



Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—WEDNESDAY, Oct. 5.
(Continued from our last.)

The Marquis of Lansdowne assured the House that notwithstanding the adjournment at a late hour, the preceding evening might have enabled him to prepare a greater field of argument in support of his view of the question, he would not detain the House at any greater length than if he had been permitted to address them on the preceding evening. On that ground he was not sorry for the delay which the adjournment had caused, because it enabled him to reply to some observations which he had heard, indeed he must say imperfectly heard, from the noble earl who had just sat down. That noble earl had commenced his speech by alluding to the foreign and domestic policy of his Majesty's present advisers since they came into office. It was not his (the Marquis of Lansdowne's) intention to follow his noble friend throughout all his observations on this subject; but he could not allow him to base his opposition to the present measure on the ground of the want of success which he (Lord Dudley) alleged had attended all the projects which his Majesty's ministers had introduced. Now this allegation proved that his noble friend had been misinformed, for it could not be supposed that for some time past he had attended in his place in their lordship's house. Had his noble friend attended there and listened to the proceedings, which he must remark his noble friend did not always do, he would have witnessed measures connected with the laws of the country introduced by ministers passed through their lordship's house unopposed, and without a single division having been taken on them.

The Earl of Dudley trusted the noble marquis would excuse him for interrupting the course of his observations. He had merely adverted to the failure of the financial projects of his Majesty's ministers.

The Marquis of Lansdowne appealed to their lordships if his noble friend had not accused his Majesty's ministers of a general and uncalled for subversion of the institutions of their ancestors. Now he could not but say that if his noble friend thought so he had been guilty of a dereliction of his duty as a member of their lordship's Assembly. He would ask him why, if he conceived the principles on which his Majesty's ministers had acted subversive of the settled institutions of the country, had he not opposed those measures of reform which had been introduced under their auspices? Why had he not opposed the Bankruptcy Bill? Why had he not opposed the Lunatics Bill?

The Earl of Dudley again repeated that he only alluded to the financial projects of the Government.

The Marquis of Lansdowne admitted that his noble friend had particularized finance, but he had also said that the present Administration were disposed to change every thing which of course included the reforms which had been proposed in the law. He therefore conceived himself justified in alluding to those measures which he had mentioned, but he would content himself with observing that the Bills passed through their lordships' House notwithstanding his noble friend had stated that they were subversive of the constitution of the country. Now with respect to the particular point of finance he would trouble their lordships with one or two observations. His noble friend had said that his Majesty's Ministers had failed in each of their financial projects.—This assertion clearly proved that his noble friend had not been present when the Coal Bill or the Wine duties Bill had passed their lordships' House. He would wish to ask his noble friend if he was present in the House when the alteration in the system of the cotton trade received their lordships' assent? These were portions of that financial measure which his noble friend said had completely failed. The latter of these alterations, he meant the alteration in the calico trade, alone entitled his Majesty's Government to some credit for legislation, for it had the effect of vivifying the commerce not only of Manchester, but of the North of Ireland. His noble friend had once said that measures were good for keeping; but he had this evening proved that he also considered speeches good for keeping.—(A laugh.)—However, his noble friend had kept his speech too long.—(A laugh.)—Had it been made some time ago it might have had effect; at present it was impotent, for its burden was to designate all the measures which their lordships had passed unanimously utter failures. His noble friend had alluded to the philosophers of Birmingham. Now he was sure that their lordships would do him the credit to believe that he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) would never allow himself to be influenced by the opinions of any body of men on a subject of such importance as that which they were then discussing, at the same time that he thought the philosophy of the measure as good as the logical arguments of the Representative of Garton and Old Sarum against it. But he confessed it surprised him not a little to hear his noble friend speaking of the impolicy of alluding to the philosophy of the Birmingham people, because, if he was not much mistaken, about a year ago his noble friend had himself given his aid to the generation of that philosophy—he meant that of East Retford to Birmingham, had voted in favour of the creation of one

of those philosophies whom he was then so anxious to cry down. Having said this much, the noble Marquis proceeded to offer his views of the measure before their lordships.—To do this it was necessary that he should shortly review the arguments which had been adduced in opposition to the measure by the noble Lords on the other side of the House. The noble Earl who had on one occasion filled the situation which he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) then had the honour to hold (Earl Harrowby) had told their lordships that he had exerted all his ingenuity to find the means of voting in favour of the measure going into Committee, but that he found it impossible. Now it struck him (the Marquis of Lansdowne) that the noble Earl had used all his ingenuity to excuse himself from giving his vote against the question. The noble Earl had observed that it would be very easy for him to make the best speech ever made in opposition to Reform by digesting together the speeches and writings of the present supporters of the measure. He was happy to be able to say that he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) was equally fortunate, for it would be easy for him to draw exclusively from the arguments from the omissions, from the concessions, and from the inconsistencies of the noble Lords opposite the very best arguments that could be made in support of the Ministerial plan of Reform.—He held, as a general proposition, that all change was an evil, more especially in a state of society so long and so highly civilized as that in which they lived. The condition, however, of no society could be secure that was not prepared to yield a little to any great influence that may arise in the State. He had no hesitation also in admitting that the old relations of any society were more easily maintained than new ones. But admitting these principles, he denied the justice of the inference that it was the character of their constitution to oppose an unbending and stubborn resistance to every modification of existing institutions. If they looked into the Statute Book, they would find that such was not the character of the constitution. What were the laws which existed at the time of the reformation in this country? What were the laws during the reign of the Stuarts, and the changes made in their time? What were the laws which called the House of Hanover to the Throne, and effected the Union between England and Scotland, and England with Ireland? Let their lordships look, above all to that violent and extraordinary change made at a recent period by which three-fifths of the electors of Ireland were at once annihilated.—[Hear, hear.]—What were all these changes but sacrifices, unmeasured sacrifices. If their lordships pleased, made to a political expediency, and resting on nothing but expediency? The real character of their constitution was to gather round it, and embody all the political strength of the country, consisting, as the noble Duke [Duke of Wellington] observed last night, of all its wealth and all its knowledge.—He was glad to hear the noble Duke express his assent to this principle of the Constitution, but the noble Duke used the word learning in place of knowledge. If the Marquis of L. did not allude, when he used the word knowledge, to academical learning; he meant that kind of knowledge which enabled men to judge of their own interests.—[Hear, hear.]—of what they ought to claim and what they thought would be beneficial to them as members of civil society. If their constitution had been without this power of bending to circumstances as they may arise, instead of standing as it now did, magnificently above the encroachments of time, and change and circumstances, they would find it a wreck upon the shore, without two planks remaining together. [Hear.] There were some observations made by the noble Duke [Duke of Wellington] which he must confess he heard with some astonishment.—He understood the noble Duke to say that the declaration made by him at the commencement of last Session on the subject of Reform had been made as a minister of the Crown, and not in his individual and private character; and that whatever his own opinion might be, he was bound, as a Minister of the Crown, and to support any plan for altering the system of representation. Now, from what the noble Duke said upon another occasion, in reference to the political condition of Ireland, he could not have expected that such was the principle which guided his conduct as a Minister of the Crown.—[Here the Duke of Wellington made an observation across the table, which was not audible. We understood the noble Duke to say that he was not a supporter of Reform either in his public or private capacity.]—For his part he always thought it more desirable and more safe that important changes of this kind should come recommended from the Government, for thus an opportunity would be given of imposing limits to the change that might be thought necessary. The noble Duke when he brought forward the catholic question acted on a principle quite different to that he now professed. The noble Duke said he had hitherto debarred himself from acting as an individual upon so great a question, because he always thought it was one the importance of which required that it should be taken up by the Government.—He believed he was correct in the language he attributed to the noble Duke. He thought at the time it was a proof of the wisdom of the noble Duke, who said at the time, that when spoken to upon the subject by Lord Castlereagh, his answer was that he would be ready to express his opinion on that great question when it was brought forward by the Government. The noble Duke's mind seemed since that time to have entirely altered, for he now declared that, as

a Minister of the Crown, he felt himself precluded from proposing a reform of the representation. This appeared the more strange, because he believed there was not one noble Lord on either side of the House who declared himself hostile to all Reform. Though some stepped a little more forward, and others a little more backward, there was not one who did not seem disposed to move a little upon the subject. They never ventured to declare their views, to state what their plan was.—If plan it might be called, that plan had none distinguishable in feature, form, or limb. If the plan of Reform which was in their minds had yet assumed any shape, the people of England had reason to complain that they were kept six months without having this nostrum for all political diseases communicated to them.—[Hear.]—He should be glad to hear what it was, and he hoped his noble friend (Lord Wharfedale, we believe) would inform them. It was strange, however, that the question was allowed to be so long agitated, that Parliament was suffered to be dissolved, and this Bill, after a long and painful discussion, suffered to pass through the House of Commons, and the people of England all the time kept completely in the dark as to this potent nostrum. All they were permitted to know was that there were certain possible things, which, under certain possible circumstances, the noble lord opposite would be prepared to do; but that these things were they were not prepared to make known. While his noble friend (Lord Grey) and his colleagues entered upon a long and tempestuous voyage of Reform, aware of the perils and dangers that encompassed them, and prepared to brave these perils, the noble lords opposite thought to drop down comfortably and quietly to St. Helen's, and, if it should suit their wishes, enter upon a secure and pleasant trip of Reform.—[Hear.]—He was astonished that those who were considered the prescriptive physicians of the State should at length find themselves driven to have recourse to the quackery of his noble friend opposite.—[Lord Mansfield observed across the table that he suggested nothing in the way of physic or quackery.]—The Marquis of Lansdowne understood his noble friend to have said something about the prevention of bribery.

Lord Mansfield—I said nothing about bribery.

The Marquis of Lansdowne begged his noble friend's pardon for having misunderstood him. He readily apologized to his noble friend for having supposed him to have committed himself hastily on a proposition for the prevention of bribery.—(A laugh.)—He understood now that his noble friend meant to do nothing. Indeed, it was not easy to understand what the noble lords who opposed this measure meant they differed so much in opinion. The noble baron (Wharfedale) told them on the opening of this debate that he was prepared to give up the Scotch Representation, but the noble duke (the Duke of Wellington,) on the contrary, maintained that the institutions of that country were perfect; that under them it had prospered beyond example, and produced a state of society approaching nearly to, if not entirely reaching perfection.—("No," from the Duke of Wellington.)—When the noble duke represented Scotland as the best governed and most prosperous country in Europe, he thought that as a matter of course the noble duke included the system of representation. He fully concurred with the noble duke as to the prosperity of Scotland, and it was impossible to witness it without feelings of triumph and gratulation. The industry of that country had wrought wonders. The results of her agriculture and manufactures were visible over the whole face of the country, and her ships covered the Atlantic. But did their lordships suppose that this unexampled prosperity arose from superiorities? The only superiority he could discern in it was the superiority of education.—[Hear, hear.]—and that was the superiority to which it was their object to give its due weight in the change representation now proposed. The object of the Bill was to give to wealth and knowledge the power they were entitled to possess. The noble Duke (Duke of Wellington) drew an argument against the £10 franchise from what took place recently at elections in Dublin and Liverpool, two populous places, as he said, with a numerous constituency. But was not one object of the Bill to remedy such abuses and prevent them in future, by not confining to freemen the right of election, but throwing it open to housekeepers? Even here the advantage of a numerous constituency was manifest, for they were exactly informed of the abuse, and the House of Commons was taking steps to punish it by adopting the very remedy proposed by this Bill. In Liverpool the bribery was entirely confined to the freemen, that class of voters which the noble Lord opposite would retain. The most respectable housekeepers in that town were, by the present system, excluded from the right of voting. Out of 2,400 inhabitants, whose property and respectability entitled them to sit on Juries, there were only eighty freemen. Mr. Roscoe and his sons did not possess the right of voting for Liverpool, at the same time that their gardener enjoyed that right. Was it to be concluded that because a menial servant could be bribed, Mr. Roscoe and his sons could also be bribed? Yet to this the objection of the noble duke amounted. A noble friend of his yesterday, in stating his objections to this measure, said that it would have the effect of producing a constituency whose first objects would be to put an end to taxes and the national debt. Now he had in his possession a paper which was of great importance not only as it related to this question, but as showing the great diffusion of wealth in this country. The paper to

which he alluded was the number of accounts kept at the Bank of England by persons having property in the Funds. The number altogether was 275,323, and of these there were 264,668 the accounts of persons whose income was less than £200 a year. Now was it not highly probable that this class would form a considerable part of the new 10l. constituency and was it not natural that they should say to their representatives—"Do what you like in other matters, but do not touch the Funds—take care that our dividends are paid in the same way as persons having property in land might very naturally be supposed to say, take care of our rents."—[Hear, hear.] The noble Duke argued that the new ten-pound constituency would be more accessible to bribery, as being all of one class. The noble Duke forgot that this franchise was not confined to those who paid only ten pounds, but included all inhabitants from 10l. to 10,000l.

The Duke of Wellington—I said they would be more exposed to combination.

The Marquis of Lansdowne did not see how the facility of the combination could be greater under the new than under the old constituency. In a great many towns there would be more voters who paid above ten pounds rent than those who paid only ten pounds, and in such places the objection could not apply. The noble Duke contended last night that the cry for Reform in this country arose out of the events in Paris and Belgium. No person at all acquainted with the history of the country could deny that since the American war, even long before the American war the opinion was every year gaining ground that some improvement in their system of Representation had become necessary. Such an opinion having been once formed, and nothing having been done to remove this ground of complaint, it was in the very nature of things that it should increase in strength, and manifest itself in regular ebullitions of popular feeling. What Lord Bacon said of bodies might be said of the opinions of the people; they moved irregularly when out of their places but regularly when in them. To say that the agitation which now prevailed on the subject of Reform and the wish for a change of the representative system had its birth in July last, and had been produced by the events in France, was not more correct than to attribute the explosion, not to the gunpowder, but to the match by which it was ignited. It was impossible there could be security for any state unless it was disposed and contained within itself the power of so modifying its institutions as to meet the wishes of the great body of the people when they became convinced that improvement and alteration had become necessary. The real principles to this Bill were principles to which the Noble Lords opposite had more or less expressed their assent. He should not go at present into details of it. That was the course pursued by those who opposed it, but it was not a course perfectly fair, because the Committee was the place for discussing the details. The real principles of the Bill were to exterminate the nomination boroughs, to extend the political influence of the middle classes of the population, and to give the right of voting in counties to every species of occupancy. These were its principles, all the rest was detail. On these principles, notwithstanding what had fallen from some Lords on the opposite side, he felt confident it was the wish and the intention of his Noble Friend [Earl Grey] that their lordships should exercise their undoubted right of forming their own judgement, and of coming to that decision which on mature reflection they might deem the best, the safest, and the most constitutional.—[Hear, hear.]—uninfluenced by considerations of fear or favour. If he thought his Noble Friend was capable of debarring them from the exercise of this right, even if it were in his power to do so, which it was not, he should first express to him in private his dissent from such a course, and if that did not weigh with his Noble Friend he should not hesitate to express it in public.—[Cheers.] Though as a member of that House he did not wish that its constitution should in any way be connected with a principle of corruption, no man would more zealously come forward in support of those privileges handed down from their ancestors, one of which was the full and perfect right to deliberate on all public questions, and to pronounce their judgment on them as independent branches of the Legislature.—[Cheers.]—It was said that the measure effected even the existence of that House. Were the Bill to pass to-morrow there was no privilege which of right belonged to them, no power, no dignity, no authority, which they would not enjoy in as full vigour as they did now. All they would be deprived of was a corrupt participation in the abuses of the other branch of the Legislature. [Cheers.] It had been asked what they were to do when they came into collision with the other branch of the Legislature, and with the expressed wishes of the people? What they had to do was to stand manfully and constitutionally on their privileges. Public opinion claimed this from them; and though in their honest judgment they might not decide in conformity to what was hoped and desired, still public opinion in the end would not condemn them. It was not in the corruptions of Garton and Old Sarum they could find security, but in their own just constitutional influence as a branch of the Legislature, which he verily believed was yet revered in the country. He heard with pleasure a noble Lord in this debate recommend to their lordships to treat with contempt any threats from without. He trusted their decisions would never be influenced by threats. They could not, however, expect to have the support and confidence of the people if they persever-

ingly resisted any improvement of a system of representation over which, in all its ramifications, they were thought to exercise an improper and unconstitutional influence. It was not on such a system he wished them to found their hopes of being able to transmit to their posterity those honours which they derived from their ancestors, and which he firmly believed to be essential to the well-being of the State.—[Cheers.]—Let them not be influenced by clamor or threats; and if they should be used, let them be discarded as unworthy of notice. As one branch of the Legislature, they had by legislative measures been the means of diffusing capital—of extending trade and commerce—of calling into existence large and opulent towns crowded with an active, intelligent, and wealthy population.

Let them not refuse to Manchester and Birmingham, when created, the privilege of that state of society under which they arose. Let them not suppose that when the surface of society was covered with new and full streams of wealth and population they could continue to flow in their old and narrow channel. Rather let them do that which was not innovation, but true wisdom; let them incorporate with their ancient institutions the increased wealth, knowledge and industry of the country.—[Continued cheering.]

(See second page.)

Fashionable Education.

MRS. HANFORD, respectfully begs leave to acquaint her friends and the public of her arrival in Fredericton, where she has opened a Seminary at Mr. W. MILLER'S opposite the Officer's Barracks, where the following branches of education will be taught viz:—
Music, Singing, French, Italian, Spanish, Drawing, Painting, Shell Work, Chromatizing and Wax Fruit, Marbling, Glass and Engraving, Filigree work.

She invites the Ladies and Gentlemen of the place and its vicinity to view her specimens of the above branches, which may be seen at her lodgings, as above, on Wednesday's and Saturday's, between the hours of 12 and 2 P. M.

As Mrs. H.'s stay will probably be but for a short period, those who wish to avail themselves of her services will please make early application. Fredericton, 29th, Nov. 1831.

LETTERS.

Post Office, Fredericton, Sept. 10, 1831.

A.
Col. John Allen, Robert Armstrong, Mrs. John Akerson.

B.
Gershom Bunnell 3, Andrew Brown, Covert Brown, James Brown, Zecarh Brown, Abraham Brown, James Burns, James Burns, Pat Burns, John Bridal, Antonio Bellure, Andrew Bamed, Martin Brenneau, William Bell, Samuel Blackburne, John Brennen, Jane Bean, Mrs. Boyd.

C.
Sarah Cushman 2, James Carney 2, Thomas Crawford, Thomas Crawford, William Corne, Mrs. Currie, Mary Coyle, James Conolly, Samuel Camorin, Isaac Chace, Nathaniel Churchill, Ann E. Close, Daniel Coakley, Casper Caldwell, Michael Carroll, Peter Crain, Lavina Crain, Edward Conway, Mary Carman, John Cronk, Arnold Carroll, James Carter, Peter Clammas.

D.
John Drisdale, Robert Douglas, John Dev, James Diaper, George Doherty.

E.
Clarissa Everitt, Wm. Everitt, Andrew Eriv, Thomas O. Falvey.

F.
James Fleming, Jeremiah Fields, Caleb Foster, George Finley, Wm. Faulkner, Rebecca Fielding, Wm. Ferguson.

G.
Thomas Gilbert 2, Hugh Gribbin 2, James G. Lusher, Peter Gilligan, Yarnan Goodwin, Susan Guimara, Thomas Griffiths, Thomas Grier, William Gray, John Gibson Junr., James Grier, Daniel Gillen.

H.
John P. Hoyt, John Hayatt, Thos. Hardyman, Alex. Harper, John Herbery, Arthur Haughey, William Harned, Nichl. Henry, Richard Hulme, Wm. Hanson 2, Thomas Hotham.

I.
James Ingraham, Charles Ingram, Samuel Jones, John Joyce, James Johnston, George Johnston.

K.
Mark Kelly, Thomas King, Catherine Knox, John Knox, Wm. Keddie, Wm. Kirk, William Kokes, Mary Kenahan, James Karney.

L.
Benjamin Lovely, Fanny Lockey, Gabriel Lyth, Catherine Lunn, Francis Lippett, John Landarkin, Wm. Lindsey, Robert Lynch, James Lander, James Lafferty, Richard D. London, Catherine Larkin.

M.
Benjamin Morse 2, Abigail Miles, Frederick Murrall, Thomas Maguire, John Mitchell, Peter Moran, Jeremiah Murphy, George Morrow, John Murry, Mary Ann Myrady, Miss H. Manson, George Mulgreen, Aaron Murry, Joseph McDermott 2, James McGarry 3, James McLoughlin 4, Alex. McLeod, Alex. McLagan, Francis McDonnell, Bernard McCallan, Thomas McKenney, Andrew McKane, Wm. McNicholl, Thomas McKinnis, Terrance McKenney, Daniel McKinnis, Robert McKinstry, Charles McKutchin, William McAuley, Alley McGawie, Elizabeth McRaney.

N.
Samuel Nason 2, James Noble.

O.
William O'Brien 2, Henry Oliver.

P.
Amos Pedlar 2, James Peters, William Peters, Richard Power, William Pennington, Charles Perkins, Robert Pearson, Samuel Pitfield.

Q.
Pat. Quinn, Catherine Quinn.

R.
Edward Reynolds, Susan Rieley, John Rea, Daniel Rea, G. A. Rolston, Mrs. Mary Robinson, Andrew Ritchie, Samuel Rody.

S.
John Simnot 3, Edward Seymour 8, Elijah Simon, James Sisson 2, Thomas Smith, Nelson Stewart, Patrick Smith, Mrs. Smith, John L. Smith, Robert Sanborne, James Shortall, Wm. Sheals, Charles Shields, George Shaw.

T.
T. Turner 2, James Taylor 2, Benjamin Taylor, Mr. A. J. Taylor, Mic. D. Trybe, Elihu Thorp, John Torrens 2, James Topley, James Torsy, William Tovy, Mrs. S. Taylor, Wm. Tripp.

U.
John Upton.

W.
Silvester Wood, Robert Woods, Rev. A. Wood, Amos Watson, Mrs. Mary Williams, Andrew Withand.

Y.
John Young 3.