by the honourable and learned Gentleman. The Honourable and learned Gentleman, without any foundation, attempted to raise a prejudice (which must have its effects not only in that House, but out of doors) against his Majesty's Ministers, who, in the discharge of the painful duty which had devolved upon them, had been reluctantly compelled to take the step in which the proceeding at present pending in the other House of Parliament originated. Again, the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had adverted to the omission of his Majesty's name in the Liturgy. For himself, he (the Attorney-General) was satisfied that whatever question might arise as to the expediency or inexpediency of that step, in point of law it was completely justifiable. For what would have been said if his Majesty's Ministers had advised the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy? It appeared that a message had been sent from his Majesty had been communicated to his Majesty's Government, supported by evidence which it was impossible for them to overlook. It was said, that by the omission of her Majesty's name Government had pronounced a sentence of condemnation on her Majesty. This was a groundless assertion. But, if his Majesty's Ministers had advised the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy, how could they, with any consistency, have brought down the Royal Message, or have been accessory to the Proceeding in progress in the other House of Parliament? He denied that there was the slightest want of respect on the part of his Majesty's Government towards the Queen. Any apparent disrespect was attributable entirely to her Majesty's own conduct. He confessed, that he thought the course pursued in the House by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, though a very excellent course for the Advocate of her Majesty, whose business it was to make the most of every thing for his client, was by no means a proper course for a Member of Parliament. He denied, that the less that was said upon the whole subject the better, in order that the House might keep their minds free from bias, and be qualified to pronounce with impartiality on the momentous question, if it should come before them. All attempts to depreciate the character of the witnesses in this great question, was to presume that they were false and perjured, and that no truth could be expected from them, were amenable to the law, and, on whichever side they were made, ought to be punished. But that House ought to be extremely cautious not to lend themselves to the popular feeling—a feeling excited for the purpose of running down her Majesty, but to prejudge the case in any other way. Although he condemned the libel now in question as much as any man, yet in point of numbers and industry in this metropolis, there was no comparison between those whose libels were of that tendency and those who entertained the same love for her Majesty's friends, but who under that hypocritical mask were endeavouring to undermine the Government, and to effect that which they had long in view—a Revolution. No man could walk the streets of London without seeing the infamous placards from such persons on every wall. But had the Honourable and Learned Gentleman ever seen any placard of a monarch of this racter, attempting to prejudice her Majesty's cause, or to brand its supporters with infamy? Perhaps there never was a period when the conduct of the Attorney General were so heavy as at the present moment; of all those duties none occupied his attention more than the state of the public press. He lamented to say, that although it would be indispensible to institute numerous prosecutions, he was apprehensive that the arm of the law could not sufficiently restrain the license of the press. He felt as much interested as the Honourable and Learned Gentleman could do for the preservation of that inestimable blessing, the liberty of the press; but he was persuaded that no man who read the infamous publications to which he alluded, would wish us to bring their authors into a court of justice would be to attack the liberty of the press. The existing licentiousness of the press was greater than it had been in any former period of our history. He was sorry that it fell to his lot to endeavour to repress it. He trusted that he should not be considered to have been remiss in the discharge of his duty, because he had not yet taken notice of a publication that appeared only last week. The perusal of the grossest and infamous libels which appeared day after day and week after week, would occupy the whole of the time of the Attorney General. At the same time, he must not sleep on his post; for remissness was as much to be deprecated as an active negligence. He confessed, that with all the Honourable and Learned Mover's ingenuity and talent, he (the Attorney General) was at a loss to discover in what link in the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's reasoning he made the immediate publication in question a breach of privilege. As to the other object of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's proposition, namely, the instruction to the Attorney General to prosecute, it would not become him, having the honour as he had to hold that office, to say a word.

Mr. TIERNEY declared his intention of making no further observations on the great question respecting her Majesty, until it should come regularly before the House. He would therefore confine himself strictly to the motion made by his Honourable and Learned Friend. He confessed that he could not well understand how his Honourable and Learned Friend could make the libel in question a breach of the privileges of the House. At least, the argument by which his Honourable and Learned Friend had endeavoured to do so, appeared to him to be no reflection upon the House of Commons knew that the House of Lords had entertained a Bill which they respected her Majesty, and because that Bill was a Parliamentary proceeding, and because the House of Commons was a branch of Parliament, therefore the libel in question was a breach of the Privileges of the House of Commons. Now, it should be remembered, that what that House was pleased to call a breach of the Privileges of Lords, was not by a communication from that House, but merely from an examination of the Lords' Journals. The Bill might never come to the House of Commons. If the publication in question was a breach of Privilege, it ought to be taken notice of by the House of Lords rather than by the House of Commons. The next question was, whether, if it was declared to be a breach of Privilege, the Attorney-General should be instructed to prosecute? Now, to such a proceeding, he conceived there were two objections—the one was connected with the trial with the weight of the opinion of the House of Commons against him. But even if prosecution by the Attorney-General were the fit course, it was for the House of Lords to pursue it, and not the House of Commons. Under all the circumstances of the case, he strongly recommended to his Honourable and Learned Friend to withdraw his motion.

Lord A. HAMILTON denied that when he or the Honourable and Learned Gentleman said any thing in that House, in disparagement of the conduct of Ministers towards her Majesty, it was with the view of inflaming the minds of people out of doors. What they did was merely to recapitulate that conduct. If such a recapitulation had the effect of inflaming, it was attributable to the conduct itself, and not to him. It appeared to him that the Honourable and Learned the Attorney General had been unfortunate in his allusions to the reported omission of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman said, that if Ministers had advised the continuance of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy, they could not have been sanctioning the proceedings against her. He thought that it was quite erroneous to say that a charge could not with consistency be made against any one who, until the time of the charge, had been treated as innocent. But had Ministers done nothing else which had the same effect that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman supposed would have resulted from the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy? Was not the offer of 50,000l. a year as inconsistent with the subsequent charge of criminality, as the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy would have been? And how was the same thing nevertheless to be stricken by her Majesty's name out of the Liturgy; for it was stated in the papers on the Table of the House not to have been done in consequence of the intended proceedings against her Majesty. To the declaration of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, that Ministers were actively engaged in converting the temporary occurrences of the present day to purposes of lasting mischief, he would add, that those persons had the most valuable coadjutors in his Majesty's Ministers; for certainly never was a more injurious, dangerous, and unjustifiable principle put forth by any Government, than that of arming one branch of the Royal Family against another, and teaching the public that the triumph of the one could be obtained only by the disgrace of the other. As to the libel in question, it was so gross, so injurious, so flagitious, that no man could possess the slightest liberal education, that, in his opinion, it could be detrimental only to its author, and by no means to her Majesty.

Mr. MAXWELL said a few words, but the noise in the House was so great, that we can only express our belief that the Honourable Gentleman conceived the House would be guilty of a great dereliction of duty, if it neglected to notice the libel in question.

Mr. WETHERELL said, that as the Noble Lord and the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had both intimated that the publication in question would become the subject of prosecution, his object was answered, and he felt great satisfaction that it was so. The House might therefore dispose of his motion as they thought fit. He could not help observing, that the Noble Lord had not communicated with on his (Mr. Wetherell's) chair with his usual amenity, when he observed that he (Mr. Wetherell) had not proceeded diligently and accurately on this subject. The Noble Lord had charged him with a kind of neglect in not having brought forward similar motions against *The Examiner* and other publications. It was not to be supposed that the Noble Lord's own Attorney General had not read those publications. How then was he (Mr. Wetherell) to be expected to submit them to the consideration of the House? Was he to be the Noble Lord's shadow? He thought that it was not much to enquire whether the libel had been brought under the notice of the House one publication on which an unanimous opinion had been pronounced, that it was a fit subject for prosecution, and which it was intended to prosecute. With the leave of the House he would withdraw his motion.

The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Lord CASTLEREAGH postponed to-morrow his motion for an adjournment to the 21st of August.

BIRMINGHAM.

Mr. Alderman WOOD presented the Petition which he had offered to the House last night. He had since carefully read it, and although it was couched in very strong language, he was not aware that it contained any expressions disrespectful to the House. It proceeded from a numerous meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham, but as it was signed only by the Chairman of the meeting, George Edmonds, he knew that it could be received only as the Petition of that individual.

The Petition was then brought up and read. It was of considerable length, and expatiated on the various abuses which prevailed in the constitution of Parliament, and in the administration of public affairs.

After the Petition had been laid on the Table,

Mr. Alderman WOOD moved, that it should be printed.

Mr. R. SMITH declinedly objected to this proposition. It was quite enough to hear such nonsense read. He could not agree to its being printed.

Mr. Alderman WOOD repeated that the Petition was agreed to by a large meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham. He thought it somewhat selfish in the Honourable Gentleman who had enjoyed the treat of hearing the Petition read to wish to deprive others of the gratification of knowing its contents.

Mr. GURNEY was apprehensive that to refuse to print the Petition would be to establish an injurious precedent.

Mr. R. SMITH observed, that any man had a right to give vent to as much absurdity as he pleased, but that he thought the House of Commons would degrade itself by consenting to give that absurdity a permanent form.

Mr. Alderman WOOD did not conceive that the precedent of refusing to print the Petition would be injurious, as the House had consented to allow it to lie on the Table. That was certainly as much as could be expected with reference to such a mass of nonsense, virulence, and slander.

Mr. Alderman WOOD said, that to prevent the danger of the precedent, he had better withdraw the Petition.

Mr. R. DUNDAS recommended the Honourable Alderman to allow it to be negatived.

Mr. Alderman WOOD observed, that it should be just as he (Mr. R. Dundas) liked.

The motion for printing the Petition was then negatived without a division.—The House was to thin, indeed, that a division could not have taken place.

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS.

Mr. TENNYSON said, that the Landlords and Tenants Bill which he had had the honour to present, and which having received the Royal Assent, he wished to give notice before the House separated, that, conformably to an intention which he had before intimated, and to what he found to be a prevalent feeling on the subject, he should very early in the next Session move for leave to bring in a Bill for further and more generally amending the laws which affect the relation of landlord and tenant, and especially for providing a more summary and acceptable, and a less expensive remedy for recovering the possession, when unlawfully retained, of small tenements, where a rent not exceeding 20l. or 30l. a year. He deemed it right to give this long notice, more effectually to direct the attention of the House and the country to a subject so important to the landed interest and the public at large, in order that when he should bring it under the consideration of Parliament, it might have the benefit of that previous and matured reflection, which it so much required and so fully deserved.—Adjourned.

THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

LONDON:

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1820.

We received yesterday the Paris Papers of Saturday last. In the Chamber of Peers, on Friday, the Projet respecting the Treaty with Algiers was agreed to, 78 to 41; as was also the Budget of Ways and Means, 116 to 5. There remained nothing further for discussion, except a Report from the Committee of Petitions, which was to be considered on Saturday. The Session of the Chambers was, it is said, to be closed either on Monday or Tuesday.

These Journals contain no further news from Naples. We gave yesterday all the details which were published in the *Moniteur* of Friday, and which are copied, but with no addition, into the other Papers of Saturday. There appears to have been no fresh arrival in the interval.

The Neapolitan Ambassador paid his respects to the KING and the Royal Family on Friday. His MAJESTY also transacted business with the Duke de RICHELIEU and the Minister of Finance.

Colonel BARBIER DUFAY was interrogated on Friday by the Procureur du Roi. He is charged with having taken an active part in the late disturbances in the capital.

The accounts from Madrid of the 11th instant state, that a Committee had been appointed by the Cortes to examine the decrees issued by his MAJESTY since 1814, in order to confirm those which are not in opposition to Constitutional principles, and to pray the KING to revoke those which are. It has been determined to annul a decree of the Extraordinary Cortes of the 18th March, 1812, excluding from the succession to the Throne the INFANT DON FRANCIS PAUL, and the INFANTA DONNA MARIA LOUISA, Ex-Queen of Etruria. The *Miscellanea*, after mentioning that accounts from Algesiras state, that the introduction of English contraband goods on the side of Gibraltar, is greatly injurious to the public treasury, says, "those who would wish measures to be instantly taken for preventing this, as has been done in Catalonia, forget that there is a wide difference between these two parts of Spain. Catalonia is a rich manufacturing province, peopled with industrious inhabitants, immediately interested in repressing a contraband trade; but on the coast of Andalusia, particularly in the neighbourhood of Gibraltar, there is not a single manufacturer—but all consumers, ever ready to favour the introduction of foreign goods."

Accounts from Bilboa, dated the 14th, mention that, on the day before the Ex-Minister of Police, CHAVARRA, pursued by the authorities from Madrid to the frontiers, was recognised and arrested as he was about to embark at Portugalete, two leagues from Bilboa. He was taken to Burgos under a strong escort, and given up to the Tribunal for inquiring into the false reports respecting the flight of the KING.

A Notice has been published at Rome, by order of Cardinal CONSALVI, ordering all the vagabonds in the Roman States to find some means of employment within ten days.

FRENCH FIVE PER CENTS.—Friday, 78f. 80c.
DEFERRED STOCK of the 5th March, 1817, 104f. 65c.
2nd March, 1820, 92f. 70c.

In the House of Commons last night Mr. WETHERELL brought forward, agreeably to notice, his motion "to direct the ATTORNEY-GENERAL to prosecute the Editor of *The Western Luminary*, for passages reflecting on the QUEEN." It was well observed by Mr. TIERNEY, that the offence could only, by a very forced construction, be deemed a breach of the privileges of the House, and the motion was ultimately withdrawn. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, however, intimated, that numerous prosecutions must be instituted for libels connected with the proceedings against Her MAJESTY.

We trust it will not be imputed to us that we do not strongly disapprove of the disgusting language made use of with regard to her MAJESTY, if we have refrained from joining in the cry for prosecution which has been raised. The truth is, that the article selected by Mr. WETHERELL for notice, was of a very low description, that if it excited any other feeling than that of contempt for the writer, it must have been that of unqualified disgust. We are sure too, that the QUEEN possesses too much sense to be a moment hurt by such contemptible scurrility, and could almost take it upon us to say, that prosecution is the last thing that she would wish for. For our part, any enemy of the description of *The Western Luminary*, is one who would never give us much pain. There is another description of enemies, infinitely more to be dreaded, because their attacks are more insidious, and can with more difficulty be warded off. But these enemies cannot long be concealed by the law. The writer who lays aside all regard to decency in sentiment or language, will soon be rewarded by the public scorn, which will in most cases be found no inefficacious punishment. We really cannot bring ourselves to believe that the *loyal* people of Exeter, from the Right Reverend Bishop down to the humblest Tory, will hereafter feel so much disposed as they have been to bask in the *genial rays* of this *Luminary*.

We have always seen Ministers but too willing to avail themselves of every opportunity which they considered favourable for an inroad on the liberties of the press. This is precisely such an opportunity. The sacrifice of this wretched scribbler will cost them nothing; and they no doubt calculate that it will gain them a character for impartiality. They will be very willing, therefore, to make him the scape goat for the sins of his more dexterous, but not less mischievous brethren, that they may have a pretext for prosecuting other writers, whose punishment they would gladly purchase at the expence of this very moderate sacrifice.

Mr. TENNYSON gave notice of his intention to move for bringing in a Bill next Session, for facilitating the process of ejectment from small possessions.

VALPARAISO, APRIL 19, 1820.

Here we are making rapid strides towards complete independence; one step more, and which is about to be taken, will bring us to our journey's end. Then we shall receive this long sought blessing, without seeing the infamous placards from such persons on every wall. But had the Honourable and Learned Gentleman ever seen any placard of a monarch of this racter, attempting to prejudice her Majesty's cause, or to brand its supporters with infamy? Perhaps there never was a period when the conduct of the Attorney General were so heavy as at the present moment; of all those duties none occupied his attention more than the state of the public press. He lamented to say, that although it would be indispensible to institute numerous prosecutions, he was apprehensive that the arm of the law could not sufficiently restrain the license of the press. He felt as much interested as the Honourable and Learned Gentleman could do for the preservation of that inestimable blessing, the liberty of the press; but he was persuaded that no man who read the infamous publications to which he alluded, would wish us to bring their authors into a court of justice would be to attack the liberty of the press. The existing licentiousness of the press was greater than it had been in any former period of our history. He was sorry that it fell to his lot to endeavour to repress it. He trusted that he should not be considered to have been remiss in the discharge of his duty, because he had not yet taken notice of a publication that appeared only last week. The perusal of the grossest and infamous libels which appeared day after day and week after week, would occupy the whole of the time of the Attorney General. At the same time, he must not sleep on his post; for remissness was as much to be deprecated as an active negligence. He confessed, that with all the Honourable and Learned Mover's ingenuity and talent, he (the Attorney General) was at a loss to discover in what link in the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's reasoning he made the immediate publication in question a breach of privilege. As to the other object of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's proposition, namely, the instruction to the Attorney General to prosecute, it would not become him, having the honour as he had to hold that office, to say a word.

Mr. TIERNEY declared his intention of making no further observations on the great question respecting her Majesty, until it should come regularly before the House. He would therefore confine himself strictly to the motion made by his Honourable and Learned Friend. He confessed that he could not well understand how his Honourable and Learned Friend could make the libel in question a breach of the privileges of the House. At least, the argument by which his Honourable and Learned Friend had endeavoured to do so, appeared to him to be no reflection upon the House of Commons knew that the House of Lords had entertained a Bill which they respected her Majesty, and because that Bill was a Parliamentary proceeding, and because the House of Commons was a branch of Parliament, therefore the libel in question was a breach of the Privileges of the House of Commons. Now, it should be remembered, that what that House was pleased to call a breach of the Privileges of Lords, was not by a communication from that House, but merely from an examination of the Lords' Journals. The Bill might never come to the House of Commons. If the publication in question was a breach of Privilege, it ought to be taken notice of by the House of Lords rather than by the House of Commons. The next question was, whether, if it was declared to be a breach of Privilege, the Attorney-General should be instructed to prosecute? Now, to such a proceeding, he conceived there were two objections—the one was connected with the trial with the weight of the opinion of the House of Commons against him. But even if prosecution by the Attorney-General were the fit course, it was for the House of Lords to pursue it, and not the House of Commons. Under all the circumstances of the case, he strongly recommended to his Honourable and Learned Friend to withdraw his motion.

Lord A. HAMILTON denied that when he or the Honourable and Learned Gentleman said any thing in that House, in disparagement of the conduct of Ministers towards her Majesty, it was with the view of inflaming the minds of people out of doors. What they did was merely to recapitulate that conduct. If such a recapitulation had the effect of inflaming, it was attributable to the conduct itself, and not to him. It appeared to him that the Honourable and Learned the Attorney General had been unfortunate in his allusions to the reported omission of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman said, that if Ministers had advised the continuance of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy, they could not have been sanctioning the proceedings against her. He thought that it was quite erroneous to say that a charge could not with consistency be made against any one who, until the time of the charge, had been treated as innocent. But had Ministers done nothing else which had the same effect that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman supposed would have resulted from the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy? Was not the offer of 50,000l. a year as inconsistent with the subsequent charge of criminality, as the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy would have been? And how was the same thing nevertheless to be stricken by her Majesty's name out of the Liturgy; for it was stated in the papers on the Table of the House not to have been done in consequence of the intended proceedings against her Majesty. To the declaration of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, that Ministers were actively engaged in converting the temporary occurrences of the present day to purposes of lasting mischief, he would add, that those persons had the most valuable coadjutors in his Majesty's Ministers; for certainly never was a more injurious, dangerous, and unjustifiable principle put forth by any Government, than that of arming one branch of the Royal Family against another, and teaching the public that the triumph of the one could be obtained only by the disgrace of the other. As to the libel in question, it was so gross, so injurious, so flagitious, that no man could possess the slightest liberal education, that, in his opinion, it could be detrimental only to its author, and by no means to her Majesty.

Mr. MAXWELL said a few words, but the noise in the House was so great, that we can only express our belief that the Honourable Gentleman conceived the House would be guilty of a great dereliction of duty, if it neglected to notice the libel in question.

Mr. WETHERELL said, that as the Noble Lord and the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had both intimated that the publication in question would become the subject of prosecution, his object was answered, and he felt great satisfaction that it was so. The House might therefore dispose of his motion as they thought fit. He could not help observing, that the Noble Lord had not communicated with on his (Mr. Wetherell's) chair with his usual amenity, when he observed that he (Mr. Wetherell) had not proceeded diligently and accurately on this subject. The Noble Lord had charged him with a kind of neglect in not having brought forward similar motions against *The Examiner* and other publications. It was not to be supposed that the Noble Lord's own Attorney General had not read those publications. How then was he (Mr. Wetherell) to be expected to submit them to the consideration of the House? Was he to be the Noble Lord's shadow? He thought that it was not much to enquire whether the libel had been brought under the notice of the House one publication on which an unanimous opinion had been pronounced, that it was a fit subject for prosecution, and which it was intended to prosecute. With the leave of the House he would withdraw his motion.

The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Lord CASTLEREAGH postponed to-morrow his motion for an adjournment to the 21st of August.

BIRMINGHAM.

Mr. Alderman WOOD presented the Petition which he had offered to the House last night. He had since carefully read it, and although it was couched in very strong language, he was not aware that it contained any expressions disrespectful to the House. It proceeded from a numerous meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham, but as it was signed only by the Chairman of the meeting, George Edmonds, he knew that it could be received only as the Petition of that individual.

The Petition was then brought up and read. It was of considerable length, and expatiated on the various abuses which prevailed in the constitution of Parliament, and in the administration of public affairs.

After the Petition had been laid on the Table,

Mr. Alderman WOOD moved, that it should be printed.

Mr. R. SMITH decidedly objected to this proposition. It was quite enough to hear such nonsense read. He could not agree to its being printed.

Mr. Alderman WOOD repeated that the Petition was agreed to by a large meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham. He thought it somewhat selfish in the Honourable Gentleman who had enjoyed the treat of hearing the Petition read to wish to deprive others of the gratification of knowing its contents.

Mr. GURNEY was apprehensive that to refuse to print the Petition would be to establish an injurious precedent.

Mr. R. SMITH observed, that any man had a right to give vent to as much absurdity as he pleased, but that he thought the House of Commons would degrade itself by consenting to give that absurdity a permanent form.

Mr. Alderman WOOD did not conceive that the precedent of refusing to print the Petition would be injurious, as the House had consented to allow it to lie on the Table. That was certainly as much as could be expected with reference to such a mass of nonsense, virulence, and slander.

Mr. Alderman WOOD said, that to prevent the danger of the precedent, he had better withdraw the Petition.

Mr. R. DUNDAS recommended the Honourable Alderman to allow it to be negatived.

Mr. Alderman WOOD observed, that it should be just as he (Mr. R. Dundas) liked.

The motion for printing the Petition was then negatived without a division.—The House was to thin, indeed, that a division could not have taken place.

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS.

Mr. TENNYSON said, that the Landlords and Tenants Bill which he had had the honour to present, and which having received the Royal Assent, he wished to give notice before the House separated, that, conformably to an intention which he had before intimated, and to what he found to be a prevalent feeling on the subject, he should very early in the next Session move for leave to bring in a Bill for further and more generally amending the laws which affect the relation of landlord and tenant, and especially for providing a more summary and acceptable, and a less expensive remedy for recovering the possession, when unlawfully retained, of small tenements, where a rent not exceeding 20l. or 30l. a year. He deemed it right to give this long notice, more effectually to direct the attention of the House and the country to a subject so important to the landed interest and the public at large, in order that when he should bring it under the consideration of Parliament, it might have the benefit of that previous and matured reflection, which it so much required and so fully deserved.—Adjourned.

THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

LONDON:

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1820.

We received yesterday the Paris Papers of Saturday last. In the Chamber of Peers, on Friday, the Projet respecting the Treaty with Algiers was agreed to, 78 to 41; as was also the Budget of Ways and Means, 116 to 5. There remained nothing further for discussion, except a Report from the Committee of Petitions, which was to be considered on Saturday. The Session of the Chambers was, it is said, to be closed either on Monday or Tuesday.

These Journals contain no further news from Naples. We gave yesterday all the details which were published in the *Moniteur* of Friday, and which are copied, but with no addition, into the other Papers of Saturday. There appears to have been no fresh arrival in the interval.

The Neapolitan Ambassador paid his respects to the KING and the Royal Family on Friday. His MAJESTY also transacted business with the Duke de RICHELIEU and the Minister of Finance.

Colonel BARBIER DUFAY was interrogated on Friday by the Procureur du Roi. He is charged with having taken an active part in the late disturbances in the capital.

The accounts from Madrid of the 11th instant state, that a Committee had been appointed by the Cortes to examine the decrees issued by his MAJESTY since 1814, in order to confirm those which are not in opposition to Constitutional principles, and to pray the KING to revoke those which are. It has been determined to annul a decree of the Extraordinary Cortes of the 18th March, 1812, excluding from the succession to the Throne the INFANT DON FRANCIS PAUL, and the INFANTA DONNA MARIA LOUISA, Ex-Queen of Etruria. The *Miscellanea*, after mentioning that accounts from Algesiras state, that the introduction of English contraband goods on the side of Gibraltar, is greatly injurious to the public treasury, says, "those who would wish measures to be instantly taken for preventing this, as has been done in Catalonia, forget that there is a wide difference between these two parts of Spain. Catalonia is a rich manufacturing province, peopled with industrious inhabitants, immediately interested in repressing a contraband trade; but on the coast of Andalusia, particularly in the neighbourhood of Gibraltar, there is not a single manufacturer—but all consumers, ever ready to favour the introduction of foreign goods."

Accounts from Bilboa, dated the 14th, mention that, on the day before the Ex-Minister of Police, CHAVARRA, pursued by the authorities from Madrid to the frontiers, was recognised and arrested as he was about to embark at Portugalete, two leagues from Bilboa. He was taken to Burgos under a strong escort, and given up to the Tribunal for inquiring into the false reports respecting the flight of the KING.

A Notice has been published at Rome, by order of Cardinal CONSALVI, ordering all the vagabonds in the Roman States to find some means of employment within ten days.

FRENCH FIVE PER CENTS.—Friday, 78f. 80c.
DEFERRED STOCK of the 5th March, 1817, 104f. 65c.
2nd March, 1820, 92f. 70c.

In the House of Commons last night Mr. WETHERELL brought forward, agreeably to notice, his motion "to direct the ATTORNEY-GENERAL to prosecute the Editor of *The Western Luminary*, for passages reflecting on the QUEEN." It was well observed by Mr. TIERNEY, that the offence could only, by a very forced construction, be deemed a breach of the privileges of the House, and the motion was ultimately withdrawn. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, however, intimated, that numerous prosecutions must be instituted for libels connected with the proceedings against Her MAJESTY.

We trust it will not be imputed to us that we do not strongly disapprove of the disgusting language made use of with regard to her MAJESTY, if we have refrained from joining in the cry for prosecution which has been raised. The truth is, that the article selected by Mr. WETHERELL for notice, was of a very low description, that if it excited any other feeling than that of contempt for the writer, it must have been that of unqualified disgust. We are sure too, that the QUEEN possesses too much sense to be a moment hurt by such contemptible scurrility, and could almost take it upon us to say, that prosecution is the last thing that she would wish for. For our part, any enemy of the description of *The Western Luminary*, is one who would never give us much pain. There is another description of enemies, infinitely more to be dreaded, because their attacks are more insidious, and can with more difficulty be warded off. But these enemies cannot long be concealed by the law. The writer who lays aside all regard to decency in sentiment or language, will soon be rewarded by the public scorn, which will in most cases be found no inefficacious punishment. We really cannot bring ourselves to believe that the *loyal* people of Exeter, from the Right Reverend Bishop down to the humblest Tory, will hereafter feel so much disposed as they have been to bask in the *genial rays* of this *Luminary*.

We have always seen Ministers but too willing to avail themselves of every opportunity which they considered favourable for an inroad on the liberties of the press. This is precisely such an opportunity. The sacrifice of this wretched scribbler will cost them nothing; and they no doubt calculate that it will gain them a character for impartiality. They will be very willing, therefore, to make him the scape goat for the sins of his more dexterous, but not less mischievous brethren, that they may have a pretext for prosecuting other writers, whose punishment they would gladly purchase at the expence of this very moderate sacrifice.

Mr. TENNYSON gave notice of his intention to move for bringing in a Bill next Session, for facilitating the process of ejectment from small possessions.

VALPARAISO, APRIL 19, 1820.

Here we are making rapid strides towards complete independence; one step more, and which is about to be taken, will bring us to our journey's end. Then we shall receive this long sought blessing, without seeing the infamous placards from such persons on every wall. But had the Honourable and Learned Gentleman ever seen any placard of a monarch of this racter, attempting to prejudice her Majesty's cause, or to brand its supporters with infamy? Perhaps there never was a period when the conduct of the Attorney General were so heavy as at the present moment; of all those duties none occupied his attention more than the state of the public press. He lamented to say, that although it would be indispensible to institute numerous prosecutions, he was apprehensive that the arm of the law could not sufficiently restrain the license of the press. He felt as much interested as the Honourable and Learned Gentleman could do for the preservation of that inestimable blessing, the liberty of the press; but he was persuaded that no man who read the infamous publications to which he alluded, would wish us to bring their authors into a court of justice would be to attack the liberty of the press. The existing licentiousness of the press was greater than it had been in any former period of our history. He was sorry that it fell to his lot to endeavour to repress it. He trusted that he should not be considered to have been remiss in the discharge of his duty, because he had not yet taken notice of a publication that appeared only last week. The perusal of the grossest and infamous libels which appeared day after day and week after week, would occupy the whole of the time of the Attorney General. At the same time, he must not sleep on his post; for remissness was as much to be deprecated as an active negligence. He confessed, that with all the Honourable and Learned Mover's ingenuity and talent, he (the Attorney General) was at a loss to discover in what link in the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's reasoning he made the immediate publication in question a breach of privilege. As to the other object of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's proposition, namely, the instruction to the Attorney General to prosecute, it would not become him, having the honour as he had to hold that office, to say a word.

Mr. TIERNEY declared his intention of making no further observations on the great question respecting her Majesty, until it should come regularly before the House. He would therefore confine himself strictly to the motion made by his Honourable and Learned Friend. He confessed that he could not well understand how his Honourable and Learned Friend could make the libel in question a breach of the privileges of the House. At least, the argument by which his Honourable and Learned Friend had endeavoured to do so, appeared to him to be no reflection upon the House of Commons knew that the House of Lords had entertained a Bill which they respected her Majesty, and because that Bill was a Parliamentary proceeding, and because the House of Commons was a branch of Parliament, therefore the libel in question was a breach of the Privileges of the House of Commons. Now, it should be remembered, that what that House was pleased to call a breach of the Privileges of Lords, was not by a communication from that House, but merely from an examination of the Lords' Journals. The Bill might never come to the House of Commons. If the publication in question was a breach of Privilege, it ought to be taken notice of by the House of Lords rather than by the House of Commons. The next question was, whether, if it was declared to be a breach of Privilege, the Attorney-General should be instructed to prosecute? Now, to such a proceeding, he conceived there were two objections—the one was connected with the trial with the weight of the opinion of the House of Commons against him. But even if prosecution by the Attorney-General were the fit course, it was for the House of Lords to pursue it, and not the House of Commons. Under all the circumstances of the case, he strongly recommended to his Honourable and Learned Friend to withdraw his motion.

Lord A. HAMILTON denied that when he or the Honourable and Learned Gentleman said any thing in that House, in disparagement of the conduct of Ministers towards her Majesty, it was with the view of inflaming the minds of people out of doors. What they did was merely to recapitulate that conduct. If such a recapitulation had the effect of inflaming, it was attributable to the conduct itself, and not to him. It appeared to him that the Honourable and Learned the Attorney General had been unfortunate in his allusions to the reported omission of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman said, that if Ministers had advised the continuance of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy, they could not have been sanctioning the proceedings against her. He thought that it was quite erroneous to say that a charge could not with consistency be made against any one who, until the time of the charge, had been treated as innocent. But had Ministers done nothing else which had the same effect that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman supposed would have resulted from the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy? Was not the offer of 50,000l. a year as inconsistent with the subsequent charge of criminality, as the insertion of her Majesty's name in the Liturgy would have been? And how was the same thing nevertheless to be stricken by her Majesty's name out of the Liturgy; for it was stated in the papers on the Table of the House not to have been done in consequence of the intended proceedings against her Majesty. To the declaration of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, that Ministers were actively engaged in converting the temporary occurrences of the present day to purposes of lasting mischief, he would add, that those persons had the most valuable coadjutors in his Majesty's Ministers; for certainly never was a more injurious, dangerous, and unjustifiable principle put forth by any Government, than that of arming one branch of the Royal Family against another, and teaching the public that the triumph of the one could be obtained only by the disgrace of the other. As to the libel in question, it was so gross, so injurious, so flagitious, that no man could possess the slightest liberal education, that, in his opinion, it could be detrimental only to its author, and by no means to her Majesty.

Mr. MAXWELL said a few words, but the noise in the House was so great, that we can only express our belief that the Honourable Gentleman conceived the House would be guilty of a great dereliction of duty, if it neglected to notice the libel in question.

Mr. WETHERELL said, that as the Noble Lord and the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had both intimated that the publication in question would become the subject of prosecution, his object was answered, and he felt great satisfaction that it was so. The House might therefore dispose of his motion as they thought fit. He could not help observing, that the Noble Lord had not communicated with on his (Mr. Wetherell's) chair with his usual amenity, when he observed that he (Mr. Wetherell) had not proceeded diligently and accurately on this subject. The Noble Lord had charged him with a kind of neglect in not having brought forward similar motions against *The Examiner* and other publications. It was not to be supposed that the Noble Lord's own Attorney General had not read those publications. How then was he (Mr. Wetherell) to be expected to submit them to the consideration of the House? Was he to be the Noble Lord's shadow? He thought that it was not much to enquire whether the libel had been brought under the notice of the House one publication on which an unanimous opinion had been pronounced, that it was a fit subject for prosecution, and which it was intended to prosecute. With the leave of the House he would withdraw his motion.

The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Lord CASTLEREAGH postponed to-morrow his motion for an adjournment to the 21st of August.

BIRMINGHAM.

Mr. Alderman WOOD presented the Petition which he had offered to the House last night. He had since carefully read it, and although it was couched in very strong language, he was not aware that it contained any expressions disrespectful to the House. It proceeded from a numerous meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham, but as it was signed only by the Chairman of the meeting, George Edmonds, he knew that it could be received only as the Petition of that individual.

The Petition was then brought up and read. It was of considerable length, and expatiated on the various abuses which prevailed in the constitution of Parliament, and in the administration of public affairs.

After the Petition had been laid on the Table,

Mr. Alderman WOOD moved, that it should be printed.

Mr. R. SMITH decidedly objected to this proposition. It was quite enough to hear such nonsense read. He could not agree to its being printed.

Mr. Alderman WOOD repeated that the Petition was agreed to by a large meeting of the inhabitants of Birmingham. He thought it somewhat selfish in the Honourable Gentleman who had enjoyed the treat of hearing the Petition read to wish to deprive others of the gratification of knowing its contents.

Mr. GURNEY was apprehensive that to refuse to print the Petition would be to establish an injurious precedent.

Mr. R. SMITH observed, that any man had a right to give vent to as much absurdity as he pleased, but that he thought the House of Commons would degrade itself by consenting to give that absurdity a permanent form.

Mr. Alderman WOOD did not conceive that the precedent of refusing to print the Petition would be injurious, as the House had consented to allow it to lie on the Table. That was certainly as much as could be expected with reference to such a mass of nonsense, virulence, and slander.

Mr. Alderman WOOD said, that to prevent the danger of the precedent, he had better withdraw the Petition.

Mr. R. DUNDAS recommended the Honourable Alderman to allow it to be negatived.

Mr. Alderman WOOD observed, that it should be just as he (Mr. R. Dundas) liked.

The motion for printing the Petition was then negatived without a division.—The House was to thin, indeed, that a division could not have taken place.

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS.

Mr. TENNYSON said, that the Landlords and Tenants Bill which he had had the honour to present, and which having received the Royal Assent, he wished to give notice before the House separated, that, conformably to an intention which he had before intimated, and to what he found to be a prevalent feeling on the subject, he should very early in the next Session move for leave to bring in a Bill for further and more generally amending the laws which affect the relation of landlord and tenant, and especially for providing a more summary and acceptable, and a less expensive remedy for recovering the possession, when unlawfully retained, of small tenements, where a rent not exceeding 20l. or 30l. a year. He deemed it right to give this long notice, more effectually to direct the attention of the House and the country to a subject so important to the landed interest and the public at large, in order that when he should bring it under the consideration of Parliament, it might have the benefit of that previous and matured reflection, which it so much required and so fully deserved.—Adjourned.

THE MIRROR OF FASHION.

TO SHEW
THE VERY AGE AND BODY OF THE TIME,
ITS FORM AND PRESSURE.

The gout in the KING's hand was yesterday, we are happy to say, much better. His MAJESTY experienced less pain than before he had taken the attack.

Yesterday the Dukes of YORK and GLOUCESTER visited his MAJESTY