EUROPE.

ENGLAND.

[*Continued from our last page.*]

pily be able to try whether his counsels be sound or not. The noble earl recommends your lordships to suspend all operations on reform for two years, in order that the people may have time to think about it; but in giving this advice to your lordships I suspect the noble earl has taken a leaf out of a noble Duke's (Wellington) book, which the noble duke had scarcely written there before he wished it cancelled.—Your lordships will no doubt remember the declaration of the noble Duke, in a debate preceding the introduction of the Catholic Bill, that he wished all that had been said were sunk in oblivion, and then they might be able to see what they could do. Now, although I have the misfortune to differ from the opinion of the noble duke still I cannot but remark that his opinion is sound, compared with that of the noble earl; for it was a practical opinion; and as for that of the noble earl, why suppose even your Lordships were to bury the question of reform in oblivion for two years, in order to see what might be done with it after that time, why what would it end in but nothing? But, my Lords, although that Noble Earl has said that he has no objection to bribery—

Earl Mansfield—The Noble Lord errs; I did not assert that I had no such objection, but I simply refused to offer any opinion upon the subject.

The Lord Chancellor—Well then my Lords, the noble Earl, you see, would not even commit himself so far as to offer an opinion upon this topic but probably has reserved it until his period of years and two days has elapsed—laughter and cheers. The Noble Baron (Wharncliff) has been pleased to give your Lordships an account of the observations which reached his ears during his perambulations through the streets; but the noble Baron no sooner mentions one street as containing inhabitants inimicable to the measure, than that street, to a man crowds your Lordships' table with petitions in its favor. I will not say that St. James' street is amongst the number, but, when the noble Baron asserted that Regent street was against the bill, instantly comes a requisition to the churchwardens of the parish, then follows a meeting, and then comes a petition almost unanimously signed, entreating your lordships to give your sanction to the bill—(hear and laughter) Through whatever street, whatever alley the noble Baron wends his way, all become writers all become petitioners to you lordships in favor of the bill. If he flies to the river, up rise the watermen, for it was no later than yesterday that I presented a petition in favour of the bill from one thousand watermen; and if he takes refuge in a coach, I have no doubt the hackney coachman will send up the petition of their numerous body all alike in favor of the bill. Wherever there is a householder, there the bill finds a partizan; and, although the noble Baron may not meet with an opponent of the bill on Hayhill, yet he will, at least, find no friend to it in one street on the side of Lansdowne House, because it was a street without an inhabitant. If the noble Baron takes to the country, there he is followed by the cry 'the bill,'—if he takes to the towns, still the cry 'the bill, the bill,' !—and even he will not escape if he flies wearied to his inn, for there he will be pursued by his landlord, and persons in the garb of attendants, crying out 'the bill, the whole bill,—the bill, the bill.—loud laughter. Yes, thus will the noble Baron be pursued from the city to the country, from the country to the towns; and when at length wearied with the sounds, he reaches his own domains, he will be greeted by the contiguous town of Sheffield with the cry of 'the bill!' from the mouths of ten thousand petitioners in its favor—laughter.

'Whither shall I fly for refuge?'

ere, my Lords, are circumstances which will sufficiently evince to your Lordships that my Noble Friend is not a much safer guide as to facts than he is as to opinion; for my Noble Friend has stated that he is not a bit-by-bit reformer, but what may be called a wholesale reformer. He deals in no shadowy unsubstantial measures, but he has told your Lordships that nothing but a solid, substantial, and constutional correction of the abuses which exists will satisfy both the Scotch and the English people; and this is a circumstance to which I must particularly entreat your lordships' attention, and those especially who wish to know the grounds upon which they now choose to follow the opinions of those men who say that a large and efficient change is necessary, and yet all the arguments which have been used by the noble lord, and by all the speakers against the bill, are just as good against a moderate reform as against the bill itself—[hear] I shall now my lord proceed to notice such parts of the speech of a noble earl, [Harrowby] on this side of the house which were passed by in the reply of my noble friend on the other side; and, first, with respect to the calm judgment which the noble earl has said he had exercised on this measure, whilst he had accused us of haste in action, and inconsistency amongst ourselves in all our measures, and has said that he looked alone to his own side of the house, for calmness of judgment. Now, many noble lords have looked up to the vote of the noble earl as that which should be some guide for them; and it had been thought that the noble earl would have assented to the bill going into committee but it seems that he has made up his mind to refuse his sanction to that step, as it is, in his opinion, altogether opposed, to the constitution of England. Now, my Lords what is to be thought of the calmness of the judgment of the noble lord, when it actually seems that his mind is so altered from its ordinary impartial judgement that although he had calmly heard a noble lord argue upon the opinions and expressions which were delivered in another house, although the noble earl [Vane] quoting the speeches of his noble friend (Earl Grey) and quoting and referring to them also by his noble friend's christian and sirname, and even although the noble earl himself repeatedly alluded to opinions which were delivered in the house of commons, yet what will your lordships think, I repeat, of the effects which prejudice can produce in warping so excellent a judgment as that of the noble earl, when he rises, and calls my noble and learned friend (Plunket) to order for quoting and referring to what is actually become a matter of history; namely, the opinion delivered during the last Session of Parliament by a member of the house of commons? Now all these circumstances will, I think, my lords, very plainly show that all the wrong judgment is not on our side of the question; and I think they also show that the noble earl, and all those noble lords who pursue the course which has been taken by him, might have brought their minds more acutely to the consideration of this question had they suffered themselves to consider it with a judgment less biassed. The next grievance of which the noble earl has complained is one which brings at once to issue the great principles of the bill, and I shall now proceed to grapple with it, and endeavour to show to your lordships the utter fallacy upon which the fears of the noble earl are founded. The noble earl stated that the great charge which he and those who thought with him had to bring against the Bill, was that population and not property is its basis. It is, if I do not err, upon this great change in the constitution, upon this great innoration of its principles, which is now for the first time made, that the noble earl and his friends are determined with might and main to throw out the bill. Now if it can be said that the basis of this bill is population, because some large towns are selected for representation on account of their importance and their population, then I must admit there are some grounds for the statement that the basis of this bill is one of population. But if the noble earl means by his assertion that the very principle on which these boroughs are selected to send Representatives is that a change is effected in the grounds upon which their Representatives are to be elected—namely, from property to population—and that I contend, my Lords, is what the noble earl does mean, when he says that population is the basis of the Bill, why then I must take the liberty of denying the logic or even the fairness of the conclusion which the noble earl has deduced from his reasoning; and I deny also that in that sense the Bill is founded on the basis of population. Now will your lordships or will any man in his senses, venture to assert that, in the county representation, population is the basis of the representation? If any man will tell me so, let me ask him what he calls a freehold qualification, is that property or is it not? and if it be property, which I contend it is, where does the argument of the noble earl rest? Why, even copyhold property is *bona fide* and absolutely property; and if there be one exception to this rule, the real and true basis upon which the Bill is founded, it is that which is formed by the admission of the right of tenants at will to vote at elections. But whose fault is this, my lords? Was this provision one of the original features of the bill as framed by Government? I, for one, must say that I did not approve of it, but it was introduced at the suggestion of my noble friend to my left [the duke of Buckingham), and he beat the Government in the division which occurred on it. I must therefore re-assert that it is property which enfranchises, and that alone. Let us now come to the question of the borough qualification—and I must first remark that I stand here in a peculiar situation. I must beg your Lordships to revert to what was the old practice of the Constitution, and ask yourselves if the franchise which is possessed by inhabitant householders is not as much a principle of population and not property, as that which the present measure was said to rest upon; nay, it is more so, for the Bill requires no less a qualification than to be a 10*l.* householder. Now in London and other large towns, I must admit that a 10*l.* house is certainly a low qualification, but that is not the point I am now arguing, for I am on the principle of the Bill, and if I can satisfy the noble earl that, all over England, except in London and other very large and popular places, the tenant of a ten pound house is a responsible man, I think I am entitled to his vote for the second reading. In small towns, and here I speak within the hearing of noble lords, who know personally that the man who inhabits a 10 pound house in the country, is a person in tolerably easy circumstances—(hear,) and I will tell your lordships why the ten pound qualification was selected. It was originally proposed that twenty pounds should be the qualification, but it was found on enquiry, that in one county town, containing 1,700 houses, there were not twenty persons who were rated at twenty pounds a year. Only look at the situation in which any man appears who pays 10 pounds a year in any place but in large towns. He would be found to be either a shopkeeper on a small scale in large towns—or a large scale in smaller towns; in other places he will be found to be a person removed much above want, at the head of a family, and fully able to provide for its wants. But then, says a noble earl, how do you know that in conferring this franchise on a population of 4,000, how do you know you are not enfranchising a population of 4,000 paupers, because they may, says the noble earl, have no property? Now was there ever ingenuity so thrown away. Who, in a town, composed of 4000 paupers, must pay the poor rates, for there must be property to pay them, and if such extreme cases are allowed to be put, why may not I assume a similar right, and put a case also. What would your lordships think, if it should be found that nomination boroughs have been in the possession of Jews and brokers, who, if it be possible, and that it is possible I need only refer to facts on record, is to secure us against the introduction into the House of Commons of an alien enemy? Who will say that another Nabob of Arcot shall not again send in his 18 or 20 members. Where are all the sacred rights of Englishmen? Where all the influence of property if a Nabob of Arcot can come with his treasures of Star Pagodas, and send his 20 members into the House of Commons? I am not my lords putting an extreme case, for I am stating facts which have actually happened, we have never heard of a town of 4,000 paupers, but we have heard of jobbing agents in Parliamentary representation, and it is to destroy forever such a traffic that this bill has been introduced. It has been said that freemen could vote who had been paupers. Whoever attended an election, and did not see questions put and mooted before the Assessor, and decided by the Assessor, against freemen voting because they had received parish relief? But to talk of property as the criterion of power, of eligibility, betokened one of the greatest inattentions either to the consistency of argument, or to the known facts of the case. The right of voting is at present enjoyed, as regards boroughs, by the following class of persons:—inhabitant householders paying scot and lot—[there are very few such boroughs in England,] by freemen resident and non-resident as much as the resident were entitled to exercise the elective franchise in by far the greater number of individual burgage tenures, which, it is said, are property. Let me remind noble lords that it is not the property of the noble lord who is a borough proprietor; but is it the property of the voter; he receives his burgage qualification by a conveyance at two o'clock in the afternoon, he votes for the nominee of a real burgage borough at three o'clock, and at four he delivers up to the Lord's solicitor his title to his vote, to be used the next time of an election; and that you call a property qualification! It is an abuse of terms to say so, of a right of property in somebody else; but, my Lords, be assured that it is worse than an abuse of terms that the other person should hold the right, for it is an abuse of the Constitution. Are we not dealing with the question of a representative form of Government? Are we not arguing of what ought to consist the House of Commons? And the answer made on all occasions is—this a rank representation, this amounts to downright election—this is neither more nor less than the people choosing their own representatives—this is neither more nor less than a new imagined, most intolerable, abominable, inconsistent, detestable, pernicious doctrine, that the psople should have votes in the choice of members of Parliament. We are then asked, when was any time when any such things were known in England—or any such rights voted—or when the present system was not? I will not remind your lordships that this will not do, because it does not carry us back even to the restoration—I will not remind your lordships that Edward IV. added so many boroughs—Edward VI. so many, and restored 20—that good Queen Elizabeth added 48 and 12, viz. 60—and that down to the restoration somewhere between 200 were revived and created; but as to what my noble and Learned Friend said, I am bound to tell your lordships (and I shall prefer giving it in the words of the author) what a certain Mr. Prynne says; and what is said by a sage of the law, who never had the fortune to incur judicial vengence for the honesty of his political opinions. Writing soon after the restoration, Mr. Prynne enumerated 64 boroughs, 14 in Cornwall, as all new, "and for the most part," he says, "the Universities excepted, very mean, poor, inconsiderable boroughs. set up by a late return, by the practice of Sheriffs, or Gentlemen desiring to serve them, by courting, bribing, (this is the origin of the venerable part of the Constitution, which has existed time out of mind; not from Richard I. but only previous to the restoration,) feasting, not by prescription or charter, some few excepted, since the reign of Edward IV. before whose reign they never elected or returned members in any English Parliament." And now onward as to another authority which my noble friend will allow me to refer to, as that of the House of Commons itself exhibited in the report of a Committee in the years 1623, 1624, of which Mr. S. Granville was chairman and Reporter and which consisted of some of the greatest lawyers ever known in the history of either House. Those great sages of the law were Coke, Selwyn, and Noy, whom I name with Coke and Selwyn, because they were on one side of the House; and Noy, who was afterwards Attorney-General, was well known for his high monarchical principles.—The first resolution was this—'that there being no ancient custom or prescription who should be elected or who should not, we must have recourse to what is common right, which for this purpose was held to be, that more than freeholders ought to have voices in elections, viz. all inhabitant householders resident within the borough." What then becomes of the doctrine invented for the purpose of this debate, that the old law of England is, that inhabitants shall not have the right—that householders shall not have the right—but that the right belongs to the burgage tenant—to freeholders and to corporations? To burgage tenants it belongs in the way I have stated, and it never did belong to them in the present form—but they who really were voters were real *bona fide* voters of a burgage tenement; but to inhabitant householders with a £10 qualification, but to all householders—householders whose houses were not worth £1 a year. Every inhabitant having a house over his head—be it worth 1s, be it worth £1,000—had a right to vote; and I will take upon me to lay down, upon the authority I have stated, as the law of the land, that, if the Crown was ever allowed to issue a writ to Manchester or Birmingham, to choose members of Parliament, there being no custom or prescription or corporation, that writ would call upon every householder, at common law, to vote. What then became of prescription, custom, or corporate right? I say it is usurpation—not a common right. Coke, Selwyn, Noy, Granville, say that the common right is for every inhabitant householder to vote. Are we speculators, innovators, revolutionists, idle dreamers, and fanciers of things, when we have, in fact, only limited an ancient right—we have not even gone to the extent of it; and that is the object and origin of the £10 qualification. I have heard a great deal in the course of this debate, of the extravagance of this bill. Says one noble lord, it gives us only a set of voters who must be occupied in earning their daily bread, and who have not time to instruct themselves, and attend to State affairs. His noble Friend who lives in Birmingham, and is therefore expected to know more than I think he does, laughs and sneers at the statesmen of Birmingham and the philosophers of Manchester. I say that the noble lord will yet learn a lesson of political wisdom from the statesmen of Birmingham, and of temperance and moderation from the philosophers of Manchester. My noble Friend was ill advised when he displayed his talent and sarcasm with refereuce to 180,000 persons—he was ill advised in his sarcasm—he did little to lay in a stock of credit for the Order to which he belongs, and of which he is a distinguished ornament; and instead of meeting their moderation, their respectful demeanour, their affectionate attachment signalised in every one of the petitions with which they have approached this House, with a return of courteous kindness and common civility, showing that he prided himself on knowing hexametar and pentametar, and derided the knowledge of the manufacturers of Manchester and Birmingham. Though I would not hear them, though for all that my ears could afford, read one single verse—and though I would not allow them to approach, even within the distance of sight, with one single epigram in the mother tongue, either in prose, or numeric verse—yet I, as their Representative in other respects, for I have represented them in the Commons House of Parliament, while yet I had no constituents of my own, and they had no member of their own—nay more, they have none, and much they have felt the want of this member—though the noble lord stated that it was a hardship that they had none—I now once more, representing them, bow, in all manner of prosody—[the noble lord suited the action to a word]—in all matter of prose, in all matter of education—nay, even in elegance of personal demeanour—(a laugh)—I bow for them, and hide their and my diminished head, as God knows both of us well may do, in the presence of my noble friend; but to say that I would take his opinion upon any practical matter—upon any unknown light—upon any subject of action—upon any one of those manly questions which engage the statesmen, the lawyer, the philosopher in practice—to say that I would put his opinion in competition with that of those steady, gallant, rational, judicious, reflecting, and, because an unaffected, entirely trustworthy men as regards their judgment, to which they always give fair play—I would not be so gross in friendship—I cannot go so far as te make him even dream of such a compliment. A noble lord near the table had objected to the Bill because the individuals to be chosen by large towns would not be Representatives, but delegates. But what argument was there in mere assertion? Did the noble lord mean to say that it was less honourable to be a delegate from a large community than from one delegator? Was it worse to be the delegate of a borough than the delegate of a borough proprietor? The person who was sent to Parliament by any number, from two, to fourteen, was as much a delegate as he who was sent by 4,000; but the difference was this, that the one was a delegate from some noble lord, or attorney, or Jew broker; and was as much nominated by one or other of them, as the Representative who was chosen by 4,000 persons, which delegate had been described as false and hypocritical, though he represented the country, while the other represented only the interest of one individual. But, the noble lord had said he had no great objection to give the franchise to large towns, whenever any borough became delinquent, and forfeited its privileges. Now, was there ever a more monstrous proposition than this? Does he mean that Old Sarum is to be allowed to send representatives as long as it is unconvicted, while Birmingham was to remain unrepresented? Did the noble lord mean that members ought not to enter Parliament by the high open road, but sneak in by means of some nasty, dirty, by-way of a rotten borough? The noble lord said he would give the franchise to Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, and Birmingham, on a certain condition—on a conviction for bribery and corruption in some borough. Was there ever any thing so fantastical as this? Could any thing be so absurd as to say 'Hang up these large and important towns, which have done no wrong, till you find some borough guilty, and then admit them to take the place of the convicted? He might as well say to Mr. Johnston or Mr. This, or Mr. That, I want from you 10 acres of land which belong to me; but Mr. Johnston would say, You cannot have these acres till my Lord Something, or Mr. Thompson has stolen 150*l.* and is hanged, but I will not give you the land till such an event takes place, because till then it is my undoubted right and property. Would not every one say that I was a fool, and that you were unjust to allow me to wait for my right from Mr. Johnston till my Lord Something or Mr. Thompson had committed a felony?—a (laugh.) This, though it might excite a laugh, was the real state of the question.—There was a mighty danger in treating such a question with neglect, or in refusing to look it in the face. He would say, and say it without fear of contradiction, that there never was any system defended by high Tories, by high Monarchy men, or by subjects of any description—no system, in short, described in romance for the last 120 years, so absurd as the present system; for if there was one system more absurd than another, it was the system which allowed rotten boroughs to return representatives, while large and wealthy towns were doomed to exclusion. [hear.] He would humbly endeavour to show that the King, by the oath which he took at the coronation, was authorized to adopt the principles on which this question of reform was founded. He would appeal to the words addressed by the most Rev. Prelate to his most gracious Majesty at that great solemnity, when he delivered the sword of justice into his hand. The most Rev. Prelate said 'You promise that you will restore that which is gone into decay, maintain that which is restored, reform that which is amiss, and confirm in good order. He would use the same words, and say confirm in good order, confirm the franchise to those who enjoy it by right, and confirm it not only to copyholders, but also to such of those paying scot and lot who had lost it from negligence or disuse. He might also say reform that which is amiss, and which has gone into decay; and while he had the honor to serve his Royal master, he would lend his heart and best abilities to enable him to fulfil the injunction—to restore what was gone into decay, and reform that which was amiss—[hear, hear.] He was ready to make every sacrifice to enable his Royal master to fulfil such an engagement, and if it was said, 'Hitherto shalt thou come, and here shall thy waves be stayed,' though the surge should dash over him, he would maintain that which was restored. So much for the argument in favour of the old Constitution. He had endeavoured to show from Coke and Selden that the present system was not that which formerly existed, and putting aside these authorities, he would only ask if there could possibly be a more monstrous absurdity than a borough without electors, and a Parliament without constituents? Was it not absurd in the highest degree, that while changes were going on in every quarter, there should be no change in the mode of obtaining seats in Parliament; that, in short, while history bore testimony to constant changes in almost every parson of the Constitution, the people were to have no change in their representation. He might illustrate the necessity and propriety of change by reference to the old law, as compared with the present. The old law says if a man cannot pay in money he must pay in property and goods. Now this part of the law was framed when there were no bank notes; no bankers, as now, issuing paper of every description; and even the most fastidious lawyer, however much he might be against reform, could not deny that this reform had been made tacitly in law and in practice. Looking, too, at the Courts of law; looking at the first Court, next to that of their lordships, the Court of King's Bench, was there any man who could stand up and say that it had, or ought always to remain in the same state? Such an assertion hardly deserved a reply; and the assertion that the constituency ought not to be changed was equally futile. It was the height of futility to charge those who introduced the measure as innovators and changers, while those who opposed the measure were the only persons who deserved the name.—He was bound to say, with all proper respect for the public, and with all due deference to the public opinion, yet as an honest man, as a Minister of the Crown, and as a Magistrate—the first Magistrate in the Kingdom, he was bound to say that a combination to refuse to pay taxes was an unlawful act. He said this with a full persuasion that it was impossible for many thousands who were at that meeting to hear what passed there; but he also felt persuaded that the spirit of those who did hear pervaded nearly all the rest. He trusted those persons would consider their opinions, for the spirit which pervaded that meeting was a most unhappy one, if it should extend itself. Indeed, the principle it involved, and its consequences, would be so frightfully extensive, that Government would be resolved into its elements if it were not put down. (Loud cheers). He could have no better opportunity, if he desired popularity, of offering up incence to the popular idol than that which then presented itself. No Juggernaut could receive greater praise than might be drawn from those 150,000 gods; but he objected to their conduct; he had no hesitation in saying that it was intolerable, and that he wished to put an end to it. (Hear, hear,) If the people were represented, such combinations would be utterly useless, they would be a mere *brutem fulmen*, for they could not exist an hour unless they were universal; but if they knew that they had no Member of Parliament to represent them, then, he would say that such combinations were all but legal. Why then not do that which ought to be done, even if no such symptoms existed of popular discontent? He would implore their Lordships, by every argument of kindness and justice to the people on the one hand, and by every argument of prudence and consideration towards themselves, to adopt the course which wise and prudential statesmen would adopt in such an awful crisis. [hear, hear,] He trusted they would listen to the prayers of the people and adopt the principle of the present Bill—nor, if they choose, without sifting, and examination, and modification, if necessary, but that they would at all events adopt it: and that above all things they would not reject it—that they would not insult the people by saying—'God forbid that we should entertain this Bill'—(loud cheers from the Ministerial benches.) Their lordships appeared to think that this Bill touched them more nearly than the rest of the nation—(cries of 'No, no,' from the Opposition side). He certainly so understood their Lordships; but he was delighted that he had their lordships on that side of the House to go with him one step—[a laugh]. They must however, go with him another step also. It not only did not more peculiarly concern them than others, but it concerned them much less. He would just ask their Lordships to put themselves, as his Noble Friend (Lord Plunket) had asked them last night to do, in the place of others. Let them place themselves in the situation of other people, and suppose that a bill materially affecting the Peers were sent to the House of Commons. Suppose a Bill were to be passed by their lordships relative to the Scotch or Irish Peers holding seats in that House; or a Bill regulating the tenure of the Peerage generally; or in such cases as that of Lord Huntingdon. Suppose such a Bill should after passing their lordships, find its way to the House of Commons. He would suppose that their lordships set great store by this Bill, and that every Peer in that House thought it of the highest importance to their order. He would suppose that all letters from the Scotch and Irish Peers, who were not Members of the House—that all advices were calling upon them to help their countrymen by getting the measure passed. He would suppose further that the Bill had passed their lordships' house by a majority in the proportion of 100 to one which was about the majority by which the present Bill passed the Commons, taking into account only the real representatives of the people, though to avoid all cavil he would take it at 50 to one. He would then suppose that the moment the Bill came on for discussion in the Commons, an Hon. Member of that House would get up and declare that they would not be dictated to by the Peers—[hear, hear]—that they would deal with the matter as they thought proper, and they would not even allow it to go into the Committee (loud cheers from the Ministerial side.) He should further suppose that a motion should be made, waiving the usual courtesey of getting rid of it by moving that it be rejected. [hear, hear.] He would yet also suppose that in the course of the debate it should be discovered that this motion was calculated to offend their Lordships—and that another Commoner, after stating that the original mover had given vent to his [the latter's] feelings better than he could have done himself, should move, between one and two o'clock in the morning, in the room of the honest motion, that this aristocratic Bill be got rid of, an alteration, which, though differing in words, was, in effect, the same, namely, that the Bill should be read a second time that day three months. He would then suppose that the House of Commons should refuse to negotiate with the Bill, which did not at all affect themselves, should refuse to parley with such a revolutionary and aristocratic measure, should refuse to take it all into its consideration, and reject it without allowing it to go to the Committee; and then he would put it to their Lordships, whether they would feel that such conduct on the part of the House of Commons was at all courteous towards themselves? (much cheering.) He would also imagine that all this while there was not one single Commissioner who did not think that some change was necessary, though they characterized the one before them as being intolerable to themselves (the Commons), pernicious to the people, neither of whom it at all affected, and hurtful and dangerous to the Peers themselves; and then they all say, out with this measure, away with this unclean thing out of our camp. [Hear, hear.] He believed he might fearlessly assert, that there was not one among their Lordships who would not say that this was not the right way in which to treat a bill which had been sent to that house by the House of Peers, which bill related exclusively to matters connected with the Peerage. [hear, hear.] Was it, then, he would ask, the right way to treat as their Lordships had partly done, a Bill coming from the Commons relating to Parliamentary reform? Was it right that their Lordships should refuse to consider of it in detail? When the Peerage Bill, in the time of Sir Robert Walpole, was sent down to the House of Commons, there was a majority of 120 against it; but the House of Commons, though they ultimately rejected the Bill, did not even divide upon the second reading. [hear.] Their Lordships surely ought to adopt towards them the same courtesy. [hear, hear] It had been asked what great benefits would result from this measure. If he should single out one, he would show that he was not a person who sought to be worshipped out of doors, and he would state that there was strong reason for passing this Bill. Their Lordships were now on the brink of a great event—they were on the eve of the awful decision upon this question, and it behoved them to consider well when men told them they should not yield to clamour. There could be no worse folly—no baser, nor more despicable fear than that of being accused of fear—(hear, hear). He spoke then in the same hall in which their lordships sat in 1828, when he heard, though less regularly than at present, that mean argument urged against the emancipation of the Roman Catholics. Your Lordships said then that the times were troubled, that too much clamour existed, and for fear of being thought to yield to fear, your Lordships rejected the bill. This was in July. The summer passed away, the autumn came, but it brought not with it the boon of domestic peace; the rage went on until a Catholic was returned to a Protestant Parliament. The winter came, and with it also so came an increase of agitation. Spring came on, and the agitation became fiercer, and a more restless spirit pervaded Ireland; a spirit far more extensive than that which existed on the July proceeding. What did their Lordships do then? The only change which had taken place was the lapse of seven months, and an augmentation of the danger, and an enhancement of the agitation. What did their Lordships do? They acted wisely and patriotically, and firmly, and honestly, and they saved their country by not attending to the cuckoo note of those who said that they ought not to yield to intimidation—(continued cheers.) It was needless for him to say that if that argument which had been listened to in July had any weight, it must have had ten thousand fold more weight the April following, for then the Catholic body was more powerful. If that argument had been listened to for 20 years preceding the time, he would assert that that mon-