

scene ends in confusion and devastation. Yet, my lords, this is the resource to which we must have looked; these are the means 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 farther. 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?

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. I entreat your lordships not to look at it in this point of view only, 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 his Majesty's 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 those measures into execution. The Lord Lieutenant did take measures, and did succeed in putting down that rebellion. Well, my lords, 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 purpose, principally, of pro-

posing this very measure; and, in point of fact, the very first measure that was proposed after this legislative union, after those successful endeavors to put down this rebellion, was the very measure with which I am now about to trouble your lordships.

Is it possible noble lords can believe 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 without the consent of the other House of Parliament?

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 of opinion 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, twenty-seven earls, a vast number of peers of other ranks, and not less than two thousand 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 would have 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 it—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 is to be derived to any one class in the state of continuing the disabilities, and adopting 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 incur all the existing evils in order to maintain 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: these are, the liberties of the people, 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

said to be permanent; but it contains 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 last year of King William. 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 sacrifice of the mass, are not originally 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, first on dissenters from the Church of England, by the 12th and 13th 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 the affirmative 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 dissenters, but could not be taken by Roman Catholics. The danger with respect to Roman Catholics had originated in the time of Charles II, and 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 so far as it was possible. Therefore we have this as one of the principles of the Rev-

olution, as well as the principles I before stated derived from the Bill of Rights.

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 forever — that these liberties are secured forever; but as for these oaths, they are enacted in exclusive words, and there is not one word about how long they shall last.

Well then, my lords, what follows?

The next Act we have is the Act of Union with Scotland; and what does that Act say? That the oaths to be taken by the members of Parliament, as laid down by the 1st of William and Mary, shall continue and be taken till Parliament shall otherwise direct. This is what is called a permanent Act of Parliament, a provision to exclude Catholics for all future periods 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 1 William III, cap. 8) 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?

I suppose that the noble and learned lord [Eldon] will answer my question by saying that one Act was permanent

and ought to be permanently maintained, but that the other Act was not permanent and the Parliament did right in repealing it in 1817. But the truth of the matter is that neither Act was intended to be permanent; and the Parliament of Queen Anne recognized by the Act of Union that the first Act, relating to seats in Parliament, was not permanent; and the noble and learned lord did quite right when he consented to the Act of 1817, which put an end to the 10th clause of the 1st of William III, cap. 8.

Then, my lords, if this principle of exclusion — if this principle of the Constitution of 1688, as it is called, be not permanent, if it be recognized as not permanent, not only by the Act of Union with Scotland (in which it was said that the exclusion oath should continue till Parliament otherwise provided), but also by the later Act of Union with Ireland, I would ask your lordships whether you are not at liberty now to consider the expediency of doing away with it altogether, in order to relieve the country from the inconveniences to which I have already adverted?

I would ask your lordships whether you are not called upon to review the state of the representation of Ireland — whether you are not called upon to see, even supposing that the principle were a permanent one, if it be fit that Parliament should remain as it has remained for some time, groaning under a Popish influence exercised by the priests over the elections in Ireland.

I would ask your lordships, I repeat, whether it is not right to make an arrangement which has for its object not only the settlement of this question, but at the same time to relieve the country from the inconveniences which I have mentioned.

I have already stated the manner in which the organization I have alluded to works upon all the great interests of the

country; but I wish your lordships particularly to attend to the manner in which it works upon the Church itself. That part of the Church of England which exists in Ireland is in a very peculiar situation: it is the Church of the minority of the people.

At the same time I believe that a more exemplary, a more pious, or a more learned body of men than the ministers of that Church do not exist. The ministers of that Church certainly enjoy and deserve the affections of those whom they are sent to instruct, in the same degree as their brethren in England enjoy the affections of the people of this country; and I have no doubt that they would shed the last drop of their blood in defence of the doctrines and discipline of their Church.

But violence, I apprehend, is likely to affect the interests of that Church; and I would put it to the House whether that Church can be better protected from violence by the government united in itself, united with Parliament, and united in sentiment with the great body of the people, or by a government disunited in opinion, disunited from Parliament, and by the two Houses of Parliament disunited. I am certain that no man can look to the situation of Ireland without seeing that the interest of the Church, as well as the interest of every class of persons under government, is involved in such a settlement of this question as will bring with it strength to the government and strength to every department of the State.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, Emperor of the French (1804-14), and the most famous of modern generals, was born at Ajaccio, Corsica, Aug. 15, 1769, and died at Longwood, St. Helena, May 5, 1821. He was the son of Charles Marie Bonaparte, and at the early age of ten entered the military school at Brienne, completing his military studies at Paris, where he received a lieutenant's commission. Gaining the rank of colonel, he was sent against the Austrians in Italy. Here fortune favored him, supplemented by his own great will-power, strategy, and rapid action, and enabled him not only to win many victories, but to mulct the defeated towns in heavy ransoms, and give the rich provinces of Italy to his soldiers as pillage. In December, 1797, he returned to Paris, where he was met with acclaim, and then set out to strike a blow at England by the conquest of Egypt. Setting out thither, Malta, Alexandria, and Cairo fell before him, and an Ottoman army was driven by him into the sea; but he received a check at Acre, from a combined English and Turkish force; while in Aboukir Bay, Nelson all but annihilated the French fleet. Escaping capture, he reached Paris just in time to meet the want of a strong man at the head of affairs and was made First Consul, abolishing the Directory and taking the Tuileries as his official residence. In May, 1800, he again took the field against the Austrians in Italy, and after crossing the Alps with 35,000 men he came upon the rear of the enemy, entered Milan, and at Marengo gained a great victory. This won for the conqueror the consulship for life, and in 1804, he was crowned at Notre Dame Emperor of the French. The next ten years was a struggle against the allied powers of Europe, which for a time went in Napoleon's favor. In December, 1805, he invaded Austria, occupied Vienna, and broke up the coalition; at Ulm he forced the Austrian general to lay down his arms, when the Corsican pushed on and entered the capital; later on he crossed the Danube and defeated an Austro-Russian force at Austerlitz; and at Jena (October, 1806) he defeated the Russians and marched upon and entered Berlin; after which he moved against the Russians and Prussians, and though partially defeated at Eylau, he again won at Friedland (June, 1807), and by the temporary peace that ensued extorted from Prussia half her territory. In July, 1809, once more the laurels of victory fell to "the man of Destiny," in the French defeat of the Austrians at Wagram. Meanwhile, three of his brothers had been placed upon thrones, and the Emperor Francis of Austria was compelled to acknowledge the sovereigns of Napoleon's creation, and to hand over to him his own daughter, Maria Louisa, in marriage, Josephine being divorced to meet the exigency. In January, 1812, Sweden and Russia declared war against France, and Napoleon now entered upon his expedition to Russia, which, though it brought him new laurels, closed in the disastrous winter retreat, and lost him three-fourths of his army. The year 1813, though it brought him the victories of Lutzen and Dresden, brought him also defeat at Leipzig, and the humiliation of seeing (March, 1814) his allied enemies enter Paris. The end of his career now drew near, for after his abdication and exile to Elba and escape therefrom, he was confronted by the allied forces under Wellington in Belgium, and lost all in the hazard of battle at Waterloo. After this came the banishment to St. Helena, where he died six years later, his remains finding sepulture, in 1840, in the magnificent tomb in the Hôtel des Invalides, Paris.