

**ENGLAND.**

The marquis of Londonderry said he was anxious to claim their lordship's attention at that moment in consequence of the personal attack which had been made upon him by the noble marquis—an attack at which he was much surprised, as he was not conscious of having ever given the noble marquis any personal offence.

The marquis of Lansdowne begged to disclaim all intention of offering the Noble Marquis any personal offence.

The marquis of Londonderry, after declaring himself perfectly satisfied with the noble Marquis's declaration, proceeded to say that he did not think the noble marquis had answered one single argument of the many which had been so ably urged by the noble earl near him on the preceding evening. The noble marquis then launched forth into that declamation in which he so highly excelled ; but he would to the noble marquis what was the difference between his declamation and the arguments of the noble earl. The speech of the noble earl had torn the Bill to pieces ; and the noble marquis, with all his great power of declamation, had not been able to re-establish it in any one part. For himself he considered that the bill was unjust, unconstitutional, and unprincipled ; and he would tell their lordships why. He considered it was unjust because it robbed large classes of the people of their vested rights ; he considered it was unconstitutional because it subverted all the great institutions of the country ; and he considered it unprincipled because, if noble lords would look to what took place in another house, they would see that the Government had departed, in the progress of the measure, from every principle on which they set forward, and had spitted their ground as often and in all ways which they thought likely to keep them in power. He also accused the Ministers of partiality in the details of the bill ; and begged particularly to call their lordships attention to the cases of the counties of Durham, Northumberland, and Cumberland. There was another point in reference to that part of the north in which he had some interest to which in consequence of the absence of his noble friend [Durham], he felt some difficulty in adverting ; but he felt so strongly upon the subject that he could not pass it over altogether in silence. He alluded to the case of the free-men of Durham, and wished their lordships to observe the extreme hardship which had been there inflicted on a large body of men. He did not believe the Reformers would be satisfied with this bill, extensive as was the change it would effect. The noble earl must feel that universal suffrage and the vote by ballot were behind it, and that they would inevitably follow.

—Earl Grey.—No. 20.

Earl Grey—No, no.

The Marquis of Londonderry maintained, notwithstanding the disclaimer of the noble earl, that the people would not be satisfied with this Bill. The Reformers having established the first parallel, never would be satisfied until they had carried the place. As an Irishman he felt most strongly respecting the dreadful evils which must ensue from this measure. Ireland, directed,—as it unfortunately was, by a single organ, would not be content with the Reform Bill. It would be merely regarded as a step towards a repeal of the Union; and he was perfectly well persuaded that if the Bill passed it would have the effect of delivering up Ireland to the Roman Catholics, and so destroying the Protestant interests in that country, and the Protestant Church. [hear, hear.] As nearly as he could judge from calculation of the numbers and dispositions of the ten pound voters in Ireland, there would be seventy-two members of the House of Commons, out of the members allowed by the new arrangement, hostile to Protestant interests and the Protestant Church, and eager to promote a repeal of the Union. (hear, hear.) He protested against the recent elevations to their Lordship's House, as in one sense unconstitutional. He considered it unjust and improper and unconstitutional that any man should be allowed an opportunity of giving two votes upon the same question in different places. He hoped the noble earl at the head of the Government, would yet return to those noble sentiments he had once expressed, that he would redeem his pledge of standing by his order—that, though late, he would adopt that line of policy which would carry the country through its dangers—and that he would abandon a measure which he ought never to have brought forward. He also hoped that no further attempts would be made to use the Sovereign's name to promote a measure destructive of the Constitution. It was most improper and most inoleorous to lay together the name of the Sovereign and the sovereignty of the people. (hear.) He protested against it as most unconstitutional. He likewise protested against the style and nature of the appeal which the noble earl had made to the Right Reverend Bench. Did the noble earl dare to suppose that Right Reverend Bench was not guided and actuated by feelings of honor? [hear.] It was a most unconstitutional proceeding. Why should any Peer doubt that the courage and consistency and honour of that Right Reverend Bench was as high and enduring as his own? (hear.) He would not trouble their Lordships with any farther observations? He was glad that he had risen to declare his intention to oppose the Bill; and he was happy in being able to record his humble prayer to the noble earl at the head of the government to reconsider the subject under discussion, and pause before he farther attempted to urge their Lordships to a step which could not be recalled. (hear.)

The Earl of Haddington and Lord Goderich rose together, and the calls upon each of the noble lords from their respective friends continued for some time, and it was moved that each be heard.

The Duke of Richmond rose to order. He believed that it was usual for their Lordships to hear both sides of any question upon which they undertook to decide; and as they had just heard one speech against the measure, he thought their Lordships in justice would now listen to one of its supporters.

The Earl of Haddington having given way, Lord Brougham rose and said that throughout the many incidental discussions which had arisen upon this important question he had studiously avoided troubling their Lordships. But if he had the feelings of a man, and was worthy of the honor of sitting in their Lordship's House, it was impossible for him to sit silent after the charge which had been adduced against the Members of His Majesty's Government, as the authors of the measure then under discussion, by a Noble Friend of his, in the end of his Speech on the previous night, in which they were accused of having committed a crime, the penalty of which would have to be incurred by their political opponents. If he were capable of any act which justly exposed him to such an accusation he should be ashamed to shew his face before their Lordships or before his country; and he denied that the conduct of

the government, with regard to this measure, was of such a character. It had been stated truly by his noble friend that this was not a new question. It had been discussed at intervals during the last 60 or 70 years, and it appeared to him worthy of remark that, when it was first proposed for discussion to the House of Commons, with how little of disfavour it was received, and that, too, in a House of Commons not such as might have been supposed likely to have received favourably any thing in the shape of dangerous innovation. The course of events towards the close of the last century had been calculated to fill the minds of all men with distrust of change; and if he for one had been living at that time, and in a condition to take part in political affairs, he could not have brought himself to support any proposition of that nature. But although time and circumstances might suspend the consideration of the question, he was convinced it was one of such a nature that although it might slumber for a time it could never sleep; or that if it should sometimes be even wrapt in sleep, yet that there was something in the constitution of society, and in the character of men's minds, which rendered it impossible that it ever should remain at rest and be forgotten. During the course of the last war events thickened upon each other calculated to produce a desire on the part of the people to have a change in the representation. The very duration of that war, and the almost miraculous changes which it created in the state of society, produced a state of things which in many respects might be called unnatural. In the midst of that long career of glories added to British fame, from—[we did not hear the first victory]—to Trafalgar, and he would add from Blenheim to Waterloo, changes of a most extraordinary nature had been going on in society. In the midst of much apparent and also of much real prosperity there had been great reverses; while interests had been destroyed, or had given place to others which had grown up; and from time to time property of every description had been liable to fluctuations, which never occurred without bringing much of loss and ruin in their train. Scarcely an interest, commercial or manufacturing, in the country, but had partaken of the most alarming, sudden, and frequently recurring periods of depression. What was the effect of all this? He would not say that it was a just or a reasonable inference to draw from such premises, but it was nevertheless unquestionably true, that the people had more or less come to the conclusion that all the distress and difficulty which they had suffered was to be attributed to the false and vicious constitution of the House of Commons. He was not one of those who joined in that belief. (cheers.) He was not a supporter of the measure before their Lordships because he thought the constitution of this Country incapable of working for its good. (cheers.) It would be a libel upon that Constitution, a libel upon the generation who had lived and prospered under it, were he to do so. (cheers.) But he would say that it was not to be wondered at that a people who saw themselves living under a system by which they were now elevated beyond a reasonable prosperity, and now reversed to a state of suffering almost too great to be endured, and who saw that system maintained by the House of Commons, should be disposed to attribute such results to the constitution of that House. Under these circumstances, he contended that true policy demanded of them that they should concede something to those who felt so strongly that a change was necessary to their good, even if the accuracy of such opinion could not be clearly sustained.—But during the period to which he had alluded had nothing occurred calculated to give force to those impressions on the part of the people? No one could be blind to the fact that during that time a practice had grown up, or at least very greatly increased, as well in its frequency as in the open and undistinguished manner of its operation, which was not known in the earlier times of the constitution—he meant the practice of buying and selling seats in Parliament [hear, hear.] He believed that this practice was first publicly noticed it had been in existence before, yet then and even since, until very recently, it had been carried on under the decent veil of mystery. Now, however, it had come to be openly declared notorious as the sun at noon-day, and he had heard it in that House, and he knew it had been so in another—he had heard it lauded as necessary to the preservation of the interests of the Peerage and the balance of the Constitution.—[Hear, hear.]—These facts were known to the people, who at the same time knew that the practice so lauded was a violation of the laws of the land. The people of England were not fools, and it was impossible to make them reconcile it to their minds that that which the law denounced as a crime should be recommended to their practice as a virtue. [hear, hear.] With a system of representation in which the law and the practice contradicted each other it was not wonderful that the people of England found it impossible to dissociate in their minds that anomaly and the existence of anomalous boroughs. But they had heard it said that the existence of some such access to Parliament was necessary, and that without it was impossible the machine of government should go on. Now he had never heard it pointed out by those who made such an objection, upon what principle any particular borough were to be selected for the purpose of returning the ministers of the Crown. It was evident that any such selection must be an act of injustice to those who should be disfranchised, and so far from diminishing or palliating discontent, he believed it would be the surest mode of propagating it to all eternity. His noble friend opposite had not only objected to the measure that it had no principle, but also to the principle upon which he afterwards said that it was founded. He

had said that the principle of population having been acknowledged they would be compelled to go to the full extent of that principle; and then that the measure was defective and would prove unsatisfactory. He also understood his noble friend to have said that they ought to have taken a limited principle of population combined with the principle of taxation. Now he denied that they had taken population at all upon the principle stated by his noble friend; but he maintained that they had taken it in conjunction with taxation. The proof of this was to be found in the papers upon their lordships' table shewing the proportion of assessed taxes paid, first in the towns to be disfranchised by the bill, and, second, in the towns to which they proposed to give the franchise. ["hear," from the opposition.] If that did not prove that the two principles had been taken, why were the papers there. [hear, hear, and a laugh.] He cared not at whose call they had been produced; they had them there, and were enabled to take them in conjunction with population in disposing of the question. [hear.] His noble friend had also drawn a glowing and beautiful picture of the effect of the present system in preparing those who were to succeed their lordships in that house for the discharge

of their high and important duties. Undoubtedly the introduction of the sons of peers into the other house of parliament was an admirable and a most useful practice in the constitution. They were there initiated in the forms of public business, and, by mixing freely with their superiors and inferiors, encountered that sort of footing which rubbed off the rust that otherwise must adhere to them from the retired habits of their station. But should he be told that the nomination system was necessary to produce this good? [cheers.] How many examples could he mention then, and in all former times, where the counties of England were represented by the eldest sons of peers? At this moment there was the case of the noble lord at the head of the Government, whose son sat for the county of Northampton, a county for which his noble friend himself had also the honour to sit, until his political principles lost him the confidence of the freeholders. Besides Northumberland there were the counties of York, Lancaster, Derby, Lincoln; and indeed he might go through the whole list of the counties of England, and state that they had been represented at some time or other by the sons of peers. Long, he trusted, would this continue to be the case; and how honorable and useful must such a connection between the peerage and the people be, compared with sneaking into parliament through a nomination borough [hear, hear,] or competing with the still dirtier avenue of 5,000*l*. By a county election the benefits arising from contact and intercourse with the people, through a spirited contest upon that noble arena, answered both parties; and it was there that the finest public qualities were often first called into action and appreciated. It was by scenes of that description that each class of society was taught to know the value of the other, and to be sensible of the mutual benefits they interchanged. He never would form such an opinion of the good sense, the feeling, and the gratitude of the people of England as to believe that they would not continue under the bill before the house to choose the sons of peers for their representatives. But what would be said to Scotland? In Scotland where the system of representation was so exalted for having produced the happiest results, and made its people the happiest and most contented in the world—in Scotland the eldest son of a peer could not sit for a county in parliament; the law disqualified him. He thought such a state of the law bad, and it was one of the objects of this bill, to correct it; so that here they should have a wide door opened to the connections of the peerage into the house of Commons by the bill. But did more it also opened an additional number of members to the counties through which they would retain their connection with the electors, without stooping, as it had been said they must do, to seek for mob popularity. God forbid that he should ever see the heirs apparent of the peers of England so degenerate as that. [cheers.] But was said that in the towns they had created a ten-pound franchise, and that with such a constituency none would find their way into the house of Commons but persons who had spent their lives in obtaining popularity amongst that class. As this was only conjecture he had only conjecture to oppose it; and upon the strength of all former experience he denied that any such results were likely to follow the adoption of this bill. Experience proved that large bodies of voters were ready to elect a bank director an East India director, or any other gentleman who offered himself to them with the recommendation of wealth, talent or character. When he saw Hull, Liverpool, Newcastle, Bristol, and other places, with large constituencies, returning members who were strangers to them, except by their principles and talent, he saw nothing that should prevent them doing the same hereafter. In the course of the debate their Lordships had frequently been referred to the French Revolution—he did not mean the last, but that which had been accompanied by so many horrors. A noble lord opposite had said that he hoped that his noble friend at the head of the Government was not going to be the Necker of this country. He believed that his noble friend had no such intention. But he would tell those who attributed the evils of the French Revolution to the actual Mr. Necker that they overlooked the history of France, (hear, hear.) In France there was a corrupt Court, and a degraded Peerage—degraded as much by their conduct as by the exclusive privileges they possessed—(hear, hear)—and he might add, almost with just truth, an enslaved people. These were the causes which led to those lamentable and fatal events which covered the land with mourning, which desolated Europe, and which produced evils from which, he feared, the world would never entirely recover. (cheers.) If they wished to trace those evils to their sources and foundations, they must look for them in that state of society which he had described, or they might be drawn into acts the consequence of which they also should never be able to retrieve; while, on the contrary, by looking steadily at the landmarks of experience and history, they would be found beacons to guide them on their way, and to lead them eventually into the port of safety. And now he would impress upon their lordships with one word as to himself, regretting deeply that he had to trouble them with a subject so unworthy. In advocating this measure of reform, some noble lords could boast that they made a sacrifice of great personal influence and power. He had neither the one nor the other. He had made a sacrifice, however, to the cause of reform of many preconceived opinions, of many personal predilections, of many highly cherished and highly valued attachments—sacrifices which he could not have made had he not been supported by the consciousness of honest intentions, and guided by a determination that no personal considerations should be allowed any weight in his mind when opposed to the substantial interests of the country. (hear, hear.)

The Earl of Harrington rejoiced that he had been preceded by his noble friend, to whom he gave full credit for the principles by which he professed to have been guided in the change of opinion he had undergone ; and their lordships would believe him when he said that he was equally free from any other bias or motive to the course he should pursue, opposed as it was to that of his noble friend, than an anxious desire to maintain the unabated warfare and prosperity of the country. His noble friend had entered into a history of the excitement which now prevailed in the country upon the subject of reform, and had endeavoured to explain its progressive growth. The fact, however, was, that this feeling had not been progressive, that it had only exhibited itself on particular emergencies and by sudden starts, and that it was now mainly to be ascribed to the events which had taken place upon the continent, and to the impudent encouragement it had received from His Majesty's Government. The Noble Viscount said that all men now bore testimony to the importance and necessity of reform, and that all now expressed themselves reformers. And to a certain extent this was true. Many who hitherto opposed all reform were now

friendly to such a measure ; but the reform and the only reform in which they could acquiesce must be a reform founded upon the known principles of the Constitution. This was no new ground, nor was it ground taken in that debate for the first time. But upon the general theoretical principles of reform he and all those who would vote with him on the present occasion, adhered strictly to their former opinions. (Cheers.) He was now as much disposed as ever to contend, and his noble friend, unless he relinquished every opinion he had formerly maintained, must admit that any change of the institutions of this country founded upon general theoretic principles, would be pregnant with danger. (Cheers.) His noble friend said that the revolution of 1688, the Union with Scotland, and subsequently the Union with Ireland, were facts which went to prove the power of the constitution of the country to adopt itself to circumstances. But it might be, he observed, that all these changes were founded upon the principles of the Constitution. A noble friend of his last night quoted a passage from the writings of Lord Bacon, to show that the object ought always to be to secure as much of permanence as possible in institutions founded upon popular consent ; and he then proceeded to contend that permanence in our present institutions was impossible, because the popular consent failed. But the noble lord did not say that it was necessary to make this particular change. The noble Lord asserted that Birmingham had grown great in wealth and importance, and that it was therefore necessary to give representatives to Birmingham. This he believed to be true. But when the noble lord added that it was so for the whole question, he denied that it was so ; for the noble lord himself said further, that the whole country having grown in wealth and intelligence, it was therefore necessary to new-model the whole representation. This proposition he denied. Could it be contended that because great masses of wealth and population had been accumulated in particular places that it was necessary to introduce a Bill, founded upon the principle of disfranchisement ? But disfranchisement was the principle of this Bill. The Bill began with disfranchisement, and then the grant of new rights followed. Was it necessary because Birmingham had become a great town to new-model the whole representation of the county of Warwick ? Was it necessary on this account to trample upon the chartered rights of the freemen throughout England ? His noble friend, whose health he rejoiced to find had permitted him to come there to defend the institution of the country—and he sincerely wished that the state of his health would allow him to take a more frequent part in their deliberations, and that share to which his talents so well entitled him in the management of public affairs—the noble earl (Harrowby) had said in his admirable speech, and justly said, that population was the only principle of the bill. His noble friend who spoke last said, on the contrary, that the bill proceeded upon other principles than that of population. This he doubted, or at least he would say, that if other principles had been taken as their guide they had widely departed from them. He found that additional members were given to counties which did not pay assessed taxes equal in amount to other counties to which the same advantage was not given. He found also that some of the boroughs which were inserted in schedule A paid a greater amount of assessed taxes than others which were in schedule B. If this were so, what, he begged leave to ask, became of property as a principle of the bill ? If a population of 4,000 entitled a place to two members, and a population of 2,000 to one member, there would not long be wanting persons to tell them that a place of 150,000 inhabitants ought to have more than two members, and a place of 10,000 inhabitants more than one. He was told that this principle was making every active progress among the philosophic inquirers of Birmingham and elsewhere, and it was evidently a principle which could only be satisfied by the division of the Country into electoral districts. His noble friend had said that this was the pure abstract theory of population. The noble earl had not said so. He said that they took the number of the people as a basis, and warned them that others might adapt the pure abstract theory of population. He held in his hand a very able performance, in which the author expressed his amazement that such a plan as the present should have been introduced. He said that the question of reform was not now of disfranchising some boroughs and giving the right of representation to others, but that it was a question of comparison between British and American system of representation. He said that the question was not whether forty-seven places should have some one and some two members, but whether when numbers were once adopted as a rule the people would be contented to stop there. He could not say that if the people should be disposed to claim the right of representation in the exact proportion of their number they would not have as good a right as the voters of an enfranchised borough. Then he said that those who had the rule of three on their side would be in the right. Mr. Canning could answer them, but Lord John Russell could not. The bill presented a rule-of-three question with a blundering method of working. The whole continent of Europe was looking upon our conduct with wonder and amazement. They were astonished at our readiness to abandon a constitution hitherto the object of their admiration—to renounce institutions upon which we had attained to the highest pinnacle of greatness and glory—to forsake the institutions which had enabled us to maintain so many arduous struggles, and gave us the power to maintain ourselves as the rallying point to the civilization of the world. At what were they aiming that they were thus willing to launch the nation upon the ocean of experiment, and to construct theories, for the purpose of amending what required no amendment ? But as to the disfranchising part of the measure all he wanted to know was why all the freemen of England were to be disfranchised. His noble friend said that many of the corporations were corrupt, but it was equally true that some of them were not so. He once represented a borough which was as honest as any place in the world could be—the market city of Rochester. But if some of the boroughs were corrupt, why not apply a remedy by letting in other voters ? It was very easy ; they might have ten-pounded them as much as they liked, but displaced them for other men in no respect better than themselves. They displaced the freemen, but whom did they put in their place ? [hear, hear.] The men who paid 2s. 6d. or 3s. 10d. per week for their lodging. He asked if these persons were not as much liable to bribery as the existing class of freemen ? There were some places where the occupation of a residence of less than 10l. a year entitled persons to become paupers ; and during the present session there was a bill in parliament which exempted from the payment of poor rates all persons so situated. There were now, it was said, a great number of bribeable subjects, and this class of voters

were to be added to all the other bribables subjected previously in existence. Then they violated all the principles of justice by depriving the children of freedom of their corporate rights. What had the present generation of freemen done that their children should be deprived of their rights? What had the ten-pounders done that they should be preferred to the five-pounders? He objected to the principle of disfranchisement. If the freemen were corrupt a remedy for this might have been found without any violation of right. This was a very serious thing. He had never maintained that political trusts were to be considered the same as private property. Those who attempted, did so in his opinion, to maintain an ultra opinion and an untenable position. But the political trust being mixed with political rights, which gave value to social position, and in many cases added value to property with political rights, which could be maintained in a court of law, it followed that in withdrawing the trust they committed an unnecessary violation of legal rights. This doctrine was laid down in another place by a right honorable baronet (Sir R. Peel) and he remembered having been much struck by his argument upon this part of the subject. This principle of confiscation, combined with that of the bill, was decidedly objectional, and had an inseparable connection with the disfranchisement of nomination boroughs, or the gift of representation to large towns. He ventured to say that if the noble earl had brought forward a measure comprehending the two latter objects only it would not have experienced as determined a resistance. They were twitted with not bringing forward any specific measure of Reform. Why it was not their business to bring forward any measure of this nature. A noble friend of his had said that he never took part in any discussion of the question of Parliamentary reform, but that he thought it a great advantage that the question had been brought forward by government. They were not among those who clamoured for reform. They were content to remain as they were. He wished they could remain as they were, but he knew they could not. (cheers.)—And he felt that he should beget the part of a bad and unpatriotic citizen if he were to fight upon such a subject an useless and therefore mischievous battle. He could not but advert to the speech of Mr. Cairnes upon this subject when he thought he was about to depart for India, and when it was supposed that he was addressing the House of Commons for the last time—a speech distinguished alike for eloquence and moderation. At the close of this speech his right honorable friend paid a just compliment to the noble lord the author of this Bill. He said that it would be the glory of the noble lord to have brought forward this subject and to have fought this battle, and his to have resisted it to the last. He was not now bringing forward the name of his right hon. friend for the purpose of saying what his opinion would now have been upon the subject. He had no right to do so, and thus to seek shelter under the well-merited reputation of his right hon. friend for the blindness to which he had fallen. (hear, hear.) It was also impossible to say how much the very fact of his being alive might have changed the situation of the country. “Ah! my Lords,” pursued the noble earl, “this leads to melancholy reflections.” (cheers.) But another statesman, three years afterwards—a man eminent for wisdom and ability—expressed the same opinion which had always been entertained by his right hon. friend. A right hon. friend of his, in July, 1830, wished for the extension of the franchise to Birmingham or Leeds, and having stated other reasons which had induced him to adopt that course, finished by saying that he did so to resist Parliamentary reform. He said that he was, had been, and always would be, the enemy of Parliamentary reform, understanding that term in the sense of any general change of the representation of the people. Any such fears, and the excitement it would not fail to produce, must be subversive of the constitution, and lead them to anarchy and despotism, or probably both of these dreadful evils in their natural succession. Nothing was so easy as to point out the defects of the representation—nothing more difficult than to shew how they might have been amended. But he must say, as he had always said, that he could not look at this or that defect of the Constitution. He looked at the whole machine together. If this machine were taken to pieces they might find it impossible to put it together again. These were the sentiments of that eminent person, Mr. Huskisson. He adverted to these principles, and all that was passing around him made him regret the fatal delusion which deprived them of their proper authority. They had much of the necessity of the change, but nothing of the fixed resting place. The noble Lord had said that it was necessary to go much further in order to find a resting place. But of all the delusions ever practised by sincere and able men upon themselves, that was certainly the greatest which induced them to produce the present Bill as a final resting place? Instead of a resting place, it almost seemed to him that in this Bill the noble earl and his noble friend had discovered the principle of perpetual motion, and he was ready to expect an application to his noble friends on the part of the Board of Longitude. If a public extension of the suffrage were claimed he was at a loss to know what answer would be given. Mr. Cairnes could have answered this demand; Lord John Russell could not. But if it were possible that the Bill could be considered as a final resting place, the noble lords opposite had taken care, by means of the ten-pounders, to provide a person to propel it further; and in the end it would be found that the Bill consisted of all the glories of this country, its wealth, its greatness, and its prosperity, to annual Parliaments, universal suffrage, and vote by ballot. (cheers.) His understanding was so framed that he could not see principles established without believing that sooner or later they would work out their proper end. And it was for this reason that he opposed the Bill. The noble earl had been accused, and he thought unjustly, with not bringing forward some small plan of reform. The noble earl could never bring forward a small plan of reform. The noble duke—and in saying this he did not mean to find fault with him for not doing so—might have afforded to bring forward a small plan; but the noble earl, with all his incidents and conduct, and with the memory of his former life, and opinions, without disgrace and opprobrium could never bring forward a small plan of reform. He should never forget the impression produced in this House on the first presentation of the Bill. All parties—with perhaps the exception of the radicals—all parties, Whigs, Tories and Liberals, were equally alarmed. He had met many friends who had always, for a long period, supported the question of reform, and they all said that they must support the noble earl; they could not help it, but they were afraid of the Bill. He warned the Lords to reflect that the measure was a sudden measure, and that one of the most important of their duties was to give the country