sit and vote in Parliament, without taking the oath of Supremacy."

Mr. O'Connell then addressed the House. He observed that he was very ignorant of the forms of the House, and therefore would require their kind indulgence while he stated his reasons in support of the claim which he had made to sit and vote without taking the oath of supremacy. He was ready to take the oath of allegiance, which had been provided by a recent statute, and it was his earnest desire to have that oath administered to him. If the House was of opinion he ought to be permitted to take the new oath, and he was allowed to take the qualification, he would sit and vote at his own hazard. His right to sit and vote was undoubted; for he had been duly elected and had been duly returned by the proper officer; he had been elected by a great majority of the legal voters of the county of Clare. The return had been questioned, and had been examined into before a committee of this House, who had unanimously decided that he had been duly elected. He had therefore as much right to sit and vote by the Constitution of the Realm as any of the Noble or Hon. Gentlemen who composed the House, who were the representatives of the people. He was legally and constitutionally one of the representatives. The question, however, had arisen, whether that right could be controlled by the statute law. What was the fact? Up to the reign of Elizabeth, no such oath as is prescribed by the statute in question was in existence, nor up to the time of Charles the Second was such an oath taken within the realm. It was not until the disastrous times of that reign that such an oath was presented within the House. The statute of Charles the Second provided the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, with a declaration together, and it went on to provide a remedy against any individuals who neglected or refused to take the oaths. The tests were of an extensive, he had almost said an awful nature. They were intended to preserve the King's personal government from the influence, or rather the dangers, which were then apprehended from papists. He was one of those persons called papists, and he shrunk from the obligations imposed by the statute in question. It was in vain, therefore, for the people to elect him for any county, if the law provided against his taking his seat. But he found upon reference to the statutes, that an alteration had been made in them at the time of the legislative union with Ireland. By the Union statute a discretion had been given with respect to oaths, they were prescribed, but no pains or penalties followed upon the non-observance of them. He therefore claimed to take his seat, and to vote under that statute, and secondly he claimed to sit and vote under the Relief Bill, in which no declaration was to be found; thirdly, he claimed to sit and vote without taking the oath of supremacy; and, fourthly, he claimed to sit and vote without being subjected to other tests than what are provided by the Relief Bill. The Union Act certainly directed oaths to be taken, but it enacted no penalties nor pains upon refusal to take them. He would put it to the House in their judicial character how they would deal with the public at large—and he was one of that public—one of the representatives of the people—if they were to be rendered ineligible, merely because they could not conscientiously take certain oaths. Would they desire the people to believe that the members were careless of the obligation of an oath? Did they refuse to admit a member when duly elected by the people, because he conscientiously abstained from subscribing to certain oaths? Were the people to go unrepresented? It was a bad principle—it was a bad precedent in law. He wished rather that the assembly should stand firmly as Christians and gentlemen. The next point which he had to urge in support of his claim was the Relief Bill—a bill which removed the obligations of the Union Act, and which completely abrogated the other statutes which were made for a particular period. He must contend that the period had arrived when the directions which they enforced were at an end. He would take up the present statutes, and show the fact to be so, for they expressly stated that such and such tests were to be taken "until the house otherwise provided." Now, the Act was not made for Catholics alone, nor for dissenters, nor for protestants, but for the whole body of the King's subjects; the documents therefore tendered to him were different from those tendered previous to the 13th of April; on one side there were oaths for Protestants, on the other oaths for Catholics; he claimed the benefit of that; but supposing the House were not satisfied with the reasons he had alleged, then he would call upon them to decide on his case according to the proper interpretation of the provision of the Relief Bill; that bill opened the doors of Parliament wide, both to the Catholics and Protestants, and would they destroy the social bond which it was calculated to cement? In the second section of the statute in question, provision was made for the Roman Catholic Peers to sit and vote; now Lord Kinmare, and Lord French were created peers subsequent to the statutes of Charles, and the Act admits them to the right of sitting and voting in Parliament. If, as peers created subsequent to that time, they were entitled, he had the right of contending that the people were equally potential, and if they returned a Member to this House, he was entitled to take his seat and vote upon the same principle. But it had been said that Members were only entitled to their seats who were returned after the passing of the Act. That might be so; but if he was not affirmatively included in the Act he was not negatively so. He would put it to the House as a lawyer, to determine whether that really was the construction they would put upon the Act. Now, he would suppose they were deciding upon the construction of a will, in which certain children were not named, but in which it was intended that all the children should equally participate, would they not decide in favour of the intentions of the testator? If they did so decide, let them see whether the framers of the Act in question did not intend that all the children of the same religious persuasion should share and share alike. If the second section of the Act did not aid his claim, neither did it injure it. But what did the tenth section provide? It provided that "Roman Catholics might hold any civil or military offices, places of trust and profit, and exercise any other franchise or civil right, on taking the oath herein specified instead of the oaths formerly prescribed, &c." Here then were no technicalities apparent, and he would stand on that alone. Mr. O'Connell went on to argue, that from the general wording of the Act, he was entitled to take his seat, because it expressly provided, after noticing several exceptions, that Roman Catholics should be entitled to hold every civil right, &c. Now he contended that his return for Clare was a civil right, which he was entitled to by the provisions of the bill. Judge Blackstone had defined one of the civil rights of the subject to be, sitting and voting in Parliament. He referred to Dr. Johnson, upon the definition of the word right, and contended, from his authority, that it meant in effect, political privilege. He had conformed to the 23d section of the Act; he had taken the oath, produced the certificate of the test, and he asked, respectfully, what more was required? Why make an act of outlawry against a single individual? Why except him? The Act previously said "such restraints and disabilities," (provided against the former Act), "shall be from henceforth discontinued." Why, then, were they not discontinued? Why alone, pointed at him? Was the Act of Charles the Second in force? If it was not, as indeed it was not, what was to become of him—they could not turn him out—nor would they let him in. [A laugh.] The Act of Union did not continue the penalties. The declaration Act was the most important of the statutes, because that prohibited Papists from sitting in Parliament—but that Act had been abolished. Did they mean then, the penalty was to remain? He did not want them to leave their privileges to be decided by any other tribunal, but if they had a doubt on the subject, they should give him the benefit of it, and let it be decided by a court of law. It would be competent for any person to sue him for the fine to which those were subject who should not comply with the provisions of the Act, and if it should be decided against him, his seat should be then of course vacated. Were it not that those who sent him to that House were concerned in the result, he would return home without attempting to take his seat, but seeing that his electors were anxious that he should make the attempt, he felt bound to adopt the course. The Act was intended as a healing measure. He would ask the House, if they should now refuse to allow him to take his seat, whether they would be acting in accordance with the principle of the bill? He stood on the statute, and rested his right on it. The Hon. Gent. retired, amidst cheers from both sides of the House.—After a pause of a few minutes.

The Solicitor General contended that the Learned Gent. could not take his seat without subscribing to the oath of supremacy; there were a great many points on which all parties agreed, but there was no doubt that, from the 5th of Elizabeth to the 2d of William and Mary, it was necessary to take the oath of supremacy, in order to sit and vote in that House; but it was contended that that oath was repealed by the 2d of William and Mary. He (the Solicitor-General, maintained that it was not repealed by that statute; and that down to the period of the Union it was in force. It should be allowed that the Parliament, commonly called the Convention Parliament, as much resembled a regular Parliament as possible; but they took no oath, because there was no King then on the throne to whom they should swear allegiance. In consequence of no oath having been taken, they passed an Act, in the first year of William and Mary, imposing the necessity of taking a certain oath previous to sitting or voting in the House. Now as the statute of Elizabeth required the oath of supremacy to be taken before the Lord Steward, before a member should enter the House, it was evidently left untouched by the 1st of William and Mary, which applied solely to voting, or taking a seat. From that period down to the present time, the oath of supremacy had been taken by all members, before the Lord Steward, without having been objected to, and it was not likely, if it could be dispensed with, but that it would have been taken advantage of before this. The Learned Member then called the attention of the House to the Act of Union with Ireland (on which the Hon. Member for Clare relied so much,) and contended that by the eighth section of that Act, it was rendered imperative for representatives of Parliament for Ireland to take the same oath which English representatives were bound to take: and down to the present period no person had objected to take such oaths. Since the Union the House had, in 1805 and 1812, corroborated the oath imposed by the act of the Union. Here were two solemn recognitions of the necessity of taking such oaths. He would next call the attention of the House to the Roman Catholic Relief bill, and ask was it not the intention of the legislature, in passing that Act, that it should not apply to members elected previous to the passing thereof. He looked on it as extremely just, that no person previously elected should reap the benefit of it, because the Disfranchisement bill which accompanied that Act, disqualified 40s. freeholders from voting at elections. Now if the Honourable Member for Clare should take his seat, it would give these freeholders the benefit of their votes after they had been disfranchised. With respect to the tenth section, he asked the House if the word 'civil rights,' could include a seat in that House, since that particular circumstance had been previously provided for? To elicit the meaning of an Act of Parliament the whole of it should be taken together, and he put it to the sense of the House, if taking the whole Act together, the Member for Clare was not excluded? The Hon. Gent. was out of court by his own showing, for looking at the 10th section, it says:—"It shall be lawful to exercise any civil right, &c. by taking the oath *hereinafter* mentioned." Now, the Hon. Gent. did not take that oath. It was absurd to imagine that the word civil rights, comprehended a seat in that House; if it did it would be competent for any person to go before a magistrate and take that oath, and then claim a seat in this House. Looking at the whole Act, he was of opinion, that it was not lawful for Mr. O'Connell to take his seat without taking the oath of supremacy, he would therefore move, "That it is the opinion of this House, that Mr. O'Connell, having been returned a member of Parliament before the passing of the late Act, was not entitled to sit or vote in this House without taking the oath of supremacy."

An interesting debate then ensued—Mr. Secretary Peel, Sir J. Scarlet, and Messrs. Lamb, Ferguson, M. Fitzgerald, Batley, Brougham, Sugden, Wynn, and Doherty, severally addressed the Chair—when the question was loudly called for, and the House divided

For the motion	190
Against it	116
Majority for the Solicitor General's motion	74

Mr. Peel afterwards moved, "That Mr. O'Connell be ordered to attend the House to-morrow at 3 o'clock, and that the Speaker do communicate to him the resolutions of the House, and ask whether he still refused to take the Oath of Supremacy."—The Question was put and carried.

Tuesday, May 19.

Mr. O'Connell.—The Order of the Day for the attendance of this Gentleman having been read, the Solicitor General, in reply to a question from Mr. S. Rice, said, that in the event of Mr. O'Connell refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy, he should move that the Speaker be directed to issue his warrant for a new writ for the Election of a Member for the County of Clare.—Mr. S. Rice said, in that case he should move, as an amendment, for leave to bring in a Bill to alter or dispense with the Oath, so that Mr. O'Connell might take his seat without a new Election.—Mr. O'Connell was then called in; he advanced to the Bar, and the Speaker addressed him in the following words:—"Mr. O'Connell, I am directed by the House to communicate to you two Resolutions to which the House came in the debate of last night. The first is, 'That it is the opinion of this House that Mr. O'Connell having been returned a Member of this House before the commencement of the Act passed in this Session of Parliament for the Relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects, is not entitled to sit or vote in this House unless he first take the Oath of Supremacy?' The next Resolution I have to communicate to you is, 'That Mr. O'Connell do attend the House this day; and that Mr. Speaker do then communicate to him the said Resolution, and ask him whether he will take the Oath of Supremacy?' In obedience to the last Resolution, I ask you whether you will take the Oath of Supremacy?"—Mr. O'Connell—"I wish to see that Oath."—The Clerk handed the Oath to Mr. O'Connell.

Mr. O'Connell (after a short pause) said, "I see in this Oath one assertion as to a matter of fact, which I know is not true, and see in it another assertion as to matter of opinion which I believe is not true: I therefore refuse to take this Oath."—The Speaker—"You may withdraw."—Mr. O'Connell withdrew.—The Solicitor General then made the Motion of which he had given notice, as above detailed, *i. e.* that a new writ be issued for Clare.—Mr. C. W. Wynn said, that he thought the House could not conveniently adopt the course suggested by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman's Motion. Before any election could take place, a notice to that effect must be inserted in the Dublin Gazette, and no writ could issue until forty days after the publication of each notice. Now, he contended, there was no notice at all, as forty days had not yet elapsed since the passing of the new Act. A long and uninteresting debate took place on this subject, during which Mr. Portman moved that the question should be postponed until the following Thursday.

The Solicitor-General replied, and the motion, that a new writ should be issued, was put and carried without a division.

London, May 23.—We understand that his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge is about to return to England, and at the express desire of his Majesty, will be appointed to the situation of Commander-in-Chief.

It is rumored in certain circles, and was generally talked of in Parliament last night, that Admiral Malcolm has received instructions to protect all British Merchantmen who may wish to break the Russian blockade of the entrance of the Dardanelles. In fact, it was said, the intelligence of some collision is hourly expected.

A new levy of men was to be made in Russia, in the proportion of 8 out of every 500, which will augment the army in actual service to 100,000 men.

Mr. O'Connell has drawn up an Address to the Freeholders of the County of Clare, announcing his intention of becoming a Candidate for the new vacant seat for that County.

The day at present fixed for the Prorogation of Parliament is 16th of June; but it may possibly be a few days later.

May 19.

The refusal of the Dey of Algiers to accede to the terms offered him by France, is the only article of any importance in the French papers of Saturday and Sunday.

The appointment of M. de Portalis to the Foreign Department, does not seem to have given satisfaction to the liberal party. Yet no objection can be urged against the new Minister on the score of talents or integrity. But the fact is, that the wish of the liberals is not that the Foreign Department should be filled by a member of the present Ministry, but that the whole Ministry shall be changed.

Tranquillity has been restored to those districts which had been the scenes of some disturbance on account of grain.

May 27.

We shall be happy to be able to contradict the statement in the Morning Paper, of the death of Lord William Bentinck, the Governor-General of India, on the 22d of January, after a few days' illness. No such intelligence has been received at the India House, or any other Public Office. But the rumour rests upon an arrival at Havre, with news to the end of January.

The following are extracts from the *Message des Chambres*:

"On the 5th April the Russian squadron was at Poros, to the number of four ships of the line, three frigates, a corvette, and two brigs. It was reported in that island, that Admiral Heyden having considered with the President what place of refuge the squadron should choose in case of war with England, the port of Napoli had been chosen, and that in consequence thirty pieces of cannon (twenty-four pounders) had been placed at the entrance of it. It is added, that the Admiral having since become sensible that it was impossible to escape in that port from the English fleet, had resolved to join his squadron to that which is blockading the Dardanelles, and in case of a declaration of war, immediately to force the passage and proceed into the Black Sea. It was affirmed at Poros, that the junction would very soon be effected.—*Courier de Smyrne, April* 12.

There appears to be a strange desire in some of the French papers to inculcate the expectation of immediate hostilities in the Mediterranean between the British and Russian squadrons. The *Courier de Smyrne*, influenced by Turkish politics, would no doubt rejoice at such an event, but it is with some surprise we see the article copied into a Paris paper, which has a demi-official character.

Accounts from Constantinople, by some German papers received this morning, inform us that the Grand Vizier had received orders to take Sizeboli at any rate.

The Sultan has agreed to an exchange of prisoners with Russia, and has directed that the prisoners shall be treated with proper humanity.

As an encouragement to foreigners to enter his service, he has conferred upon some Officers the Order of the Crescent.

May 28.

We understand that the following arrangements have been settled:

Chief Justice Best retires from the Common Pleas, and is to be created a Peer, by the title of Lord Wynsford, and to be Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords.

Sir N. Tindall succeeds Chief Justice Best, as Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

Sir James Scarlett is, we also understand, to be the new Attorney-General.

The new Solicitor-General is not yet named.

His Majesty entertained a select party at dinner yesterday, at the Palace of St. James's.

The French vessel which is arrived at Bordeaux is Jean Pierre, which left Calcutta on the 30th January, and Suagur the 3d of February, for Bordeaux. Three passengers came by her, who had carefully collected all the information known at Calcutta, as to Lord William's health, on the 30th January; by which it appears that the accounts on the 28th were unfavourable, but that those of the 29th were far better, and that his Lordship, on that day, had sat up six hours.

The Queen of Spain died on the 7th of May. This Princess was of the house of Saxony, and the 3d wife of Ferdinand. She was married in 1819, at which time she was only 16—her husband 35.

PARIS, May 25.—Letters from St. Petersburgh assert that all the reports respecting a blockade of the ports of Asia Minor and that of Alexandria, are without foundation. The Russian Government has not instituted any blockade but that of the Dardanelles. It is added, that it has not even the intention, or at least that it no longer has the intention, of instituting any farther blockade. It is thought that the blockade of the Dardanelles will soon be raised, because it does not at all contribute to the progress of the Russian arms, and continues to be, as it was at the beginning, a cause of irritation between the Cabinet of St. James's and that of St. Petersburgh.

However, these letters pretend that the two Cabinets are more irritated against each other than they were some time ago. Some ascribe this change to the concession made by England, with respect to the frontiers of Greece. Others pretend, and perhaps with better reason, that the Muscovite Gabinet becomes more moderate in its tone, because it feels that nothing is to be gained by breaking with Great-Britain.

The Duke of Wellington has intimated, in a decisive manner, his views respecting the war against Turkey. Our correspondent adds—'It is known at St. Petersburgh, as well as at London, that that great Captain when he has taken a resolution, never recedes. He will defend the liberties of Europe against the projects of Russia, as he defended them against the ambition of Napoleon; he will display the same energy in both causes, and there can be no doubt that he will obtain the same success."

Duchess of Cumberland.—This Princess, and Prince George, are expected to arrive in England as soon as their residence in St. James's Palace can be finished, and fitted for their reception. The Duke and Duchess then intend to take up their permanent residence in this country. The Duke of Cambridge is also expected.

Captain Sir Edward Parry, the celebrated polar navigator, has accepted proposals made to him by the Australian Agricultural Company, and goes out in June, as commissioner of that association, to Port Stephens, about ninety miles northward of Sidney, the capital of New South Wales. Captain Sir Edward Parry receives from the Australian Company £2000 per annum for four years, with a pension of £300 for life, after the expiration of that period of service. Lady Parry, daughter of Sir John Stanley, will accompany her husband to Port Stephens.—*Morn. Paper.*

Sir Sidney Smith, the hero of Acre, yesterday attended his Majesty's Levee. He is not just arrived in this country, as was intimated in a weekly journal; he has been in London for the last three quarters of a year. He is busily engaged in preparing publications for the press; and amongst other matters, it is whispered, "Memoirs of his own Life." Though now advanced in years, he retains all the activity of mind and spirit of enterprise of earlier years; and those who know him intimately speak most flatteringly of the earnestness of his conversational powers.

The Late Levee.—Mr. O'Connell was among the earliest arrivals; and appeared dressed in a court suit of black; he having been presented to his Majesty in Dublin, was not introduced upon the present occasion, but merely made his bow; which was most gracefully and graciously acknowledged by the King.

It has been remarked as one of the signs of the liberality of the age, that the Duke of Norfolk, a Catholic, presented to the King, at the levee, Mr. Montefiore, a Jew. Another Jew, Mr. J. Lyon Goldsmid, was presented by the Marquis of Lansdowne.—*Morn. Herald.*

The Hon. D. Cathcart, Lord Alloway, one of the Scotch Judges, died on Monday.—*May* 2.

Produce of Taxes.—The tax, last year, on bricks and tiles, amounted to £36,000; on hides and skins, to £380,000; on soap, to £1,200,000; on starch, to £80,000; on British spirits, to four millions; on candles, to half a million; on beer, malt, and hops, to about seven millions.

Luke Shea, Esq., of Brittfieldstown (a Roman Catholic gentleman), has been unanimously selected one of the churchwardens for the parish of Tracton, Cork, for the ensuing year.—*Southern Reporter.*

Emigration.—The Rev. Richard Harte, appointed to a living in Canada, with forty-four respectable farmers chiefly from the county of Tipperary, left Limerick in the brig Thetis on Wednesday for Quebec.—*May* 2.

Peremptory Orders.—The carriage of Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington was stopped, in passing through the Horse Guards, by the sentinel, who observed, "I am ordered, your Grace, not to allow any carriage to pass through;" to which the Duke answered, "*Sir, you have done your duty,*" and immediately ordered the coachman to turn back.

Tom Moore.—Moore has printed between three and four hundred pages of his Life of Lord Byron, which is interspersed with original letters and poems, of singular merit—after the manner of Mason's Life of Gray, and Hayley's Life of Cowper. Nearly the whole of the manuscript is in town, and the work, consisting of a thick 4to. volume, will be published during the season. Since the death of his eldest daughter, by which the poet and his amiable wife were deeply affected, they have been residing, for change of scene, at his friend and patron the Marquis of Lansdown's fine mansion at Calne, a few miles from Mr. Moore's cottage at Sloperton.

An example of the great rapidity with which, in any case of emergency, a British man-of-war can be equipped for sea, and which reflects great credit upon the Captain, officers, and crew, was instanced on Friday, in the rigging of His Majesty's ship *Procris*, Sir Charles Paget, Commander. The *Procris* commenced rigging at half past four in the morning; by eight o'clock the lower, top-sail, and top-gallant yards were across, by half past eleven o'clock she was all "a taunt," with her rigging properly placed, turned in, set up, rattled down and deck cleared up. The whole was effected, notwithstanding the circumstance of rather unfavourable weather, heavy rain having fallen from eight to nine o'clock, in seven hours!

The Lincoln Mercury mentions a Mr. Woodthrope, of Boston, as "having acquired the *singular knack* of feeding pigs until they resembled *bullocks* in size!"

The Emperor Nicholas, who is to be crowned King of Poland to-day will afford the only instance of a coronation which the Poles have seen for the last 70 years. It is said that the crown which he will wear at the ceremony has cost 3,000,000 of florins, or nearly £300,000 sterling. It was necessary to incur this expense, as the Crown which encircled the head of the elective Sovereigns of the Polish Commonwealth would not suit the Russian autocrat, and besides had disappeared amid the revolutions to which Poland has been exposed. A story is told, in one of the French papers, of the old Polish diadem being still in existence, having, on the partition of the kingdom, being carried away, and hid by two Monks, who swore never to reveal the secret till their country should recover its ancient splendour and independence.

DISTRESS OF THE COUNTRY.

From Bell's Weekly Messenger, May 23*d.*

The interest of the week is confined wholly to the Parliamentary business. Mr. O'Connell has been refused a seat in the House of Commons, and a new writ has in consequence been issued for the county of Clare. The Game Bill has been read a third time in the House of Lords, and passed, and this, as well as other new laws, will come into operation within a few months. The people will have, therefore, something to learn, and more to obey.

Many of the speakers in Parliament, and writers without, seem to attribute our national distresses to one cause only,—namely, to over-production; and Mr. Tooke, in a late letter to Lord Grenville, insists upon this cause as the greatest public evil. But is there no other source of discontent and difficulty to which many of our grievances may be traced? Are we sure that the blame can be imputed to our manufacturers and wholesale dealers alone? May not something be charged to a tendency of over-legislation?—The working up the raw commodity of paper into statute laws without any stint or limitation. In a word, is not the over-production of Acts of Parliament one of the distempers of the times? And have not too much briskness and activity in that mischievous branch of manufacture produced as many evils, as excess in other trades? Mr. Tooke's observations are so able, that we insert an extract from them:—

"Whence (he says), does the increase of production arise? In the great majority of cases, the increase of production may, unless where it is merely the effect of difference of seasons, be referred to some one or other of the following causes:—extended and improved cultivation; a resort to fresh soils; new sources of supply; cheaper substitutes for more expensive materials; a more skilful application of manual labour; and, above all, the application and progressive improvement of machinery. But an increase of production, from any one or more of these causes, must entail a diminution of profit, if not a positive loss, to the producers, upon that part of the produce which has been previously raised.

"Over production, then, exists only with reference to the producers. Looking to the community at large, it is absurd to use the term in any sense which conveys the meaning of evil. When the prices have fallen to the point which extends the consumption in proportion to the increased supply, profits are restored to their ordinary level; and the ultimate results are, extended means of enjoyment to the community, increased employment to the working classes, and augmented sources of revenue to the State.

"While, however, the main cause of the stagnation of trade may clearly be traced to an increased supply of raw produce (food excepted), beyond the previous rate of consumption, there are circumstances connected with our foreign trade which have contributed to diminish the demand, and thus to add to the depression of manufactures, arising from the increased supply of the raw material. The circumstances to which I allude are,—

"The war in the East of Europe, which excludes us from the accustomed channels of our trade with Turkey and the Black Sea.

"The voilent character of the government of Portugal, and the civil war with South America, have tended to endanger, and consequently to contract, our commercial enterprises with those parts.

"The great fluctuations of the exchange in Brazil, produced by the financial difficulties of the Government, have entailed heavy losses upon the shippers of goods thither, and are calculated, for a time, to diminish the scale of further shipments.

"The American anti-commercial tariff had the effect, in the first instance, of inducing our manufacturers to glut the markets of the United States in anticipation of the measure, and subsequently greatly reducing our exports thither.

"Although no one of these, singly, would be of much importance in the general scale of our trade, yet, collectively, they cannot but be felt as a considerable aggravation to the present commercial stagnation.

"But there is no reason to apprehend that the consumption of those parts of the world will be materially diminished, or will be otherwise than progressive; and indeed, the eventual demand arising from them (excepting the United States, if their government persists in its present self-tormenting commercial policy), will, in all probability, be the greater for the intermediate reduction of their stocks.

"In a period like the present, distinguished by the prevalence of excessive caution or under-trading, there will inevitably be a falling-off in the revenue while such depression lasts."

STATE OF TRADE.

The Stockport Advertiser says:—No fresh instance of the least breach of the peace, we are happy to find, has taken place towards the new hands who have been brought into the town to work; but the private hostility towards them, we are sorry to say, seems little abated, and the feeling is any thing but generous. In particular situations they have been denied by their neighbors even the use of water; the baker has refused to bake their bread—and the shop-keeper also to supply them with the necessaries of life, though the money be tendered to him at the time.

The *Coventry Observer* says:—We are sorry to state that no change for the better has yet taken place in the silk trade, nor is any improvement likely to occur for some weeks. For several days past, considerable sales have been effected, but at prices very much below a scale by which any profit could be realized for the manufacturer. The general policy now seems to be, to clear off the large on hand, previously to giving out fresh work, and we fear this system will of necessity, be acted on for such a length of time as must expose the weavers to severe privations.

State of Manufactures.—We are sorry to say that accounts from various parts of the country state the continuance of the depression under which the trade of the manufacturing districts has for so long a period labored. In that part of Lancashire and Yorkshire where the people mainly depend on the loom, the suffering is more distressing than at any former period. In Manchester and the larger towns the distress is aggravated by the turn-out of the spinners and silk weavers: but in the districts to which we more particularly allude, life is barely sustained, and that too, on a pittance which will eventually produce diseases.—*Liverpool Chronicle, May* 23.

Outrage at Manchester.—We regret to have occasion to notice the scandalous outrages which were yesterday practised, in various instances, for so far as we know, the first time in this town, of cutting out work from the looms of the hand-loom cotton weavers. Although the materials thus damaged are of much less value than those used in the Spitalfields manufacture, the spirit which dictates the destruction of the property is equally atrocious, and must be promptly and decisively checked.—*Manchester Mercury.*

The Earl of Winchilsea.—The withdrawal of this Nobleman's name from the list of Subscribers to the King's College, was the cause of his rencontre with the Duke of Wellington, and the latter event has since caused the noble Earl to withdraw his name from the British Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation. Within a few days the Earl has addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Society, requesting that he may no longer be considered one of its Vice Presidents; assigning as a reason, that after the violation of the laws of God and man, of which he felt he has been guilty in a recent affair, his name was unfit to appear at the head of a religious institution.—*Manchester Advertiser.*

UNITED STATES.

From the New-York Albion, June 27.

Buenos Ayres.—The intelligence from this part of South America is again of a most disastrous complexion. The party from the interior which has taken up arms against Lavalle, the present usurper and murderer of the unfortunate Dorrego, has approached to the very walls of the city, which has no doubt, ere this, surrendered. Several actions took place towards the latter part of April, which generally terminated to the disadvantage of Lavalle's troops. One account states that Lavalle, who was outside of the city, has been cut off. If this be true, his fate may be easily anticipated. The utmost confusion and terror existed in the city, which the dominent party endeavoured to augment by representing that their opponents spared neither age nor sex. This is done with a view of stimulating the citizens and foreigners to defend the place. The English and North American residents refuse to take any part in the dispute, further than to act as patroles for the internal tranquility of the city. A body of Frenchmen however, denominated the "Friends of Order," seemed inclined to take a more active part, which did not meet the approbation of their Consul. The order issued by the Government to enroll all foreigners, including the English, had been withdrawn.

The Cherokees.—The state of Georgia has cut off from the Cherokee Territory, and taken into possession, 1824 square miles, or 1,167,360 acres. The land is said to be generally of good quality, and a part of it remarkably fertile. It is proposed to be laid off into 24 districts of two miles each, of which three Counties will be formed. The Cherokees have long been in quiet possession of this land, and their right to it was never, 'till the accession of General Jackson to the Presidency, even disputed. The new line runs through the estate of John Ross, Chief of the Nation, who was absent from home at the time of the survey. The United States Agent protested, but in vain, against the survey, on the grounds that the evidence taken by Georgia was exparte—Indians not being permitted to give testimony in a Georgia Court of Justice; that the boundary had been definitely settled and run, before the conclusion of the Treaty of the Indian Springs, under which Treaty the State of Georgia claims; and that it is the province of the General Government to run all boundary lines claimed under the Indian Treaties, and not of individual States. From the present General Government, the Indians need not expect redress, for several of the present Cabinet were in favor of enforcing the Mackintosh Treaty, which was surreptitiously obtained by the State of Georgia. The Indians will, no doubt, be driven from their homes into the wilderness. "Some bolt, red with uncommon wrath," will surely be their avenger.—*Boston Palladium.*