



HARBOUR GRACE, Conception Bay, Newfoundland:—Printed and Published by JOHN THOMAS BURTON, at his Office, opposite Messrs. W. DIXON & Co's

### BISHOPS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Mr C. Lushington moved a resolution declaratory "That it is the opinion of the house, that the sitting of the bishops in parliament is unfavourable in its operation to the general interests of the Christian religion in this country, and tends to alienate the affections of the people from the Established church."

Lord J. Russell in opposing the motion said, the change which the hon. member proposes to make in this constitution is of a very essential and prominent nature. It is not like the change which we effected when we passed the reform bill, which was done upon the ground that the house of Commons, which ought to represent the people, did not sufficiently do so, and that it did not perform the functions which it ought to perform, and in consequence of which it became necessary to make it more in accordance with the ancient constitution. Now there was no such claim, there are no such pretensions, in support of the present motion. It is a motion to alter one of the most ancient points in the constitution of these realms, and to resort upon new grounds to a new constitution of parliament. I say, therefore, that to such a change I am averse unless I have the strongest reasons, not vague and undetermined, but strong and well defined reasons, in its support. Now the reasons by which the honourable gentleman sought to advocate his proposal are altogether vague, desultory and unsatisfactory. The Established Church is a distinct part of the constitution of this country. The bishops, by holding seats in parliament, are the acknowledged representatives of that part of our constitution. If they are to be excluded from their seats, I then do not see by what rule we could exclude the other orders of the clergy from seats in the house of Commons. To the proposition of the honourable member I must therefore object, because in a country like this, where political and ecclesiastical duties are so intermingled, I cannot see how, by dint of resolutions, we are to reach the millennium, and have a certain number of persons of the Established Church, ministers of religion—solely and exclusively devoted to religious interests, with their eyes constantly directed to what is above—and another set of persons who shall in like manner confine themselves to political interests.

Mr Ewart observed, that there had not been a single argument adduced on the opposite side of the house against the motion of his honourable friend. It had been, he would say, the custom of the house in reference to this subject to substitute clamour for argument. He had heard those advanced by the noble lord with some degree of surprise. The noble lord had stated, that under Whig governments the bishops had been Whigs, and that under Tory governments they had been Tories. The noble lord had also stated, that the proposed change would not be consistent with the constitution. Did the noble lord recollect that the mitred abbots had been swept away at the period of the reformation, a precedent, which he, (Mr Ewart) looked upon as being as good as some of the changes that had been made by the reform bill would furnish for future legislation? The noble lord had referred in the course of his speech to a right reverend prelate, whose name, however, he would not mention; he had alluded to the bishop of Exeter. Now he (Mr Ewart) conceived that the noble lord partook somewhat of the character of that justly celebrated and most polemical right reverend prelate in thinking that the spiritual lords were *pastores parochiarum, sed non pastores populi*. He (Mr Ewart) was ready to admit that the bishops in the house of Lords adequately represented the higher orders of the clergy, but he denied that they by any means represented the great body of the working clergy of the country. The honourable gentleman, after having referred to the opinions of Lord Faulkland, of Spencer, and of Milton, in support of his view, and which he stated to have been opposed to the continuance of the bishops in the upper house of parliament, observed, in conclu-

sion, that although the house might put a stop to the proposition of his honourable friend, it would still work its way with the people. The current which flowed underneath would change the popular mind in its favour, and by slow but certain operation they would eventually succeed in carrying it through that house.

Mr C. Buller observed, that upon another occasion the noble lord had made a most capital speech upon their side of the question. But at his speech of to-night, he (Mr Buller) confessed his astonishment and regret.—The noble lord had not, in his (Mr Buller's) opinion, adduced a single original argument in defence of his opposition to the present motion. In the first place, he asked how far they meant to go; and then refused his consent to the proposition because there was a dangerous set of gentlemen known as Radicals, who, he apprehended, would desire to go further. It was easy for honourable members opposite to stir over the debate on the present occasion, but there was not one of them who did not know that in ten years hence the minority which would vote for retaining the bishops in the House of Lords would be about as small as that which now voted for their removal.

Sir R. Peel said, that if there was any unpopularity attached to the opposing of this motion he would beg leave to put in his claim for a share of it; for he certainly would not be guilty of acting so base a part as to leave that unpopularity with the noble lord. He feared that he might not serve the interests of the noble lord by complimenting him upon his speech; but he must still say that he had never heard a speech delivered in a more manly way, or one which reflected greater credit on him who had made it; because, if he (the noble lord) had been opposed at an election by 600 clergymen, and if, in the course of his government, he had been opposed by a majority of the bishops, he (Sir R. Peel) would say, that the noble lord had set an example to public men, if, under such circumstances, he had not permitted hostility, met either as a minister or a man, to prevent him, or discourage him, from stating his opinion upon a great constitutional question. There was one objection to this motion which had not been adverted to by the noble lord, and which he, (Sir R. Peel) thought to be entirely decisive. The honourable gentleman who had brought forward the motion asked them to proceed, not by a legislative measure, but by a resolution of the House of Commons, to disqualify a portion of one branch of the legislature from exercising its functions. What right had they to pass such a resolution? What force would it have when they should have passed it? Did they wish to abide the dilemma in which the House of Commons would be placed by passing a resolution, which when passed would be of no effect whatever—would be mere waste paper? He had chiefly risen fairly and openly to assent to the opinions expressed by the noble lord, although he felt, he might not, by so doing, strengthen him with those who were his general supporters; but he could not silently hear it said by an honourable member opposite, that they (the opposition) wished to leave the unpopularity of resisting this motion of the noble lord. Whether popular or unpopular, he cared not; he would give it his most decided opposition, not merely from seeing what would be its immediate consequence if carried, but from considering it as fatal to the civil liberties of the country. (The right honourable baronet resumed his seat amid loud cheering on both sides of the house.)

The house then divided, when the numbers were, for the motion, 92; against it, 197; majority, 105.

(From London papers, March 11-April 3)  
PROTESTANT ADDRESS TO THE KING.

(From the Dublin Evening Mail)

We subjoin, with equal pride and pleasure the address to the King's most excellent

Majesty, of the mayor, commonalty, and citizens of Londonderry, in Common Council assembled. It is an eloquent statement of the condition to which his Majesty's loyal protestant subjects are reduced by the malversations of a cabinet which has forced itself upon his Majesty's councils, and assumes the functions of a government only to betray its duties; and conveys a spirited remonstrance against the continuance of a state of things so prejudicial to his Majesty's rights, and the best interests of this country.

The citizens of Derry have a hereditary claim on the attention of a protestant monarch, and we rejoice to find their appeal couched in the appropriate language of men who can truly say—

"In your Majesty we behold the successor of that glorious monarch, whose conquering arm rescued our liberties from destruction, and engrafed upon the constitution his sword had saved the enduring principles of reformed faith."

The address was presented by his Grace the Duke of Wellington:—

### TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the mayor, commonalty, and citizens of Londonderry in council assembled, humbly tender the assurance of our devoted attachment to your Majesty's sacred person and illustrious house."

"In your Majesty we behold the successor of that glorious monarch, whose conquering arm rescued our liberties from destruction, and engrafed upon the constitution his sword had saved the enduring principles of the reformed faith."

"That faith is no longer menaced, but openly and ferociously assailed—its ministers reviled and persecuted—their families driven to destitution, and their lives demanded an annual sacrifice to the stimulated passions of a fierce and bigoted population. We implore your Majesty's attention to the proceedings of an association, confederated under a vague and shallow pretext, but realizing the most extensive mischief; deluding the ignorant by specious but impracticable schemes—cajoling the weak by professions of moderation—levying contributions to maintain a systematic resistance to the law, and taking to their councils the disciplined agents of spiritual domination, establishing a wide and dangerous organization throughout the kingdom."

"Assembling under the eye of your Majesty's lieutenant, they scruple not to agitate the question of the dismemberment of the empire, and to discuss the necessity of an appeal to arms, if resisted in the accomplishment of their treasonable designs. Delegating mercenary and unscrupulous agitators they contrive to spread their mischievous doctrines throughout the provinces, and profiting by the aid of affiliated and corresponding societies, engender dissensions, and produce dissension in communities hitherto undisturbed by their baleful machinations."

"Intimidation and violence are openly practised, and when they fail to crush the dauntless spirit of our protestant fellow subjects, calumny and vituperation furnish the daily resources of their virulent and untiring enemies."

"No rank, however elevated—no character, however pure—no functions, however sacred, are exempted from this terrific ordeal; supported by a licentious press, they scatter inflammatory addresses among the people, denouncing magistrates, vilifying the judges, and libelling every man who dares to maintain opinions not sanctioned by the judges of the metropolitan jurisdiction."

"We view with alarm the promulgation of doctrines which have already unsettled the foundations of society by degrading the influence of rank and the sacredness of property; holding up to public derision the supremacy of one, and to popular cupidity the attractions of the other."

"We do not hesitate to declare our conviction that to the open encouragement of your Majesty's government those evils are to be ascribed—admitting to their councils, yielding to the suggestions, or terrified by the admonitions, of the leaders of the move-

ment, they pursue a policy fatal to the interests and security of our religion, and fraught with peril to a state acknowledging for a sovereign the defender of the protestant faith."

"We implore your Majesty's most serious attention to the evils we have endeavoured to describe; to give protection and encouragement to your protestant subjects in Ireland, and that your Majesty will be pleased to recommend to parliament the adoption of such measures as may avert the dangers and mitigate, if they cannot allay, the apprehensions wherewith they now beset."

The *Moniteur* contains the following statement on the subject of the disorders at Amiens, noticed yesterday by our Paris correspondent:—Some disturbances have broken out at Amiens. A Royal ordinance granted at the request of the mayor and municipal council of the town, had extended the receipt of the duties paid on entering the town to beyond the suburbs; and on the day that the regulations for the new tariff were carried into effect numerous groups of people assembled, who endeavoured to hinder the execution of the new system, and maltreat the officers employed. The ring-leader of these disturbances, a man of the name of *Dreux*, having been arrested and put into prison, a considerable crowd, composed of the rabble of the suburbs, and several bad characters of the town, assembled towards the evening before the prison, and demanded that the should be set at liberty immediately.

"As soon as the Prefect heard of the riot he required the assistance of the armed force. The 2nd regiment of Cuirassiers immediately turned out; and after several warnings had been given to the crowd, the soldiers advanced at full trot, and the rioters immediately dispersed. Stones were thrown at the Cuirassiers, but no collision whatever took place. The mere display of the armed force was alone sufficient to re-establish order in the town. At the departure of the courier, Amiens was in the state of the most perfect tranquility, and the duties were received without the least resistance on the part of the inhabitants of the suburbs."

This statement, which appeared in the government evening paper, *La Chartre*, late on Saturday night, was by far too meagre an explanation of the rumours which had reigned during the day on the Bourse, to be accepted as satisfactory on the subject, and in consequence the funds continued to drop at the *petite Bourse*, which is carried on at Tortoni's, on the Boulevards, until they got down to 78f. 65c. 80c. The wretched account, which also was published in the evening, respecting Gen. Evans, may have tended to increase the depression of the French securities, as serious consequences are attached to the rout of the Anglo-Spanish army.

The *Moniteur* has adopted, root and branch, a most extraordinary defence of the appanage of the Duke de Nemours, which was printed in the *Journal des Debats* of Saturday.

*La Nouvelle Minerve* contains a plausible scale of appropriation upon which the two millions of francs of secret service money is to be made. Among other items is the following:—"Cost of supplementary police for watching the chateau, 350,000f, or £14,000." A pretty commentary upon six years of Louis Phillipian rule.

M. Sapey, the reporter to the commission for examining the appanage law of the Duke de Nemours, is said to have strenuously resisted an effort to get him to dine at the chateau. The hon. deputy proceeds upon the principle of another refractory *taxe*, and declines the honour of eating with his Majesty until he has cleared up his accounts with the Chamber of Deputies.

A private letter from Naples of the 3d of March, mentions that a slight earthquake was felt in that city on the same morning, which was followed by a storm of uncommon violence. The final revocation of the quarantine was daily expected in the port of Naples. Nothing of any political importance had taken place since our last advices.—*Norm. Herald.*