

EUROPE.

ENGLAND.

[Continued from our last page.]

Lord Plunket made a few observations, but the interruptions were so frequent that it was almost impossible to catch his remarks. We understood him to contend that in the language his Noble Friend had used he had merely expressed an opinion. That opinion was in accordance with reason and experience, and amounted to this:—If their Lordships rejected what was reasonable, just and constitutional, they would have thrust upon them what was unreasonable, unjust and unconstitutional. (Hear, hear.) The noble Baron (Wharcliffe) had told their Lordships that a revolution was not only begun but consummated, and that because one, two, or three individuals out of a meeting of 150,000 had used extravagant language. That was certainly as magnificent a deduction from as slender premises as ever he had heard of. (A laugh.)

Lord Tenterden said he perfectly agreed with the Noble and Learned Lord as to the danger of rearing just, reasonable, and constitutional measures; but the justice their Lordships had to consider was, whether the Bill was a just, reasonable, and constitutional measure (hear, hear)—and in order that that point might be discussed, he moved the Order of the Day for renewing the adjourned debate upon the Reform Bill. (Cheers.)

Earl Grey said he rose to order. The noble and learned Lord was out of order in moving the Order of the Day, there being at that moment a motion upon a Petition before their Lordships. Besides there were other Petitions to present. (Hear, hear.)

Lord Tenterden said he could not know that fact. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.)

The Earl of Wicklow said he could not reconcile it with his feelings as to his duty to allow the discussion upon the Birmingham Meeting to close without drawing their Lordships' attention to one point. He agreed with the noble and learned lord on the woolsack that it would be unjust to attribute to a whole meeting the intemperance, whether premeditated or not, of one man; but he wished to know from the noble and learned lord on the woolsack, if his correspondent had apprised him of any proceedings to the following effect:—That a gentleman at the meeting had stated, that as a Hampden had refused the payment of ship money, so would he, if the Reform Bill was rejected by the Lords, refuse the payment of all taxes. And having made that statement, he called upon all those who were favorable to it, and would support him in it, and would adopt it, to hold up their hands. Upon which a forest of hands was held up amidst an immense cheer. That being done, the Speaker called upon those who dissented from the proposition to hold up their hands, and not one hand was held up. Was the noble and learned lord aware that any such proceedings as that had taken place, and, if they had, was he still prepared to characterize the meeting as orderly, peaceable and constitutional? (Hear, hear.)

The Lord Chancellor said he certainly was not aware that any such proceedings as those adverted to by the noble earl had taken place. The fact was a novelty to him, and a very awkward fact it was. (Laughter.) It was certainly a very disagreeable piece of intelligence. As a lawyer, however he must say that there had been no breach of the peace, and therefore nothing that could justify legal proceedings upon that ground against the individual who had used the violent and improper language. As described to him, the meeting had been conducted in a most peaceable manner, and had separated as quietly as did their Lordships, or even more so, for it had dispersed as quietly as children breaking up from school.

The Earl of Eldon said he should be ashamed of himself if, after having spent a long life in his profession, he did not rise to declare, whether regularly or irregularly as to the time, that any person who pursued the course said to have been pursued by an individual at the Birmingham meeting violated the laws of the country, and was amenable to the tribunals of the country. (Hear, hear.) No man was more ready to admit than he was the soundness of the doctrine, that the act of one was not the act of the many, but when the many adopted that act it became theirs, and they were responsible for it. (Hear, hear.) This, he contended, was the law of the country; and he contended, further, that if the statement referred to by a noble earl, Wicklow, were correct, the law officers of the crown would not do their duty if they did not take cognizance of the proceedings at the Birmingham meeting. He was disposed, however to believe—he could not do otherwise—that those gentlemen (the law officers) had inquired into the matter, and found some reasons for believing that the facts were different from what they were represented to be in the statement alluded to by the noble earl. He wished not his own opinion to be taken upon the subject, but he appealed to the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench and to the noble lord who had long presided in the Court of Common Pleas, and he called upon them to state to the House what the law of the land was. (Cheers.) And he would tell the noble and learned lord on the woolsack that if such proceedings as that stated by the noble earl (Wicklow) to have taken place were to be suffered to go on, not six months would elapse before it would be utterly impracticable for any man to maintain himself on that woolsack. (Cheers.) These were his opinions; he asserted them, and he was answerable for them. (Hear, hear.)

The Lord Chancellor rose amidst loud cries for Lord Tenterden. He rose for the very purpose of interposing himself between their Lordships and the noble and learned lord [Tenterden]; and he did so because, if an indictable offence had been committed, it might have to be tried before that noble and learned lord. In such a case it certainly could not be desirable that the noble and learned lord should give an opinion upon the subject. He begged not to be misunderstood. He had merely said that unless a person had committed some act plainly and palpably leading to a breach of the peace, he could not be indicted upon a breach of the peace. There were unquestionably many other ways in which a person might offend against the laws of the country at a public meeting.

Lord Tenterden said, that notwithstanding the admonition of the noble and learned lord upon the Woolsack, he should have felt it to be his duty to offer an opinion upon the point under discussion had it not been for the explanation of the noble and learned lord. (Hear, hear.) Lord Wharcliffe explained.

Lord Holland reminded the house of the question properly before it, which was, that the petition do lie on the table. He deprecated such discussions as the present. He had never found that they redounded to the dignity of the house or assisted it in its deliberations. He rose principally for the purpose of noticing the attack which had been made upon his noble friend,

[Earl Grey] by a noble Earl [Haddington] upon the cross benches. A more unfair, uncalculated-for, and unjustifiable attack he had never heard. (Hear, hear.) His noble friend had been called upon to make the explanations which he had made, and which, taken together with the reasoning of his noble and learned friends [Lord Plunket], had placed the language and motives of his learned friend beyond dispute. Another and a dangerous measure had been alluded to by his noble friend as a natural consequence of the rejection of this, but his noble friend had never said or hinted that he would be the person to propose or to agree to any such measure. (Hear, hear.) Looking at past occurrences, it did not appear to him to be at all impossible that if the present Bill were thrown out, and from that circumstance a new government was formed, there might be persons in that new government who, though utterly opposed to this Bill, would adopt something far more dangerous, unconstitutional, and sweeping. (Cheers from the Ministerial benches.) Some noble Duke or noble Earl, who was now an anti-reformer, might come down to their Lordships, and say, "Consider, my Lords, there is a collision between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, and with this state of things it is impossible for the Government to go on. You don't know what war is, but I do, and therefore you must give way." (Cheers and laughter.) Such might be the language of the very person who at that hour counselled them not to allow the meetings at Birmingham and other places to sway them, not to give way, but to be stout, determined, and bold. (Hear, hear.) All that was just possible, and it was also just possible that a right hon. Gentleman might rise in another place and say, "My opinions are unchanged, Reform is dangerous, but we must yield to the pressure of the times." (Hear, hear.) He would counsel their Lordships to a very different course. Like his noble friend he would counsel them to concede graciously and with dignity, and not from any unworthy or unconstitutional motives.

The Duke of Wellington was really astonished at the conduct of the noble lord. The noble lord had risen to recal the attention of their Lordships to the question properly before the House, and he had, contrary to all the usages and the courtesy of debate, attacked him (the Duke of Wellington), although he had taken no part whatever in the discussion. (Hear, hear, hear.) The noble lord had attacked his conduct upon a point upon which he had really believed he had once acquired the approbation of the noble lord. (Cheers.) It, however, appeared he was mistaken, and certainly that was not a matter which would give him much uneasiness. Upon all these discussions on Petitions he had abstained from taking any part whatever, he had not even uttered a single cheer, and he should not now be induced to depart from his ordinary course more than was absolutely necessary. Whenever noble lords chose thus irregularly to go out of their way to attack his conduct they were perfectly welcome to do so. (Hear, hear.) He felt that attempts had been made and were daily making to intimidate their Lordships from a just discharge of their duties, but he held those attempts in utter contempt. (Cheers.) He neither feared them nor regarded them, for he knew that the laws of the country were too strong for those who would disturb its peace; and he had a perfect confidence in the sincerity of the attachment the great body of the people bore to the constitution. (Hear, hear.) He would tell their Lordships, however, what he did fear. He feared the consequence to which dangerous and revolutionary measures brought forward by the Government might lead. (Immense cheering.) The history of this country would bear him out in the assertion that all its evil revolutions and changes had been brought about by the Parliament or the Minister, through the improper exercise of the prerogative of the Crown. (Hear, hear.) The measure proposed to their Lordships was really a new and dangerous one—and he urged them to treat their Lordships to give it to the utmost, to use all the means within their legitimate power to throw it out, and to trust to the good sense of the country for just appreciation of their motives. (Cheers.)

The Earl of Carlisle said some expressions had fallen from the noble Duke which called for remark. The noble Duke had said that all great changes and revolutions in this country had been carried by the Parliament, or the influence of the Crown improperly exerted. Did the noble Duke mean to regard the Reformation of the Church and the Revolution of 1688 as injurious. They were Parliamentary Revolutions, and the only one he knew of.

The Earl of Haddington explained, and defended the view he had taken of the conduct of the noble earl [Grey].

The Earl of Winchester defended the noble Duke (Wellington) from the unwarrantable and altogether unjustifiable attack of the noble lord (Holland). That noble lord had insinuated that the noble duke had adopted the Catholic question for the mere purpose of retaining power. (Cries of "No, no," from the Ministerial benches and cheers from the opposition benches.) He contended that such was the insinuation of the noble lord, and further that he had insinuated that the noble Duke opposed this Bill for the purpose of again creeping into place, and that when there he would be the first to propose some more destructive plan of reform. (Renewed cries of "No, no," and cheers.) He denied the justice of such insinuations. He had strenuously opposed the noble Duke on the Catholic Question, but he was convinced of the sincerity of the noble Duke; and he now in the face of the country offered to that country his apology for having been one of those who displaced the Administration of the Noble Duke for the purpose of placing men in power who were unworthy of the confidence of their sovereign or the respect of their country, (cheering) men who, for the possession of place, had resorted to the most unconstitutional conduct and measures, and endangered the liberties of the country. (Hear, hear.) An observation had been applied to him by the noble and learned lord on the Woolsack. Learned as that noble and learned lord might be, he would not bend to the law he had laid down that night. (Hear, hear.) If plans for the withholding of the payment of all taxes were not illegal he knew not what was. If the government of the country put down. The noble earl concluded by repeating the declaration he had made last night as to an anonymous slanderer.

Lord Holland explained, he denied that he had made the insinuations attributed to him. Earl Grey defended the course he had taken in vindication of his proceedings and of character.

The noble earl [Winchelsea] had a perfect right to attack the measures of Government and principles to him (Earl Grey), and he called upon that noble earl specifically to state whether he charged him with having recourse to revolutionary measures to support himself in place.

The Duke of Buckingham said a few words, but they were rendered inaudible by loud calls for the Earl of Winchelsea.

The Earl of Winchelsea said that for the noble earl, individually, he had the greatest respect, indeed so highly had he valued the consistency of the noble earl that he had hoped to be able to give his humble support to the Government of the noble earl. But the measures of the Government had prevented him. In the Government he had no confidence; but for the noble earl personally he had the greatest respect. (Hear, hear.)

Earl Grey expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the explanation of the noble earl.

The question was then put, and the petition ordered to be laid on the table.

Lord Holland presented a petition in favour of the Earl of Aldgate; also a petition from 101 of the shopkeepers in Bond-street. ("Hear, hear," and laughing.) There were but 200 houses in the street, and he understood that if there had been sufficient time allowed, the signatures of every shopkeeper would have been appended to the petition.

After a few words, amid much confusion, from Lord Wharcliffe, the Earl of Mulgrave, and the Marquis of Westminster, the petition was ordered to lie upon the table.

REFORM IN PARLIAMENT.

Lord Kenyon moved the Order of the Day for the adjourned debate on the Reform Bill. On the Order being read, Lords Dudley and Goderich rose at the same moment, but after considerable confusion the latter noble Lord gave way.

The Earl of Dudley proceeded to address the House; but the observations of the Noble Lord were made in so low a tone that they were almost inaudible below the bar. We understood him to say that he felt extremely anxious to address the House, not in the expectation of being able to add anything to what had been said on the same side of the question to which he belonged, but because he desired to state his legislative and constitutional doctrines on perhaps the last occasion that an opportunity would be afforded to him to address the House in a Parliament bearing any resemblance to that which their ancestors had handed down to them. He felt that at the present momentous crisis it became every man who valued the established institutions of his country to raise his voice in opposition to a measure, the sole object of which was to carry into effect an entire and important change in the Constitution of a country which had for centuries prospered under its influence. He could not but deprecate the impetuous and misguided conduct of the present advisers of the Crown, who, when they had scarcely taken into their hands the reins of the government of the country, had applied themselves to effect a change in every branch of its institutions, and that without being able to show to the House the existence of its necessity or expedience. (Hear, hear.) They had attempted a change in the financial government, a change in the law, and though last, not least in his opinion, they attempted a change in the constitution of the other House of Parliament. (Hear, hear.)—a change, too, the effect of which would be to give supremacy to the worst power that could be experienced by any State—he meant a democratic authority. (Hear.) The measure of his Majesty's Ministers would, unless their Lordships did their duty fearlessly and conscientiously to themselves. (Hear, hear.)—be attended with this consequence, that the House of Commons would be, instead of what it then was, converted into a democratic assembly. (Hear.) What, he would ask, were their Lordships called upon to do? They were required, and that in no very persuasive tone, but in an authoritative manner. (Hear, hear.)—to stigmatize all the legislative acts of their forefathers, and that, too, with less notice than a Court, had been ever called upon to do a single. (Hear, hear.) Such was the impetuosity with which his Majesty's Ministers hurried themselves into the measure, and what was the result? A measure given to their Lordships? They were ordered to pass the Bill, or abide by the consequences arising from their refusal. The proposals and framers of the measure, having suddenly propagated its contents, had gone through the country with the Bill in one hand and the sword in the other. (Hear, hear.) When he considered the astonishing magnitude of the measure which was proposed—when he considered that it proposed to give an entirely new Constitution to the country—when he considered that by its institutions were to be changed, and the privileges of their Lordships placed in jeopardy, he confessed he thought that some higher authority should be added, and some more masterly hands should be employed in an undertaking of so much magnitude, than the authority of those persons who now introduced a measure, which, had it been broached some years back by any other party in the House, would have been scouted by them from their Lordships' presence. (Hear, hear.) What had been the statesmanlike qualities of the present advisers of the Crown who had introduced the measure to their Lordships' notice? Had they gained character by their financial arrangements at home, or by their foreign policy abroad, sufficient to entitle them to propose such a sweeping measure as that which occupied their Lordships' attention? He would say they had not. In every country the management of the Revenue had been considered as a matter of the greatest and most paramount importance, and the success of a ministry was estimated in proportion as its management of that particular branch had given satisfaction to the people. Now what was the conduct of his Majesty's ministers in this branch of their duty? (Hear, hear.) Not only had they failed in the measures which they proposed, but in every one of them they were convicted of the grossest and most palpable ignorance on the subject of the financial situation of the country. Loud cheers from the Opposition. Their case was, not that they failed in one measure, but they succeeded in none. (Hear, hear.) But they were not only unfortunate in their financial schemes. From a taxation in the funds they proceeded to attempt a modification in the duties on timber; but in such measures they were unsuccessful; and was it not an excess of confidence, and a dangerous experiment, to entrust such men with the re-modelling of our constitution, more particularly since they had shown themselves desirous of converting our limited monarchy to a purely democratic government? (Cheers.) Was it not natural, he asked, that the failures which ministers had already experienced should induce their Lordships to pause before they reposed an implicit confidence in their present subservient scheme? If there was nothing in their conduct to induce confidence, why should it be generally reposed in them, for its effect would be to prompt them to further changes in the Constitution? The measure of Parliamentary Reform was, he conceived, based on a monstrous position. He assumed, in the first place, that the House of Commons had been for years totally unfit for the duties which had been confided to it. It also assumed that the country had never enjoyed the advantages of good government, and the

people of England had been for a long time deprived of their rights. If there was any truth in this position the case resolved itself into this, that since the period of the revolution our constitution had been bad, for he denied that there had been any change in it since that time. It was the same in substance and the same in principle which then received the sanction of our ancestors, and which of course they deemed the most expedient that could be adopted. If there had been any alteration it consisted of this, that the people had acquired a great deal more of influence and power than they before possessed. The people had indeed for some time exerted a great deal of authority in the affairs of the Legislature. How this was to be accounted for he knew not, except that it originated in the greater publicity which had been given to the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly through the medium of the press. He was convinced and would assert that change which, by the way, originated in that change which he had described, was as a measure rather of temporary expediency than of permanent necessity. The two principal arguments that had been adduced in support of it were, first; and secondly, expediency. Now as to the argument of right, it was, he conceived, ridiculous to say that a man who happened to rent a tenement of ten pounds annual value had more claim to franchise than a man who rented a house of half that money. That was his opinion, considering the question on the abstract principle of right. (Hear, hear.)—When a Constitution was about to be remodelled it was essentially requisite to inquire into the evils which were experienced under it, with a view to develop the necessity of the change. Now when inquiry was made in the present instance he thought the answer would be that no evils whatever were experienced, if, indeed, he expected the solitary one of the distress which at this moment existed through the country—an evil which, however, was more to be attributed to an excess of population than to ill government. Now if this distress were the solitary evil of the existing constitution, was it necessary, even supposing it was likely to obviate the defect, to propose such an overwhelming change as that contemplated, more particularly too as so many more immediate remedies offered themselves, such, for instance, as emigration and colonization? But he did not conceive that Reform, or rather a subversion of the constitution, was required to heal the evil arising from excessive population. He knew that many persons thought differently. The Political Union of Birmingham, for instance, was of opinion that the only sanative remedy was an alteration in the institutions; but he was not prepared to admit that the great secret of public happiness could be learned by attending to the dictates of the philosophers of Birmingham. (Hear, and a laugh.) The boroughmongering Peers and the opponents of reform were blamed as the authors of the evils of the country. Now if these evils consisted of the single misfortune of an excess of population, surely no body of men could be blamed for it? The boroughmongers might with equal justice be blamed for the constant occurrence of bad weather. (Hear and a laugh.) They did not generate the evil by generating the excess of population. He deeply regretted the nature of the inducements held out by the supporters of reform to persuade the people to give their assent to the change. They were told that the prices of trade would be increased, and that bread would be cheaper if reform was obtained. These were the notions which were put into the heads of the people by reformers; and it was needless to say that no such consequences could attend the measure. When such inducements were held out it was not to be wondered that a strong feeling existed through the labouring classes in favour of the change; but was this to induce their Lordships, convinced as they must be that the feeling had its origin in misrepresentation, to give their assent to a measure the effects of which would be extremely detrimental to their privileges? The mass of the people laboured at that moment under passion and prejudice, which incapacitated them from discerning what was for their own interests. They were completely in the situation of a man signing a deed, which granted away his property, in a state of intoxication. (Hear, and a laugh.) He admitted that the grounds which he had stated, as influencing a large mass of the reformers, were not those on which the higher classes of the reformers based their support to the measure; at least they disclaimed them, and he was bound to believe their sincerity in doing so; but he would maintain that those inducements influenced ninety nine out of a hundred of the supporters of the measure. (Hear.) The higher class of reformers, he understood, grounded their support on principles of logic and philosophy; but these were things of which the larger mass of the people knew nothing, and indeed he could not see that either logic or philosophy had anything to do with a measure which professed for its object a reformation of existing abuses. He therefore maintained that if the bill were carried, it would be carried by the clamour of a people incapable of judging what was best for their advantage. Now, with respect to the consequences of the measure it was not to be expected that he could anticipate them all, but there were some to which it was impossible he could shut his eyes. First of all he asserted that it would be utterly impossible to carry on the government of the country. (Hear, hear, and cries of "Oh, oh!" from the Ministerial side of the House.) He did not mean to say that the country would have no government, but that it would be impossible to carry on any steady system of government. (Cheers from the Opposition.) It would be quite as easy to make bricks without straw as to think of carrying on a government without the means of governing. No power would be able to manage an unrestrained body exulting in the entire possession of the whole gifts of the State. What would be the form of the Constitution when it received the important change? It would be a republic. Indeed that word was not sufficiently definite, for a republican form of government had been attended in some instances with very happy consequences; but such expectations could not be cherished for the species of republican government which the proposed measure would establish; and he would therefore say that the new form would be democratical, and what was more, the worst species of democracy. He knew very well that it was the theory of the Constitution that the two Houses of Parliament were equal in legislative power. Now this he thought was a very wholesome principle, but the meditated change went to its subversion. Indeed, although such was the theory in the existing constitution, it was much departed from, for of late, such as the ascendancy of the House of Commons, if the 2 legislative bodies should engage in a struggle for pre-eminence, there was very little doubt that House would prove too much for even the Monarchy and the Aristocracy combined. It was an undeniable fact that it was only because the Crown and the Aristocracy had an influence in the House of Commons that the

He would not enter into the details of the Bill, but he could not refrain from asking if those details were such that a man could obtain a seat in the House of Commons without being bound by perpetual pledges, many of which would be subversive of the pledges of their Lordships' House? (Hear, hear.) If the details of the Bill were such, no man with feelings of honor or principles of moderation would think of seeking to be returned to the House of Commons; and the result would be that a set of men would be selected who, it was to be feared, would not only drive the aristocracy from their places as legislators, and deprive them of their authority, but, finally, who would take from them the very means of existence. (Cheers from the Opposition.) It had been said that the constitution of England was worth little; but, supposing it was so, he thought that it had lasted so long that it should not suddenly be destroyed by the compliance with the influence of faction. The country had prospered well under the constitution as it had for years existed, and he could not refrain from expressing his amazement at the rashness of his Majesty's present Government in proposing to destroy it for the purpose of giving the country in its stead an uncertain form of government. He was not prepared to vindicate the conduct of all the men who had flourished, and all the measures which had their origin in the form of government which had for years existed; but he would contend that the existing constitution of the country had been attended with the best measures, and that it had produced a set of Statesmen which were not likely to be surpassed by the Statesmen which would be called in public life on the Reform Bill. When he considered the success which had attended England's arms, both by sea and by land—a success which had been experienced under that constitution which was then raised at—he would ever look back to past times with affection and pride. He would now make one observation on what appeared to him a very important part of the case. He alluded to the danger which their Lordships were told they would be likely to experience should they reject the measure. He did not deny that resistance might be attended with danger, but he knew he was addressing an assembly composed of men of honor and of courage; and he would ask them if it would not be better to encounter the threatened danger than to concede rashly. (Loud cheers.) Were their Lordships aware of the consequences that might be expected from rash concessions? Were they aware that yielding to popular demand against their opinions would lead to the absolute loss of their rights and privileges, and their authority? Were they aware that, if the constitution were changed in the manner proposed to their Lordships, that their assembly would be only recognised as part of an empty pomp; for they would be compelled to give their assent to every measure, no matter how unconstitutional its tendency or levelling its principle, if it should please a reformed Parliament to pass it? Such would be the consequences of their Lordships' assent to the measure, and he was convinced it was only necessary to call them to their attention to induce them to pause before they gave it their sanction. It had been urged that as this measure was popular it should be carried. No doubt it was popular, but among what class of persons? It was popular to all those to whom the existing institutions of the country and the laws and privileges of their Lordships' House were hostile. The Noble Lord concluded by again calling on their Lordships to resist the proposed change, for he was convinced that after the moment of excitement and intoxication was over, and the people resumed their calm deliberation and judgment, their opinion would be expressed in hostility to the change.

[We have been politely favored with London papers containing the Speeches on the Reform Bill in the House of Lords, which are all interesting, but having received the following IMPORTANT INTELLIGENCE, we copy from the *Daily Royal Gazette*, we must stop short of our intended progress and resume the subject in our next publication.]

LONDON, Oct. 11.
House of Commons, October 10.

Lord Ebrington rose to bring forward his motion on the present state of the country. He had the satisfaction to know that the motion he should submit would not be decided by any thing which fell from him. The course he was about to recommend was simply a confirmation of what they had already done. (Cheers.) And he was sure that the House of Commons, which had the power to pass a Bill to amend its own consistency, (hear and cheers) from vindicating its own rights, (tremendous cheers for some time) and redeeming the pledges they had given their constituents. He called the attention of the House to the circumstances under which Ministers had been called on to administer the affairs of the country; a period so appalling that he almost doubted the ability of any man to restore the country to a state of happiness or security. The Noble Lord then proceeded to review the acts of the present Ministry, and concluded by moving the following resolution,

"That while this House deeply laments the present state of a Bill for a Reform in the representation of the people in the Commons House of Parliament, in favour of which the opinion of the country stands unequivocally pronounced, and which has been matured by discussions the most anxious and laborious, it feels itself imperatively called upon to re-assert its perfect adherence to the principle and leading provisions of that great measure, and to express its unabated confidence in the integrity, perseverance, and ability of those Ministers who, in introducing and conducting it, have so well consulted the best interests of the country." (Cheers.)

The cheers during Lord Ebrington's speech were of the most extraordinary kind, being taken up at one time by the Opposition, and reaching in tremendous peals of "hear, hear," from the Ministerial benches, while again the cheers commenced on the latter were caught up by the other, resumed in the galleries, and again redoubled in the body of the house.

Mr. C. Dundas seconded the motion. Mr. Goulbourn pressed the propriety of abstaining from any strong expression of feeling with respect to the proceedings of the other House of Parliament, since it would be exceedingly unjust to deny them the full exercise of those rights which they (the House of Commons) were prepared to vindicate for themselves. (Hear, hear, hear.) On what point would the rights of the House of Commons be enforced by this resolution, after the decision to which the House had already come? Were they to be told, that whenever a Bill went through its various stages in that House, and was then lost in the other, it became necessary for the House of Commons to re-assert its opinions respecting it? He considered that such a course would be to maintain the rights of the