



NEC REGE, NEC POPULO, SED UTROQUE.

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1829.

NO. XLVII.

VOL. X.

ENGLAND

HOUSE OF LORDS.

CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

The Duke of Wellington moved the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to relieve Roman Catholics from certain civil disabilities.

The Order having been read,

The Duke of Wellington said—It is now my duty to move your Lordships to read this Bill a second time, and to explain to your Lordships the grounds on which I recommend this measure to your attention.

I am under the necessity of requesting a larger portion of your time and attention upon this occasion than I have hitherto been in the habit of doing; but I assure you, my Lords, that it is not my intention to take up an instant of your time with respect to myself, or my own conduct in this transaction, any further than to express my regret that I should differ in opinion on this subject from so many of those for whom I entertain the highest respect and regard.

However, my Lords, I must say that I have considered the part which I have taken upon this subject as the performance of a public duty absolutely incumbent upon me; and I must say that no private regard, no respect for the opinion of any Noble Lord, would have induced me to depart from the course which I have considered it my duty to adopt.

I must say likewise this, that, comparing my own opinion with that of others, upon this subject, I have, during the period I have been in office, had opportunities of forming a judgment upon this subject which others have not had; and they will admit that I should not have given the opinion I have given if I was not intimately and firmly persuaded that that opinion was a just one.

My Lords, the point which I shall first bring under your consideration is the state of Ireland. I know that, by some, it has been considered that the state of Ireland has nothing to do with this question—that it is a subject which ought to be left entirely out of our consideration.

My Lords, they tell us that Ireland has been disturbed for the last 30 years—that it is a disturbance we have been accustomed to—and that it does not at all alter the circumstances of the case, as they have hitherto appeared to the House.

My Lords, it is perfectly true that Ireland has been disturbed during the long period we have stated; but, within the last year or two, political circumstances have, in no small degree, occasioned that agitation.

Besides that, my Lords, I must say, although I have no positive legal proof of the fact, that I have every reason to believe that there has been a considerable organization of the people for the purposes of mischief.

(Hear, hear.) My Lords, this organization is, it appears to me, to be proved, not only by the declarations of those who formed and who arranged it, but likewise by the effects which it has produced in the election of Churchwardens throughout the country; in the circumstances attending the election for the County of Clare; in the circumstance that preceded and followed that election, of a gentleman who went at the head of a body of men to the North of Ireland; in the simultaneous proceedings of various bodies of men in the South of Ireland, in Templemore, Killaulea, Cabir, Clonacil, and other places; in the proceedings of another gentleman, of another county; and in the fact of this gentleman from the North of Ireland, in the year 1828, having been elected in all these circumstances it is quite obvious to me that, there was an organization and direction of some superior authority.

This organization has certainly produced a state of society in Ireland which we have not hitherto witnessed, and an aggravation of all the evils which before afflicted that unfortunate country.

My Lords, late in the year a considerable town was attacked in the middle of the night by a body of people who came from the neighbouring mountains—the town of Ork. They attacked it with arms, and were driven from it with arms by the inhabitants of the town.

This is a state of things which I feel your Lordships will admit ought not to exist in a civilized country.

Later in the year still, a similar event occurred in Charleville; and in the course of last autumn the Roman Catholic Association deliberated upon the propriety of adopting, and the means of adopting, the measure of ceasing all dealings between Roman Catholic and Protestants.

Is it possible to believe that supposing these dealings had ceased, that supposing this measure had been carried into execution—as I firmly believe it was in the power of those who deliberated upon it to carry it into execution—is it possible to believe that those who have ceased these dealings would not likewise have ceased to carry into execution the contracts into which they had entered?

Will any man say that people in this situation are not verying towards that state, in which it would be impossible to expect from them that they would be able to perform the duties of Jurymen, or to administer justice between man and man for the protection of the lives and properties of his Majesty's subjects?

My Lords, this is the state of society to which I wished to draw your attention, and for which it is necessary that Parliament should provide a remedy; but, before I proceed to consider what those remedies would be, I wish just to show you what the effect of this state of society was upon the King's prerogative.

My Lords, his Majesty could not create a peer; and the reason he could not create a peer was this. His Majesty's servants could not venture to recommend to him to incur the risks of an election in another part of the country, and the risks which might have attended any accident at the election, which might have occasioned the shedding of blood. Such a disaster must have been productive of

an immediate civil war in the country; but not only was that the case, my Lords, but I confess that I had the strongest objection to another triumph to the Roman Catholic Association.

Then we are told, why don't you carry the law into execution? Why, my Lords, in all that I have stated hitherto there was no resistance to the law.

The Magistrates were terrified, and did nothing; the troops did not happen immediately to be upon the spot, and there was no resistance.

There were no troops except in the case of the procession that went to the North of Ireland. I believe there was no instance of any opposition to the King's troops, and there was no instance in which the law could be carried into execution.

When we hear Noble Lords reproaching the Government for not carrying into execution the law in Ireland, as it was carried into execution in England, the observation shows that they don't understand the state of things in Ireland.

The truth of the matter is, that in England, when the law was carried into execution in the year 1819, a large body of persons assembled for an illegal purpose; they resisted the order of the Magistrates to disperse, and having resisted that order, the Magistrates ordered the troops to disperse them; but in this case there were no circumstances of the same kind, no order was given to disperse; no order could be given to disperse, because no Magistrates were present; and if they had been present, there were no troops to disperse.

The truth is, the state of society was such as rendered these events possible every hour; and it was impossible the magistrates could be at every spot, and at all times, to put an end to these outrages, which really are a disgrace to the country in which they exist.

But, my Lords, neither the form nor the means in the possession of government enabled government to put an end to these things. It was necessary, therefore, to come to Parliament.

Now let us see what chance there was for providing a remedy for this state of things by coming to Parliament. My Lords, we all recollect perfectly well that the opinion of the majority in another place is, that the remedy for this state of things in Ireland is a repeal of the disabilities affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects.

(Cheers.)—We might have gone and asked Parliament to enable us to put down the Roman Catholic Association; but what chance had we of prevailing upon Parliament to pass such a bill, without being prepared to come forward and state that we were ready to consider the whole condition of Ireland?

(Hear, hear.) With a view to apply a remedy to that which Parliament had stated to be the cause of the disease. Suppose that Parliament had given us the bill to put down the Roman Catholic Association, would such a law as that which has passed this year be a remedy for the state of things which have already described to your Lordships as existing in Ireland? Would it do any one thing towards putting an end to the organization which I have stated to your Lordships exists; towards putting down the mischief which are the consequences of that organization; towards giving you the means of getting the better of the state of things existing in Ireland, without some further measure to be adopted?

But, my Lords, it is said, if that will not do, let us proceed to blows. What is meant by proceeding to blows is coming to civil war.

Now I believe that every government must be prepared to carry into execution the laws of the country by the military force, in case that should be necessary; and above all things, to oppose resistance to the law, in case the disaffected or the ill-disposed are inclined to resist the authority or sentence of the law; but, as I have already stated to your Lordships, there was no resistance of the law—hear, hear—nay, more, I will go further, and will say that I am positively certain that this state of things existing in Ireland for the last year and a half, bordering upon civil war, being attended by nearly all the evils of civil war, might have continued a considerable time longer, to the great injury & disgrace of the country, & those who managed the state, if they would have taken care to prevent that resistance which might have ended in that state of things being put down.

They know as well as I do they are not strong enough to wrestle with the King's government, backed by the law; they know perfectly well they would have been the first victims of that resistance, but knowing that, and knowing, as I do, that they are sensible able men, and perfectly aware of the materials upon which they have to work, I have not the smallest doubt that the state of things which I have stated to your Lordships would have continued, and that you would never have had an opportunity of putting it down in the manner some Noble Lords imagined.

But, my Lords, even if I had been certain of such means of putting it down, I should have considered it my duty to avoid those means. I am one of those who have probably passed a longer period of my life engaged in war than most men, and principally, I may say, in civil war; and I must say this, that if I could avoid, by any sacrifice whatever, even one month of civil war in the country to which I was attached, I would sacrifice my life in order to do it.

(Cheers.) I say that there is nothing which destroys property and prosperity, and demoralizes character, to the degree that civil war does; by it, the hand of man is raised against his neighbour, against his brother, and against his father; servant betrays master, and the whole scene ends in confusion and disorder. Yet, my Lords, this is the resource to which we must have looked—these are the means to which we must have applied, in order to have put an end to this state of things, if we had not made the option of bringing forward the measures, for which I say I am responsible. But let us look a little further at this.

If civil war is so bad, when it is occasioned by resistance to the Government—if it is so bad in the case I have stated, and so much to be avoided—how much more is it to be avoided when we are to arm the people in order that we may conquer one part of them by exciting the other part against them?

(Hear, hear.) My Lords, I am sure there is not a man who hears me, whose blood would not shudder at such a proposition if it were made to him; and yet that is the resource to which we should be pushed at last, by continuing the course we have been adopting for the last few years.

However, I entreat your Lordships not to look at it in this view, but let us revert a little to what passed on a former similar occasion.

My Lords, I am old enough to remember the rebellion in 1798. I was not employed in Ireland at the time—I was employed in another part of the dominions; but, my Lords, if I am not mistaken, the Parliament of Ireland at that time walked up to my Lord Lieutenant with a unanimous Address, beseeching his Excellency to take every means to put down that unnatural rebellion, and promising their full support in order to carry that measure into execution.

The Lord Lieutenant did take those measures, and did succeed in putting down that rebellion. Well, my Lord, what happened in the very next Session? The government proposed to put an end to the Parliament, and to form a Legislative Union between the two kingdoms, for the principal purpose of proposing this very measure—cheers; and, in point of fact, the very first measure that was proposed after this Legislative Union, after those successful endeavours to put down that rebellion was the very measure with which I am now about to trouble your Lordships.

Is it possible Noble Lords can that, supposing there was such a contest as that which I have anticipated, is it possible Noble Lords can believe that such a contest could be carried on, much less insisted on, by one House of Parliament, if not both? I am certain, my Lords, that, when you look at the division of opinion which prevails in both Houses of Parliament—when you look at the division which prevails in every family of this kingdom and of Ireland—in every family, I say, from the most eminent in station down to the lowest in this country—when you look at the division of opinion that prevails among the Protestants of Ireland on this subject—I am convinced you will see that there would be a vast difference in a contest carried on now and that which was carried on on former occasions.

My Lords, I beg you will recollect that, upon a recent occasion, there was a Protestant declaration of the sentiments of Ireland. As I said before, the Parliament of Ireland, in the year 1798, with the exception of one or two Gentlemen, were unanimous; and on a recent occasion, there were seven Marquises, 27 Earls, a vast number of Peers of other ranks, and not less than 2,000 Protestant Gentlemen of property in the country, who signed the Declaration, stating the absolute necessity of making these concessions.

Under these circumstances it is that this contest has been carried on—circumstances totally different from those which existed at the period I before alluded to. But is it possible to believe that Parliament, would allow such a contest to go on? Is it possible to believe that Parliament, having this state of things before them—that this House, seeing what the opinion of the other House of Parliament is—seeing what the opinion of the large number of Protestants in Ireland is—seeing what the opinion of nearly every Statesman, for the last forty years, has been on this question—would continue to oppose itself to measures brought forward for its settlement? It appears to me absolutely impossible that we could have gone on longer without increasing difficulties being brought on the country. But it is very desirable that we should look a little to what benefit it is to be derived to any one class in the State by continuing the disabilities, and only taking those coercive measures which will have all the evils I have stated. We are told that the benefit will be to preserve the principles of the constitution of 1688—that the Acts of 1688 permanently excluded Roman Catholics from Parliament—and that, they being permanently excluded from Parliament, it is necessary to have recourse to all those evils, in order to keep up that permanent exclusion.

Now, I wish very much that Noble Lords would take upon themselves the trouble I have taken to see how the matter stands as to the permanent exclusion of Roman Catholics from Parliament.

My Lords in the Bill of Rights, there are some things permanently enacted, which I sincerely hope will be permanent;—those are the liberties of the people—(hear, hear); the security for the Protestantism of the person on the throne of these kingdoms, and that he shall not be married to a Papist.

Then there is an oath of allegiance and supremacy to be taken by all those of whom that oath of allegiance is required, which is also permanent; but there is no declaration against transubstantiation. There is also an oath of allegiance different from that which is to be taken by a Member of Parliament.

I beg your Lordships will observe that, although this oath of allegiance was declared permanent, it was altered in the reign of William and Mary. This shows what that permanent Act was. Then, with respect to the oaths to be taken by Members of Parliament, I beg your Lordships to observe that these oaths, the declaration against transubstantiation, and the imprecation of the Mass, are not in the Act of William III.—they are in the Act of 30th Charles II. During the reign of Charles II. there were certain oaths imposed upon Dissenters of the Church of England, by the 13th and 14th Charles II. and to exclude Roman Catholics, by the

25th Charles II., and 30th Charles II. At the period of the revolution, when King William came, he thought proper to extend the basis of his Government, and he repealed the oaths affecting the Dissenters from the Church of England, imposed by the 13th and 14th Charles II., and likewise that permanent part of the oath of supremacy, which Dissenters from the Church of England could not take.

That is the history of the alteration of these oaths by William III., from the time of Charles II. But, my Lords, the remainder of the oath could be taken by Roman Catholics, but could not be taken by Roman Catholics. The danger, with respect to Roman Catholics, had originated in the time of Charles II., and these oaths still existed in the time of William III., but the oath was altered because one of the great principles of the revolution was to limit the exclusion from the benefits of the constitution as far as it was possible.

Therefore we have the principle of the revolution, as well as the principle I before stated, which consisted of the bill of rights and liberties of the subject.

Now the noble lords state that what they call the principles of 1688, that is to say, these oaths excluding Roman Catholics—are equally permanent with the bill of rights, by which the Protestantism of the crown is secured. If they will do me the favor to look at the words of the act, they will see that the difference is just the difference between that which is permanent and that which is not permanent.

The act says that the Protestantism of the crown shall last for ever—that these liberties are secured for ever; but as for these oaths, they are enacted in exclusive words, and there is not one word of a contrary import. Well, then, my lords, what follows? The next act we have is the act of union with Scotland; and what does that act say?—Why, that the oaths to be taken by the members of parliament are to be laid down by the 1st William and Mary till parliament shall otherwise direct.

This is what is called a permanent act of parliament—a permanent provision, for all future periods, to exclude Catholics from seats in parliament. My lords, I beg to observe, that if the act which excludes Roman Catholics from seats in parliament is permanent, there is another clause "I believe the 10th of cap. 3, William and Mary" which requires officers of the army and navy to take these very oaths previous to their acceptance of their commissions.

Now if the act made in the first year of William and Mary which excludes Roman Catholics from parliament, is permanent, I should like to ask noble lords why the clause in that act is not equally permanent?—One of these acts was merely temporary, and the other, as appeared by the change which had taken place, was not permanent. Neither Act, therefore, was binding at the present day.

The Parliament of Queen Anne, at the time of the Union, recognized the right of presbytery to seats in Parliament and consequently the Act passed in the reign of William and Mary was not permanent; and I will appeal to the Noble Lords whether the act passed in 1817, exempting Catholic officers in the Army and Navy, of certain ranks, from the oaths formerly prescribed, has not done away with the clause in chapter 8? If, therefore, the principles of exclusion, established in 1688, were found not to be permanent, and if no Acts were passed, either at the Union with Scotland or Ireland, to prevent further changes, I will ask Noble Lords on what principle of justice or sound reason any objection can be raised to the measure proposed?—But even supposing that were not the case, and that no alteration in the laws had taken place, are we not at liberty, on the ground of expediency, to repeal these laws altogether, in order to relieve the country from the inconvenience under which it has so long laboured? Are we not at liberty to revise the state of the representation in Ireland, as soon as it is perceived that the people, at the elections, are entirely under the influence of the Priests, and the arrangement which had been made in former years is found totally insufficient for the due administration of the State? The great question your Lordships have to decide is not whether some law existed, prohibiting all alteration, but whether they should, as the guardians of the public welfare, relieve the country from the improper influence exercised over such a portion of his Majesty's subjects by the Catholic Priesthood? I have already, my Lords, stated how this exclusive system tended to embarrass the measures of Government, and to excite divisions or disturbances in every part of the country, and, indeed, in every family; but I have not yet called your Lordships' attention to the dangers to which the Church itself is exposed, in consequence of this division. The Church of Ireland, in a peculiar situation. The Clergy of the Established Church there have but the minority under their charge; at the same time I must say that a more exemplary, a more pious, and learned set of men do not exist. (Hear, hear, hear.) That Church certainly enjoys the affections of those whom they have been sent to instruct to the same degree with their brethren in England; and the Protestants of both countries would shed the last drop of their blood in defence of the doctrines of the Church. But if the case comes to that point, if they were obliged to have recourse to violence, was not that likely to affect the interests of the Church?—(Hear, hear.) And I will ask whether it were more likely that such violence might be prevented by an united Government, an united Parliament, and an united people? or by a disunited Government, a disunited Parliament, or a disunited people? (Hear, hear.)

No man who attends to the subject can fail to see the situation of Ireland; and must wish to see a measure carried into effect which, I

trust, will tend so much to the peace and tranquility of the country. Having thus, my Lords, shown the necessity for some change in the system of Government, I shall now proceed briefly to state the general provisions of the Bill. The Bill in itself is very specific and comprehensive. It concedes to the Roman Catholics every office of the State unconnected with the administration of the affairs of the Church. (Hear, hear, hear.) It also concedes to them seats in Parliament, and many other offices and situations from which they had formerly been debarred. This measure is much more liberal and complete than any which has yet been proposed; and I will tell your Lordships why I have now recommended such concessions. On considering the subject maturely, I could not fail seeing the consequences resulting from the imperfect Acts of 1792 and 1793, for the relief of the Catholics. I have seen that, when there was any restriction in the concessions, the only effect it had was to encourage them to rise in their demands, and to arm them with fresh power to enforce these demands. I have, therefore, thought it my duty to make the concession as large as any reasonable man could expect—to leave nothing behind which could form a pretence for fresh demands, or for disturbing the peace or tranquility of the country. The conceding to them the right of sitting in Parliament I do not conceive can be objected to on any good grounds of policy or reason. It cannot in any manner influence any question that comes before Parliament to the prejudice of the Church of England.—It must be recollected that when the Act of the 30th of Charles II., and the other Act at the period of the Revolution, were passed, they were not enacted for the security of the Church. It was not the Church but the State which was in danger. For what were these laws enacted? Was it not because the Sovereign was a concealed Papist, and his successor an avowed one? and because, on that account, the safety of the State was threatened? But, besides this, danger was to be apprehended then, not from the Catholics, but the Dissenters. Any one who has attended to the history of those times must see that it was not the Catholics, but the Dissenters, that were dreaded, and that the privileges granted to the Dissenters contributed to the Revolution. I hardly think it can be necessary for me to show that no danger can be apprehended from admitting Catholics to seats in Parliament. In the time of Charles II. they had seats in both Houses. By the proposed law they are not required to take the oath of supremacy; but an oath of allegiance has been framed, in which a great part of the oath of supremacy has been retained, and which will answer sufficiently that particular purpose. So far, then, this Act is much better than that of Charles II. Besides this, for the last 40 years the House of Stuart has been considered extinct; and, in the opinion of a great number—and that opinion had for a long time been gaining ground—the time for the repeal of the law had at last arrived. It had been appointed for a specific purpose, and it could not be necessary when the object for which it was appointed had ceased to exist. On another subject, my Lords, I wish to say a few words. Many in this House, as well as throughout the country—and I confess I was of that opinion myself—have contended that the State ought to have some security for the Protestant Church against the encroachment of the Catholic Clergy; and I confess, on examining the question, and having been sensible of the danger to the foundation on which the security of the Church and State rests, I could find no security which would be satisfactory. The Bill, I think, my Lords, as it stands, affords more security than any that could have been received either from the Catholic Clergy or a foreign Potentate. In order to explain this, it may be necessary to refer to other States; and I beg your Lordships' attention to that subject for a few moments. The King of Prussia exercises a power over the Roman Catholics in his dominion, under different Concordats entered into with the Pope.—The House of Austria exercises a similar power and on the same grounds. The territories on the left bank of the Rhine are likewise bound by a Concordat with the Pope, agreed to in the time of Bonaparte; and those of the right bank by Concordats entered into by their respective Sovereigns. But, in the event of a Concordat being entered into between the British Government and the Pope, that would be admitting the Pope to have some power in this country; and that, I say, is a point which we never will yield.—(Hear, hear.) No foreign, be he who he may—no Prince or Potentate—has a right to interfere between His Majesty and his subjects; and from all such transactions, I trust, every Government in this country will steer clear. (Hear, hear.) Even the Veto I should not consider any security; and that could not be assumed by the Sovereign without, in some way or other, impairing his authority and dignity, and admitting the Pope to have some right to interfere in the internal affairs of the State. Suppose the King to have the nomination of the Bishops, he must, in nominating a Bishop, give him a diocese; and I should like to know in what part of Ireland such a diocese is to be found that could be conferred by the Sovereign on a Catholic Bishop, consistent with his oath? The King has sworn to preserve the Protestant Church, the Bishops and Clergy, and every thing belonging to them.—Now, how could he appoint a Catholic Bishop without giving him a diocese? And if he did, would not the Church of England rise against such an attempt on the part of his Majesty? With regard to some security against correspondence with Rome, and the necessity of supervising all communications in order to prevent inconvenience or injury

to this country, I must say that, on the point also, there are great objections. I do not see how it would be possible, nor do I think it necessary to make the attempt at present to watch over all such correspondence. It turns, no doubt, solely on spiritual affairs. But if the Pope's authority is recognized in any way, and particularly as to making laws for the Church of Ireland, then that security goes again. It would be found quite impossible to prevent it, and by making the attempt I am convinced that we should be doing more harm to the constitution and the established church than by allowing the Catholics to carry on their correspondence as they had hitherto done. That correspondence is avowed by them as relating to religious matters; but if indulgence is abused, and the conduct of any of the parties should render the interference of government necessary, I shall come down to the house, and claim additional power to ensure a result to that interference which shall be satisfactory to the house and the country.—(Hear, hear.) Another part of the bill relates to the Jesuits. An act was passed against that body in 1791, and which was probably thought at the time as secure as any law could be on the subject. I do not mean to impute any blame to the noble Lord who framed that bill, but every one knows that it has been with effect, and that not only in Ireland, but in this country, large establishments have sprung up, notwithstanding the provisions of that bill. The measure resorted to in this bill, I trust, will be effectual in suppressing such a society, without pressing hard on any individual. No one, my lords, would more reluctantly than myself impose any hardships on any individuals; but I have not the smallest doubt that, if this clause in the bill is not carried, we shall soon see this country and Ireland inundated by Jesuits, sent from all the other parts of Europe, and establishing themselves in the British dominions.—I admit that Noble Lords, when I propose this measure, have the right to ask what reason I have for believing it good, I answer, that not only the example of other States of Europe, and the result of the measures they have adopted, but even the state of Great Britain itself, warrants me in urging the expediency of the measure. If I am not mistaken, the difference between the Episcopal Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland, at a former period, were as injurious to the well-being and security of the Constitution as the present state of Ireland. Abroad we know there are no such distinctions and disabilities—the civil privileges of Protestants and Catholics are the same in the best-regulated Catholic countries, and I am not aware that any danger has arisen from such a state of things. In order to show the effect of such a divided interest in this country in former times, it is only necessary to refer to the state of society in Scotland previous to the Union; and I cannot give your Lordships a better idea of it, than by reading a petition which has this day been put into my hands, presented more than 100 years ago to the Scottish Parliament, against granting toleration to Episcopacy in that country. This petition is almost word for word a copy of many that have been presented to this House against Popery. That petition protested nothing but ruin to the Kirk of Scotland and the Constitution of that country; and I have little doubt that, when this bill has passed, the dangers anticipated from it will be found as groundless as those which were stated in that petition. The petitioners prayed that Parliament would not grant toleration to Episcopacy in Scotland, in the state of that church. Such a toleration would be unavailing and ruinous; it would sap the foundations of the Church and constitution; it would overwhelm the laws established in the country, and needlessly destroy the peace and tranquility of the nation. It would alienate from his Majesty the hearts of his best subjects, weaken the loyalty of the people, open a door to Prelacy and Popery, and bring the nation back to that state of misery and pollution from which it had so lately emerged. The petitioners, therefore, humbly entreated Parliament to uphold the laws then existing; refuse all legal toleration, because they were persuaded that, if toleration were granted, it would lead to the establishment of Popery, and produce the most dreadful effects on the institutions of the Church and State. (Hear, hear.) Now I sincerely hope, continued the Noble Duke, that as the prophesy made respecting Episcopacy in that country has not been fulfilled, the prophesy contained in some of the petitions against concessions to Catholics will in the result, be found equally incorrect, and without foundation. But there were still other grounds for granting Emancipation. There could be no doubt that after the Roman Catholics had been put on the same footing with their Protestant fellow subjects—after the candid and liberal measure proposed for them—they would have no separate interests, and could, therefore, have no grounds for confirming the suspicions which were entertained against them. They could execute nothing in this or the other House of Parliament. Parliament would look to them with the same eye with which it has watched Scotland; and I have no doubt that in a short time the same and kindly feeling would prevail there. If, however, we should be disappointed of the hopes of tranquility, and attempts to create dissatisfaction should be renewed, I will without delay come down to lay the state of affairs before Parliament, in order to enable the Government to meet the danger; and I am confident, my Lords, that on such an occasion, as well as on this, it shall meet your Lordships support and confidence. Having, my Lords, explained the grounds for the measure—the state of