"The People would be quiet if let alone, and if not there is away to make them".—
"There shall be no Reform so long as I hold a station in the Government."—

Duke of Wellington Nov.r 2 1830

APPENDIX

TO THE

BLACK BOOK:

AN EXPOSITION OF THE

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

OF THE

REFORM MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENT:

THE CHURCH AND THE DISSENTERS;

CATASTROPHE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS;

AND

PROSPECTS OF TORY MISRULE:

WITH TABLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND ELECTION STATISTICS AND CORRECTIONS OF FORMER EDITIONS OF THE BLACK BOOK.

"His Grace is favourable to Reform—he must be favourable to Reform;—'There stands his Grace between two bank directors.'"—"Not content with promises for the future, which I think you will find vain and unsubstantial, they refer to their past acts as proofs of their attachment to Reform; yet I think I shall demonstrate to you that they were only proofs of their inability to resist Reform."—*Lord John Russell's Speech, Dec. 2, 1834.*

BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

MDCCCXXXIV.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. MARCHANT, INGRAM-COURT, FENCHURCH-STREET.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE design of this APPENDIX is to supply omissions, and to correct and complete up to the present period the mass of information contained in former editions of *The Black Book*, especially the last edition, published in 1832.

The preliminary chapters were written prior to the change of administration, and comprise an exposition of the principles and practices of the Reform Ministry and Parliament up to the period of the former's dissolution. They also embrace a brief elucidation of the important interests at issue between agriculture and commerce—the Church and the Dissenters—the rich and the poor—our fiscal administration—and other great questions which are long likely to engage public and parliamentary attention. The remaining chapters relate to the recent change of ministers and itsprobable consequences, and the purport of which is sufficiently indicated by their titles. In the ADDENDA is a collection of statistical information, explanatory of subjects of previous discussion, the existing state of the representation, and the character and composition of the Reform Parliament. Much of this detail is of permanent interest, and will also be found valuable for reference in the event of a general election.

The British constitution is in a dilemma, and in the chapter on the 'Catastrophe of the House of Lords,' we have taken the 'bull by the horns,' by shewing where the chief difficulty lies and the mode of extrication. Changes of ministers are only convulsive efforts to avoid an inevitable conclusion. Our discussion may be thought premature; but surely two years are long enough for carrying on a national deception which every one sees through, though its open avowal is by some deemed inexpedient. What the nomination boroughs were, the PEERAGE is—the national grievance—and until it be redressed—until the second estate of the realm be brought to harmonize with the Reform Parliament, we shall continue to vibrate on the

agitating eve of a collision, the issues of which no man can gather up. It is not an unforeseen difficulty, it was foretold by Canning, Peel, and even Wellington, if not in words in idea, that the reform of the Lords would be an unavoidable consequence of the reform of the Commons.

Respecting the question which now fixes public attention, namely, the conflicting claims of the '*Ins*' and the '*Outs*', there seems little difficulty. The point at issue is simply this—Shall the people repose confidence in those who adopt reform from principle, or in those who repudiate it on principle. In private life the election would be promptly made. When men walk into danger with their eyes open—when they sin against knowledge—it is justly deemed a sign of weak or deranged intellect. He is a foolish shepherd who places over his flock a dog accustomed to bite sheep; nor less would be the fatuity of the people, if they trusted those who have always made them their prey, not watched over their welfare. Professions of reform will always be abundant. Who so base indeed as to profess otherwise? But the *kind of reform* makes all the difference. What a Radical deems reform, a Conservative deems destructive. It is not phrases but acts we want. To learn the future we must look to the past. What the Tories have been, we have still too many painful remembrances—an imperishable DEBT, and a '*dead weight*,' which alone, since the peace, has swallowed upwards of one hundred millions of the fruits of industry. Can this be forgotten by the toiling hives of Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Scotland? The Whigs are not without reproach; they have been timid in concession, but they have been great benefactors. In truth, when they gave us the Reform Bill, they gave us *all*, or nearly so, the rest being only a question of *time* in taking possession; the title-deeds and the power were put into our hands, and perhaps we have been too generous in consulting the convenience of the *outgoing tenants!*

For our parts we are always for choosing the least evil and the greatest good. On this principle we prefer a Whig to a Tory, and a Radical to either; but in our anxiety to serve a *relative* rather than a *neighbour*, we will not play the game of the common enemy of both.

Never since political strife began was there so outrageous an attempt as that which is now being made, on the credulity of the English nation. Those who have always been the foes of civil liberty, those who considered reform as synonymous with 'revolution,'—who even thought the disfranchisement of East

Redford a dangerous innovation on the constitution—are now put forward as the people's best friends, as the fittest instruments to select to work out the consequences of the Reform Act which they reviled, opposed to the utmost, and dreaded as the harbinger of that retributive justice their misdeeds had so long provoked. The juggling of St. John Long, of Mahomet, or any other successful practiser on popular folly, was nothing to this, and we shall be curious to see how far it will succeed in a community heretofore distinguished by good sense and discrimination. To the dialectics of the shallow sophistry which it is sought to cram down by mere force of daily and impudent iteration, no answer is requisite, for its dupes and its authors must be alike contemptible.

We are obviously in a 'crisis,' though it may be denied by those who are unable or unwilling to comprehend the social elements in conflict. It is a crisis, too, into which the country has been deliberately, if not wantonly, precipitated. It is now established on unquestionable authority that no divisions existed in the late Cabinet likely to terminate in its dissolution. Lord John Russell, in his speech at Totness (Dec. 2nd), says pointedly, that 'at no time was there the prospect of more UNANIMITY than when the Cabinet was dissolved.' Ministers were occupied in preparing plans of reform for the next session of parliament when they were abruptly dismissed, and he must be blind indeed who does not see the *cause* and the *object* when he sees the men by whom they have been supplanted. But Englishmen are great on great occasions, and they will not fail in the present emergency. Their old enemy is once more in the field; all the unclean things are collecting together to make *a stand* for the remnant of Corruption—for a rich sinecure Church, and the close Corporations that have so long rioted in the abuse of the trust property of the poor. It will be the Battle of the Bishops, for it is at their instigation, aided by the corporators, that the new war has commenced between the government and the people of England.*

* The chief cause of the breaking up of the late Administration is now generally admitted to have been the King's alarm at the sweeping plan of Church Reform preparing by the Whigs, and which the Quarterly Review called '*spoliation*.' His Majesty, we fear, like his '*sainted* father,' (the prenomen is Lord Kenyon's,) has got into the hands of the heads of the Church, and considering his advanced age there is little hope of an escape. The first intimation of yielding to spiritual influence was the King's reply to the address of the Bishops, of which Bishop Phillpotts gave so admirable a paraphrase, and circulated it with no small effrontery as the out-pouring of the royal mind. That the cause of the *break-up* originated in the Court and not in the internal divisions of the Cabinet, we have the explicit testimony of the ex-Premier in his reply to

It is an event for which we were certainly unprepared. We had consigned the Tory plunderers to the 'tomb of the Capulets,' as will be seen from the first page of our publication; having lost 'the mind and motive' force of the country, having exhausted all their arts of imposture, we never thought they would have the effrontery to re-appear in a public capacity. But their reign will be short; if not quietly disposed of by our parliamentary representatives, they will be crushed by the uprising of national execration at a general election. Meanwhile it will be interesting to observe their movements. They have already tried to pass themselves off as REFORMERS, but that is too clumsy a cheat to be long persisted in, and, thanks to the Reform Acts, there is no chance for gagging Bills, Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts, nor Seditious Meeting Bills:—therefore our opinion is that they will be driven to their old tricks, to try to alarm the proprietary of the kingdom, or to divert attention by a war about Belgium or Turkey, under pretext of maintaining national honour and preponderancy;—they will say nothing about the poor curates of England, nor the wretched peasantry of Ireland; their fears—pious and loyal souls!—will be all for the 'interests of religion,' the safety of the Monarchy, and the three estates; meaning thereby, as every one knows, tithes, pensions, cathedral sinecures, charity plunder, and a renewed lease of misrule!

These are certainly stale devices of the Pitt and Castlereagh system. Still, when one recollects the remark of Mr. Hume on the repeated success of similar arts of deception in all ages, and when, too, one sees that feats of ring-dropping, little-go, and other contrivances of fraud, continue daily to be played off with advantage in the metropolis, we cannot be sure that even Peel and his mountebank colleagues may not, for a time at least, meet with a certain degree of encouragement.

But that they will ultimately be driven from the stage there can be no doubt. Reformers are not so infatuated as to let their petty differences give a triumph to their common foe, and thereby lose the grand prize for which they have so long struggled—cheap—alike protective—and responsible government. If they cannot, at the ensuing election, secure the services of the *best* Reformer they will take the *next best*;—at all events they will unite and close their ranks against the entrance of the wily, hated, and well-known Tory.

December 15*th*, 1834.

---

the Reformers of Derby (Dec. 1st), and of Lord John Russell in the speech above referred to.

CONTENTS.

ADDENDA.

APPENDIX

TO THE

Black Book.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF THE REFORM MINISTRY.

THE Tories, or, according to their new designation, the conservators of abuses, have become, like the Jacobites, little more than an historical name. The mind and motive force of the country have left them, and it is impossible they can again exercise political power. If they are wise, they will seek obscurity rather than keep alive the remembrance of their misdeeds. They cannot complain that their reign was short, nor dissolution premature. They lived the full natural term of authority, that is, they survived till they fairly sank under the re-active energies of the corruptions they had patronized, and by which their sway had been perpetuated.

If we revert to the state of public institutions, it is manifest they could not have been longer carried on without the corrective of new principles. The seeds of decay had extended to the secondary as well as primary departments of administration. Abuses were not more rife in the church, public offices, and pension list, than in the courts of law and great corporations of the kingdom. Under a pertinacious system of non-inquiry and non-reform the gangrene had spread through the entire body politic. What is more, the Tories had lost their moral influence. A pretended respect for antiquity, a dread of innovation, and other plausibilities under which they had carried on their plunderings, failed to delude the community; it was found that the superstition of toryism, like other superstitions, was bottomed on mere selfishness and spoliation.

The Whigs succeeded under circumstances well calculated to inspire hope and confidence in the nation. First, they had been reared in the salutary school of adversity; with claims to power equal to their opponents, they had been long excluded from the sweets of enjoyment.

Of course they entered office with a tempered and even humiliated spirit, and with no little ostentation of devotion to the popular will.

Secondly, they were bound by previous pledges; during a long course of opposition they had placed on record sentiments which they could not belie without the forfeiture of all claim to principle and character.

But the third and best guarantee of their conduct was in the state of the public mind. The people had been awakened to the defects of their institutions; they were unanimous and energetic in the determination that no pretext, no factious illusion, should avert their efficient reformation. While this spirit lasted, the Whigs could not swerve from the path of patriotism without endangering their official existence; and it was only as popular excitement subsided that their own zeal in well-doing abated. That such a change has come over them we will show by their acts; but before we do this, we shall advert to some leading measures as illustrative of the principles of whig government.

We pass over such acts as had no characteristic feature about them, and the course of which would have been similar whether directed by a whig or tory administration. Such were the renewal of the charters of the Bank of England and East India Company. The only thing we shall remark, on the agreements concluded with these great public bodies, is that ministers made an improvident bargain for the public; that they conceded advantages to these corporations, (especially to the Bank in the legal tender clause,) for which they ought to have obtained a *higher price*. That this was the case is proved by the rise in the price of the stocks of the two companies immediately after the arrangements had been completed. As respects the Bank, too, the opportunity ought not to have been lost of placing the whole trade of banking on a better foundation—of securing a currency of unchangeable value—and obtaining for the public not only the *profit*, but the security of a national circulation, issued under the authority and guarantee of the state.

The settlement of the West-India question is another great measure of the whig ministers. We pass over the ludicrous part of this business—namely, ministers first proposing to grant a *loan* of fifteen millions to the planters, and then suddenly transmuting the loan into a *gift* of twenty millions; let us attend to the principle of this transaction.

Had the planters a fair claim to compensation for the emancipation of their slaves? We say decidedly no. The ground on which the claim has been most plausibly defended is the fact that a vast property in slaves had grown up, if not under the sanction, at least under the connivance of acts of parliament, and that, as this property was about to be destroyed by another act of parliament, the owners of slaves had a just claim to compensation against the legislature, though none against the slaves themselves.

Our first reply to this is, that though acts of parliament had been passed to regulate the slave-trade, none had been passed recognizing a right of property in human beings. Quite the reverse; since it is a well-known maxim of the English law, that the moment a slave touches the British soil he is free, our laws repudiating the idea of a property

in the person of an individual. Even a negro enlisting in the British army thereby becomes free by statute, (10 Geo. IV. c. 6, s. 37), as a native of England. Against the colonial legislatures the planters may have had a valid claim to compensation; they may have admitted a property in slaves, but the statute and common law of England are exempt from the opprobrium.

If government was right in its treatment of the planters, it has been unjust towards other classes. We will cite two cases in illustration. Under the authority of the law the great brewers acquired a valuable property in public-houses; by an act of parliament opening the beer-trade the property was destroyed or depreciated, and no compensation was granted for the injury sustained. Prohibiting the beer-houses to retail beer to be consumed on the premises will inflict great injury on their proprietors. Yet, though these houses were opened under the express guarantee of an act of parliament, and the property therein may be greatly impaired by another act of parliament, no compensation will be given to the owners for the loss they have suffered.

The property in newspapers has become a great property; it has been created under, and its value may depend on the continuance of the existing stamp laws. It is impossible to foresee what might be the effect of the repeal of the stamp duties, but whatever this effect may be, however greatly newspaper property may be depreciated thereby, we will venture to say the owners would neither ask nor obtain indemnification.

Why ought such different measures of justice to be dealt to the different classes of the community? We can only ascribe it to the aristocracy still predominant in the government. Members of the House of Commons, members of the House of Lords, and members of the Cabinet, were interested in the slave question; they were *owners of slaves*, and so their losses must be compensated! It was not, therefore, for the maintenance of a principle, nor to do an act of impartial justice, but for the maintenance of *a caste*, that a permanent encumbrance has been entailed on the country of upwards of £600,000 a year,—a sum equal to the taxes on knowledge, and one-tenth of all the money levied for the relief of the poor of England.

The same selfish policy, the same devotion to aristocratic interests, maintains the discriminating duties between East and West India produce, by which the people of England have been taxed four millions annually for the benefit of the trans-Atlantic planters.

An injustice or abuse ought to be abated without compensation. It is contrary to law, as well as reason, that a man should profit by his own wrong-doing. But the Whigs have been constantly doing violence to this principle; they have not sought to reform, but to *buy up* the fee-simple of abuses at their full value. They have sought to change, not lighten the burden. An overgrown salary has been commuted into a superannuation, and a sinecure into a pension. The maxim acted upon is, that whoever has once had the fingering of the public money shall for ever after be maintained out of the public purse. It is the principle of the poor-laws; let a man obtain a settlement, and he thenceforward

claims support from the parish, and let a placeman once get into a government office, and he immediately and for ever sets up the pauper's claim of being fed and clothed at the charge of the community. Some pensions have been granted on the most objectionable practice of the poor-law administration—namely, *the allowance system.* We have before us a parliamentary return of persons who receive compensation allowances for the loss of their offices until *otherwise provided for*; that is, while out of work they shall receive something less than *full* wages. According to this rule we are now maintaining a mass of tory ex-placemen. Mr. Goulburn receives £2000 a year; Mr. Croker, £1500; Mr. Planta, £1000; Mr. Courtenay, £1000; with many others. The condition on which all these pensions are received is that when they hold offices—that is, get into full employment—their pauper allowances shall cease. But why did not the Poor Law Bill abolish state allowances as well as parish allowances to the able-bodied but unemployed poor. Is it not as reasonable that John Wilson Croker and William Goulburn should have made provision for the vicissitudes of life out of their earnings as Jem Styles and Matthew Dawson?

In their Judicial Reforms the Whigs have gone on the tory maxim, that the holders of sinecures in the courts of law shall receive *full* pecuniary compensation. But we must protest against its justice; we can never admit of 'vested rights' in public abuses; we can never admit that the holders of life or reversionary interests in abuses in church or state are entitled to their full yearly value like the holders of a copyhold or freehold estate. But this favoured class seem even exempt from the changes in the value of property to which other classes are liable. Sinecures, whether lay or spiritual, are no longer sacred in public estimation—they are depreciated in value—they are, in fact, exposed to entire confiscation by the progress of opinion; yet they still continue to be bought up by government at their full nominal worth, in lieu of being extinguished by a compromise or dividend. In this way the great legal sinecures held by lord Ellenborough, the duke of Grafton, and others, ought to be got rid of. But the late reforms in the Court of Chancery have established a mischievous precedent. The monstrous sinecures of £11,000 a year, held by the rev. Thomas Thurlow, were purchased by an equivalent life-annuity payable out of bankrupt estates. The purse-bearer to the lord chancellor, and other officers in the court, were compensated in a similar manner. Lord Brougham received, as an equivalent for the loss of a portion of his sinecure patronage, an addition of one-fourth part to his retiring pension, making it £5000, in lieu of £4000, the highest sum paid to his predecessors.

Lord Brougham is a bitter enemy to the Poor Laws, as encouraging idleness and improvidence; but why does he countenance the application of principles to himself which he reprobates when applied to the less instructed portion of society? What is his pension but a compulsory rate levied on the community as a provision for old age, a large family, or scarcity of employment? These are, in truth, the very pretexts on which it has been justified. By a loss of patronage it is assumed his

lordship has not the same means of providing for his children, and his pension is deemed a provision to fall back on in old age or when unemployed. But surely this "great Westmoreland pauper" might provide for the casualties of life out of his enormous income as well as the poor man out of his wretched pittance. As to absolute want of employment there does not appear much to apprehend, as lord Lyndhurst has overcome that difficulty by descending to a chief-justiceship after being chancellor; or why not even descend to practise again at the bar, after the example of chief-justice Pemberton.* At all events there seems little need of a pension: the practice of granting pensions to ex-chancellors is one of the excrescences of the "Pitt and plunder" system, and ought to have disappeared with the first session of the Reformed Parliament.

By-the-by we might as well remark here on the enormous salary awarded to the lord chancellor by his whig friends, and which his lordship, up to this time, has condescended to receive. We do this without any personal ill-will, for we will readily admit no one deserves to be better paid than lord Brougham. But we look to principle and former professions. On examination before a parliamentary committee lord Brougham remarked on the almost impossibility that some of the tory ministers should not have been favourable to the continuance of the late war, seeing it added so enormously to their official gains. Lord Eldon was cited as an instance. Upon an average of three years during the war his lordship's net income was £19,233, and in one year, 1811, it was £22,737. (*Parliamentary Paper, No.* 322, *session* 1831.) Lord Stowell lost £8000 a year by the cessation of hostilities as judge of the admiralty court. Even the king lost by the peace, as he had no longer the plunder of the droits of the crown and admiralty to supply his extravagance. It is inconceivable men would act so detestable a part with their eyes open, as to continue the miseries of war for mere official spoil; yet as lord Brougham most justly observed, "human frailty operates so, that without stating to ourselves the points we are erring upon, *our interests* work upon us unknown to ourselves."

Now is lord Brougham more favourably circumstanced than his predecessor? Is he not surrounded by the same interest-begotten motives of action? By the establishment of the Bankruptcy Court his duties are considerably less than former chancellors; yet, allowing for the change in the value of money, his emoluments are greater than the average emoluments of lord Eldon during the war, and he has a retiring pension equal to the salary of the president of the United States of America. It is hardly possible, therefore, that he can see great defects in a system by which he so greatly profits, or be zealous in the reform of abuses. Hence his procrastinated, illusive, and abortive legal reforms. During the four years of his chancellorship not more has been effected than would have been effected under a tory or any other administration. The defects in our judicial system, and the chaos of absurdities in the statute

* Law Magazine, No. 12, p. 448.

and common law of the realm, continue unredressed. Even the Court of Chancery is still pre-eminent for delay, cost, and circuity. And why not disintegrate the mass of incompatible duties in his lordship's own office, by separating judicial from political functions, and removing the opprobrious farce of appealing from lord Brougham on the bench to lord Brougham on the woolsack? A love of patronage, of power, and emolument, are the lurking motives.*

In their Ecclesiastial Reforms the Whigs have been singularly unsuccessful, and the second session of the reformed parliament has terminated without any substantial improvement being effected either in the Irish or English branch of the United Church. It would occupy too much space to exhibit at length the abortions in principle and detail that have been propounded, still it is essential to give the reader an outline of what has been proposed, as illustrative of the views of ministers on church reform and indicative of future proceedings.

The Act (3 and 4 Will. IV. c. 37.) for regulating the temporalities of the Irish Church was the chief measure of the first session. By it the number of bishops is reduced from twenty-two to twelve, by the union of sees as the present incumbents *die off*. After the death of the present incumbents also, the enormous revenues of some of the sees are to be reduced; that of Armagh from its present amount of £14,500 to £10,000; that of Derry from £12,000 to £6,000; and all the other sees which may be worth more than £4000 to that sum. The exaction of vestry cess is abolished. So is also that of first fruits, in the stead of which there is to be imposed upon all livings above the actual yearly value of £300 an annual tax, varying in its rate according to the value of the living. Lastly, the leases of bishops' lands are to be converted

---

* Lord Brougham has certainly no objection to be *laughed at*, and not unfrequently goes out of his way to raise a laugh. The bill he threw on the table for the reform of the appellate judicature of the House of Lords on the last day but one of the session could only have been meant as *a joke*. With the same motive no doubt he introduced at the middle of the session his bills for the prevention of pluralities and the non-residence of the clergy. The delay in bringing forward the appeal bill, his lordship excused, on the pretext of "the extraordinary pressure of business in the Lords," though it is notorious they sat several months of the early part of the session with no business whatever before them.

How the Chancellor, who professes to take the lead in legal reform, can tolerate, year after year, the present management of appeals, passes comprehension. The farce of appealing from a judge in one place to the *same* judge in another constitutes only half the absurdity. Two noble lords sit and assist at the first hearing of an appeal; two others sit and hear the other side. On the third day two more noble lords who had not been present before come down and hear the reply. The cause is then set down for judgment, and in the fourth stage two noble lords assist at the judgment who had not been present either at "the beginning, middle, or end of the proceedings." (Lord Brougham's own description, Aug. 15th.) One would hardly expect an extravaganza like this to be enacted in the highest court of judicature in the kingdom. Scotch appeals, too, are brought to the Lords; the errors of the Scotch judges are brought to be corrected by a tribunal which is about as well acquainted with the laws of Scotland as the laws of Japan!

into perpetuities, by which it is *supposed* a sum of £1,200,000 (it was originally calculated at three times that amount) will be realized. The fund arising from these prospective reductions and savings—for mind, it is all in future—is to be vested in commissioners, consisting of six prelates of the Irish Church and the Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, and under their direction it is to be applied to the augmentation of small benefices, the building of churches and glebe houses, the meeting of the expenses hitherto defrayed out of the vestry cess, and other *purely ecclesiastical objects.* The fund so created it is calculated will ultimately yield a revenue of £155,000 a year.

Upon this *first* measure of reform two observations may be made. 1. It effected (with the exception of the see of Derry) no *immediate* reduction in the enormous revenues of the Irish clergy. 2. With the exception of the vestry cess, amounting to about £35,000 a year, not a single farthing is saved to the community; an enormous sinecure church establishment is still left to levy the same amount of revenue from the industry and property of Ireland. So far, then, as the people are concerned, the reform is totally valueless; it saves nothing for the poor, for education, nor for local improvements.

In lieu of a measure of this sort a very different proceeding was demanded. A crisis had happened in the affairs of Ireland; by what may be termed the natural course of events, the clergy had lost their tithes, and the church, instituted for the benefit of the people, had become alien and useless to them. Here, then, was an opportunity for getting rid of the entire grievance. Abolish the Irish Church as a national establishment; share among the clergy the remnant of property which events had left to them; let them have life stipends out of the produce of the bishops' and other church lands. In lieu of tithe let a land-tax be levied for the maintenance of the destitute, for education, and for the extinction of those territorial rights which are the great obstacle to the reclamation of the bogs and wastes of Ireland.

By such a plan of reform the ecclesiastical establishment, which has been the principal source of impoverishment and civil strife, might have been made the great instrument for improving and tranquillizing the country.

Two other acts were passed relative to the Irish Church; one for effecting a compulsory composition for tithes payable by the landlord, and the other empowering government to make advances to the amount of *one million* to such of the clergy as had not been able to recover the tithes due to them, to be repaid by five annual instalments. The landlords are now the parties from whom the repayment of these instalments may be demanded, who have of course their remedy against occupiers of the soil. It is not improbable the money advanced to the Irish clergy will never be repaid except out of the pockets of the people of Great Britain. But we must leave this to come to the schemes introduced last session for the extinction of tithe.

First it was resolved, before any final arrangement took place, the law

itself should be restored, and the right of the clergy vindicated by enforcing the payment of tithe. In the execution of this preliminary essay, that noted person the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley most signally failed. After bringing into play all the resources of his vast genius—after employing horse, foot, and artillery, to collect the pigs, poultry, cattle, and chattels of the peasantry, the most energetic of secretaries could only raise £12,000, and this after an expenditure of £60,000.* Failing in this project, the next position assumed was that whatever might be the fate of tithes, the *landlords* had no right to a farthing of them. This was lord Althorp's own explicit, firm, and decided declaration. Mr. Littleton followed with his celebrated resolution of the 20th of February, for the conversion of tithe into a land-tax, payable to the crown and redeemable by the landlords, the produce of such redemption to be invested in land for the benefit of the clergy.

To this proposition the objections were weighty and manifold. First, the policy of tying up in mortmain a mass of real property in the hands of the church or government, was not sanctioned by the experience of history. Secondly, the making the clergy stipendiaries of the state would not tend to elevate their office in public estimation, and gave a sanction to some of the popular notions respecting them. Lastly, it was not likely many of the Irish landlords would have money to spare to redeem their tithes, poor as they were known to be, and burdened as their estates mostly are with mortgages and settlements.

To surmount these difficulties the Great Agitator came forth, July 30th, with his famous proposition for at once giving a *bonus of* 40 *per cent. to the landlords* on condition that they would, in place of their tenantry, charge themselves with the payment of the remaining 60 per cent. of tithe. The plan was that the clergy should abate 22½ per cent. of their full due,—namely, 2½ per cent. for the expenses of collection, and 20 per cent for better security. Every incumbent therefore would receive 77l. 10s. certain in lieu of £100 nominal income. Of this 77l. 10s. the sum of £60 would be paid by the landlord, and the remainder, 17l. 10s., be charged on the consolidated fund, that is, on general revenue of the empire. Ultimately, indeed, it was held forth

---

* It was observed of James II. that he sacrificed "his kingdom for *a mass.*" The contempt is hardly less which attaches to the conduct of Mr. Stanley and his ex-colleagues. They not only threw away office but the prospect of office; for it is clear no man can long take part in the councils of this country who denies the legislative right to secularize church property—a principle consecrated by the example of every European state. In this the late Secretary of the Colonies committed a mistake, and demonstrated that his powers of debate exceeded his knowledge of the spirit of the age. Indeed, Mr. Stanley has not latterly evinced much wisdom; he was manifestly becoming a *spoiled child* of the House of Commons, and unable to bear the flattering but intoxicating "*cheers*," "*laughs*," and "*hear hears*" of the honourable members. His late speeches were in the worst style of that flashy adventurer, George Canning, whose brazen monument in Palace-yard, erected in honour of successful effrontery, casts ridicule on all posthumous tributes to the truly great.

that the difference of £17 was to be paid out of what is called the Perpetuity Fund, that is, the fund already alluded to, arising from the sale of bishops' leases in perpetuity; but as this fund is not likely to be realized during the present generation, it may be concluded that the tax-ridden people of England and Scotland would be saddled with the payment of nearly one-fifth of the tithes of the Irish clergy!

The plan we have last indicated is that which passed the House of Commons, but was rejected by the Lords as too unfavourable to the Church; but a plan more favourable to the Church and less favourable to the people is not, in our opinion, likely to be again submitted for their acceptance.

That it was favourable to the clergy may be easily illustrated. By the defection or hostility of the people tithe had become extinct as a property, as much so as if it had been swallowed up by the sea or an earthquake. Under such circumstances were not 77½ per cent. a most bountiful equivalent? In our opinion it was too much. Few persons would give £77 for £100 tithe even in England, to be saddled with its insecurities and the expenses of collection. Many landlords would gladly accept £77 certain, indisputable, and in perpetuity, in place of a nominal £100 of their rents. Whether the Irish clergy were entitled to anything may be doubted. They had lost their property by the course of events, and how many other persons have lost their incomes by the vicissitudes of the times without receiving compensation? To wit, those who have been ruined or injured by tamperings with the currency, the Bank Restriction Act, and the reduction of the Five and Four per Cents. Stock of the National Debt. Government showed no sympathy for the sufferers in these instances, though it was, in fact, the author of their misfortunes. We repeat, then, that the tender to the Irish clergy was most liberal—more liberal, we are sure, than will ever be again offered.

Let us next advert to this plan of ecclesiastical reform as it would have affected the community. It is of importance to examine it with attention, as it may be made the foundation of ulterior projects for the extinction of tithe in England.

Two-fifths of the tithes were to be at once swamped in a *bonus to the landlords*. This was the most indefensible part of the scheme. If there were any point on which all men were agreed, it was on the fact that, come what might, no portion of the tithe ought to devolve to the owners of the soil. This was the Chancellor of the Exchequer's own explicit and apparently unchangeable declaration. Next to the clergy no class was so deeply interested in the settlement of the tithe question as the landlords. It gave value, peace, and security to their possessions. In lieu of a *bribe* they ought to have made a *sacrifice*. But the source whence the bribe was to be taken outrages belief. It was not to be taken from the vast possessions of the Irish Church, but to be charged on the general revenue of the empire. Of the £40 out of every £100 to be given to the landlords, nearly one half was in great part to come out of the pockets of the dissenters of England and presbyterians of

Scotland. Here was ecclesiastical regeneration with a vengeance! In lieu of the reform of the rich sinecure church of Ireland opening new sources of public revenue, it would have entailed additional burdens on the community. The question of the secular appropriation of the surplus wealth of the church was perverted into a question for appropriating more money for its maintenance—and of which a whig aristocracy, who had with alacrity adopted this new scheme of public spoliation, and who are among the principal landowners of Ireland—and the rest of an absent proprietary, who had been the chief causes of the miseries of the country—were to have the sole benefit and advantage!

One of the most objectionable measures of last session—Poor Law Bill excepted—is the Civil Offices Pension Act. This act is founded on an act passed during the odious administration of lord Castlereagh. In 1817 the call for retrenchment was loud and unceasing, and in order to silence the popular cry a committee of the House of Commons recommended that certain of the most obnoxious sinecures should be abolished. But as this took away a portion of the corrupt matter at the disposal of the minister, it was proposed that the crown should be empowered to grant certain equivalent pensions to its adherents in lieu of the abolished sinecures. Accordingly the 57 Geo. III. c. 67, provided that all the chief and subaltern officers of government, from the first lord of the treasury down to the clerk of the ordnance and first and second secretaries of the Admiralty should be entitled to retiring pensions, varying from £3000 to £1000 per annum.

This, it must be confessed, was an odd mode of *economical* reform. The sinecures were abuses, and ought to have been swept away without placing another equivalent abuse at the disposal of the crown. The principle assumed was that sinecures were the property of our hereditary legislators and their dependents, and as this property was taken from them they had a right to be provided for in some other way; that either as sinecurists or pensioners they were entitled to a perpetual maintenance from the public!

Upon this bill of 1817—so base in its origin and so indefensible in principle—the Whig act of the present session for granting pensions to *themselves* is founded. The Act 4 and 5 Will. IV. c. 24 provides that the first lord of the treasury, the secretaries of state, the chancellor of the exchequer, first lord of the admiralty, president of the India board, and president of the board of trade, may each claim £2000 a year pension after *two years' service* at one or different times; that the chief secretary of Ireland and secretary at war may claim £1400 a year after five years' service, and that joint secretaries of the treasury, vice-president of board of trade, under secretaries of state, first and second secretary of the admiralty, and secretaries of India board, may each claim pensions from £1200 to £1000 for terms of service, varying from five to ten years.

Neither the public press nor the radical members of the House of Commons appear to have taken notice of this extraordinary measure

of a reform ministry. We shall, however, offer a few observations, first on the extravagance of this provision, and, secondly, on the principle of placing such a power of rewarding the high and efficient officers of government in the hands of the crown.

According to the act, the first lord of the treasury, after *two years' service*, may claim a pension of £2000 for life, and the president of the board of trade a like sum after the same term of service. Supposing now these officers forty years of age, and that they retire from office after two or three years and live to the age of eighty they will receive, exclusive of interest, £80,000 of the public money, or £40,000 for each year of actual labour. A pretty reward this to lord Melbourne or Mr. Poulett Thomson for submitting for a couple of years to the drudgery of public life, exclusive of their official salaries and patronage while in office, and which we should have thought ample remuneration.

But why should the power of rewarding public services be vested in the crown, and not in the House of Commons? It is plain enough that it is only the favourites of the court or of the ministers that will receive pensions under this act. No servant of the people, however necessitous, will ever be benefited by it—only the parasites of power. It is in fact bribes for *servility*, so much additional influence to the crown, and a further provision for titled pauperism. Lord Brougham, however, concurred in the measure as well as the duke of Wellington, and the chief objection to it entertained by earl Grey was, that "it did not sufficiently enable the crown to reward public functionaries."

There is another observation connected with this extraordinary provision of the Whigs,—namely, that it holds out a temptation to ministers to *desert their employment* without reasonable and adequate occasion. We do not mean to insinuate that the chance of £2000 a year for doing nothing was the cause of the retirement of lord Grey, Mr. Stanley, and sir James Graham; we do not mean to say that they acted from the same unworthy motives that lord Brougham says the paupers do—that they prefer one-half or one-third wages *in idleness* rather than whole wages and industry; still, as the same learned personage remarked, selfish motives do exert such an unerring influence over human conduct, unknown even to the parties themselves, that it is impossible to say to what extent they may have influenced the individuals mentioned. It cannot be denied that during last session ministers were always ready to withdraw from office; indeed, having made such a comfortable provision for themselves, and having placed in lucrative appointments their relatives and dependents, they had scarcely any motive longer to undergo the toils and anxieties of official life. They had, as the late premier recommended the bishops to do, put their 'houses in order,' and were prepared for the worst. The threat of retirement was really the talisman by which they governed the country. If the independent portion of the House of Commons was likely to prove refractory, a ministerial 'strike' was held *in terrorem*, which instantly procured implicit obedience.

Now to those honourable Members who really consider the services of

lord Althorp and colleagues essential to the government of this great empire—a necessity we confess we do not ourselves perceive—we would vouchsafe a word of advice. Why do they not take away from ministers all temptation to retirement?—why do they not obtain the repeal of an act which holds out a direct inducement to withdraw from office, and apply to them the same principle they are seeking to apply to the poor, that *those who do not work neither shall they eat*—at the public expense!

As our purpose is not to present a detailed history of the Whig Ministry merely to illustrate principles, we shall only indicate minor delinquencies. Of this sort was the grant of a pension of £2000 a year to Mr. Abercromby. The appointment of this gentleman to a Scotch sinecure judgeship of the Court of Exchequer, just on the eve of its abolition, was itself a mere job; and then on the reduction of the court to settle the honourable member on the country for life was an indefensible mode of providing for *a friend* totally unworthy of a reform government. Of the same character, or worse, was the creation of a new office for Mr. Macaulay—his father and other relatives having before been provided for—with a salary of £10,000 a year, and an ample retiring pension after four or five years service, as a means of *paying him* for half a dozen clever speeches, reviews, and party pamphlets. Not less objectionable was the appointment of sir John Byng to the governorship of Londonderry—a sinecure of £1200 a year. The Russo-Dutch loan and the guarantee given to Otho, king of Greece, were measures of questionable policy, by which a serious burden and responsibility have been imposed on the country. Then, one cannot forget their defence of naval and military sinecures—their opposition to a revision of the pension list—to the abolition of flogging in the army—to naval impressment—to the repeal of the septennial act—the stamp duties on newspapers—and the introduction of the ballot.

The measures on which the Whigs may justly pride themselves are their Reform Bill, their economical reductions in the public expenditure, their improvement of the constitution of the Scotch Burghs, and their foreign policy. They have also instituted many salutary inquiries into the civil and judicial administration of the country. But their foreign policy, next to the reform bill, is their proudest boast. They have not only preserved peace—so essential to the thorough reform of our institutions and the progress of constitutional liberty abroad—but they have severed the country from its tory connexions with the continental despotisms, and united her destinies to the free governments of France and the Peninsula. The union of the naval power of Britain with the military power of France is the guarantee of peace, or, if war should come, of victory against Tyrants!

CHAPTER II.

THE PLOUGH AND THE LOOM.

THERE is obviously a strong disposition in ministers and the reformed parliament to show special favour to agriculture. On the opening of the late session his Majesty is made to lament "the continuance of distress amongst the proprietors and occupiers of land." All the more important measures subsequently introduced, as the repeal of taxes on husbandry and the reform of the tithe and poor laws, appear to have been deemed chiefly valuable as modes of rural relief. Now an important question offers,—is there any thing in the present state of agriculture, or its relative importance as a branch of national industry, that fairly gives precedency to the Plough over the Loom? or is the preference merely a feudal prejudice, or selfish desire on the part of the territorial classes to forward those pursuits in which they are most deeply interested?

As to the existence of agricultural distress, that is a condition inseparable from the cultivation of the soil. But that there is general and unusual distress among the farming classes, we deny, and for proof refer to the *evidence* (not Sir James Graham's Report) given before the Agricultural Committee of last year. Relative distress will always subsist in agriculture. Farming is and always must be a poor trade. The inducements to invest capital in land are such, that the profits of farming must always be depressed below the profits of commerce and manufactures. This is not the only cause of depression. In England, where two-thirds of the land occupied are held by tenants-at-will, if a farmer's profits increase, his rent will be proportionately increased. So that, pressed on one side by the greater competition of capital in his employment, and on the other by the increasing exactions of his landlord, it is obvious that he can never enjoy, for a lengthened period, an exuberant state of prosperity.

From this dilemma no protection can save him. Were the price of corn, by restrictions on importation, artificially forced up to 120*s.* a quarter, his condition would not be permanently bettered. There would still be agricultural distress for him. The exorbitant price of corn would force inferior land into cultivation, the produce of which, owing to the greater outlay in its cultivation, would barely remunerate the grower; so that the occupier would be still only able to obtain a bare

subsistence; and as to those occupying the richer soils, they would be reduced to their wonted level by the increase of rents.*

The partial distress of landlords, though it originates in different causes, seems as inevitable as that of their tenants. In Poland, in Russia, in Spain, and in every European community, the landed interest is in a state of pecuniary embarrassment. Every where estates are encumbered by debts, mortgages, and settlements. This, however, is not because their revenues are small, but because they are enormous. It is men of moderate, not of large incomes, that live within them. The former are compelled to practice economy, to look after their affairs, and live according to rule; the latter are exempt from these precautions. George IV. had a million a-year and was constantly in debt, and many of the great landholders, from similar improvident courses, are involved in a like predicament.

It follows that the mere existence of poverty among the proprietors and occupiers of land is no proof of the existence of general agricultural distress entitled to legislative relief. The landed interest has always been the favoured interest in this country; it has been favoured by the

---

* That landlords usually proportion their rents to the ability of their tenantry may be instanced in the condition of farmers in the northern counties. Here, owing to the more frugal and laborious habits of farmers, land pays a higher rent than in the southern division of the kingdom. The examination of Mr. Blamire, M.P. before the Agricultural Committee is very instructive on these points; he is interrogated on the diet, &c. of farmers in Cumberland and Westmoreland.

"Is not their diet very frugal?—Their diet is extremely simple, consisting, in a great part, of *barley bread, potatoes, milk, and a small quantity of bacon.*

"And they themselves have been content to work with their own hands?—Yes.

"Does that observation apply to men farming to a considerable extent, and paying a large amount of rent?—Men farming £400, or £500, or £600 a-year, will dine with their servants; and on particular occasions will plough or harrow, or do various operations of husbandry themselves.

"And the landlords, throughout the period of the high prices, have partaken of the benefit of the rents which these frugal habits would enable their tenants to pay?—*Yes, they have.*

"And the *great profit has been to the landlords,* inasmuch as the tenant so living and adopting these habits of frugal expenditure, has been enabled to pay a higher rent than he could otherwise have afforded?—Most undoubtedly.

"Do you find, in fact, that in these two counties, where you say that those frugal habits prevail, the rent of the same quality of land is higher than in other counties?—A great deal higher; lands, which in Cumberland let for 40*s.* an acre, would not, in many other counties in England, let at more than 26*s.* or 27*s.*

"Do you ascribe that higher rate of rent very much to the simple lives and frugal habits of the tenants?—To the frugal habits of the farmer and his labour."—*Agricultural Report, sess.* 1833, p. 306.

These hints may be useful to landlords in the south; if they can bring their tenants to live as they do in the north, they may squeeze from them much higher rents; and if, by the working of the Poor Law Bill, they can reduce labourers to the *Irish level,* it is possible they may get them up to the war standard. But the question occurs to whose benefit? Is it not better the farmers and their servants should live comfortably, than that the landlords, who are much less numerous, should live luxuriantly?

progress of commercial and manufacturing industry, and it has been favoured by a most partial allocation of public burdens, and the general course of legislation. After shortly elucidating these circumstances in the progress of agriculture, we will proceed to show that, from changes in society, the time has passed when the landed interest ought to be considered the primary interest of the community.

Notwithstanding the complaints of the decay of agriculture, of farmers living on their capital, and of whole parishes being abandoned from the pressure of poor-rates, there can be little doubt that agriculture has been constantly extending. How otherwise can we account for the comparatively low prices of produce? Population has been steadily increasing, and unless the increase of food had kept pace with the increase of consumers, prices must have been enhanced by competition. It may be alleged that prices have been kept down by importation from abroad, but this is refuted by facts. In the last two years the foreign wheat and flour entered for home consumption have been very inconsiderable. The quantity of foreign wheat and flour kept for consumption in Britain, in the ten years ending in 1820, amounted to 5,206,321 quarters; and in the ten years ending in 1830, it amounted to 5,349,927 quarters.* No great difference. Yet in the interval from 1820 to 1831, population had increased two millions. Now whence has the food been obtained for this vast addition to the number of consumers? Certainly not from Ireland. The imports from Ireland during the last ten years do not exceed on the average 350,000 quarters a-year. But an increase of two millions of consumers requires an increase of at least two millions of quarters of wheat for their sustenance, and that the supply has been obtained is evident from the fact of the steadiness of prices. It may be concluded, therefore, that as this supply has neither been obtained from Ireland nor abroad, it has been obtained from the increasing produce of our own soil.

General facts of this nature entirely negative the idea of the decline of agriculture. They are much more satisfactory than the testimony of individuals; since the last, when honestly given, can only be founded on a limited observance and their own peculiar circumstances. Even witnesses examined by the Agricultural Committee of last year testified to the thriving state of husbandry. In Norfolk, Mr. Wright, an extensive land-agent, bore testimony to the progressive improvement in farming; and in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk the land is as well cultivated as ever, (p. 96.) In Cornwall, Mr. Coode stated that agriculture had improved. In Lancashire, Mr. Reed said (p. 179) the quantity of arable land had increased within the last seven years. Other witnesses testified to the same effect.

No doubt the profits of farming have fallen since the war, but the depression extends to every other department of industry. Taken as a body, in no other country do the agricultural classes enjoy such pre-

* Edinburgh Review, No. 118, p. 291.

eminent advantages. Their estates have been fertilized by the wealth flowing from the successful pursuit of commerce and manufactures. They have better turnpike-roads to roll their carriages on, and canals to transport their produce, than can be found any where else. By the help of unrivalled mechanical inventions, they are enabled to buy their wearing apparel, their woollens, linens, silks, and calicoes, cheaper than in any other country. The possession of vast colonies brings within their reach all the choicest luxuries of the earth. Through these and other advantages the English aristocracy has become the richest and most favourably circumstanced in the world. It is remarked of lord Clive, (*Universal Magazine*, July, 1760,) who had killed himself, that he had £70,000 a-year, and was the richest subject of the king. Many individuals at present have four or five times that income. Foreigners view with astonishment the splendid seats of the nobility, their gorgeous and crowded assemblies, their massive sideboards of plate, splendid equipages, and other indications of territorial opulence!

Mere wealth, however, constitutes only a tithe of the social and political advantages enjoyed by the landed interest. 1. A landed qualification is the basis of eligibility to most civil and legislative functions. Without a qualification in land, no person is eligible to be a member of parliament, a sheriff, a justice of peace for the county, or a commissioner of land and assessed taxes. 2. By the law of entail, their property is protected from the just demands of creditors, when that of persons engaged in trade would be liable. 3. Their possessions are exempt from the legacy and auction duties. 4. A mass of sinecures in church and state are kept up solely for their profit and emolument. 5. In the levy of the assessed taxes and the imposition of turnpike-tolls, special favour is shown to all interests connected with agriculture. Lastly, it is now admitted by sir R. Peel and sir James Graham, that the corn-laws, which levy a tax of twenty or thirty millions on the people, are kept up solely for the preservation of the landed aristocracy as essential parts of the community.

The only drawbacks of the landed interest are tithes, poor-rates, and county-rates. The unfairness of representing these as peculiar burdens on land has been so often exposed, that it appears superfluous to advert to them. For a landowner to complain of tithes, it has been justly observed he might as well complain that his neighbour's field is not his own, or that he is lord of only 900 in lieu of 1000 acres. For 1000 years at least the tithe-owner has been co-proprietor of the soil, and subject to his claim the landlord has succeeded to his possessions. The lien of the poor is hardly less inalienable; they have always been a charge upon the land, and justly so in return for their services. Then, again, as to the county-rates, the burden properly falls on the landowners, as it is chiefly for their convenience and security that the highways, prisons, and bridges are kept in repair.

Leaving these matters, let us come to the allocation of public burdens. The progress of taxation is a most instructive lesson in the science of government; it shows how a class, enjoying a monopoly of political

power, will pervert that power to its own selfish purposes, and to the neglect or depression of all the non-represented interests of the community.

The land-tax is a practical illustration of this truth. This impost has been stationary for a hundred and forty years, notwithstanding the vast increase in the value of landed property. Of forty-nine millions raised by taxes in the thirteen years of the reign of William III. the land-tax furnished £19,174,000. The landowners of that day, therefore bore *two-fifths* of the whole public revenue, and paid a direct tax to government, which was nominally one-fifth, and might be in reality one sixth of their entire income.

As the old valuation and rate of assessment of 1692 have been continued to the present, the produce of the land-tax at this day, including the value of what has been redeemed, is the same as it was at the end of the seventeenth century, namely, two millions a-year. But two millions at the former period was about one-fifth of the land-rents, whereas it is now only one-fifteenth. It then formed nearly one-half the public revenue; it now constitutes about the twenty-fifth part. Here, then, is a striking instance of the dexterity with which the landowners have evaded their fair proportion of taxation, and this without being subjected to any countervailing burdens; for it must be borne in mind that when contributing one-fourth of their incomes to the state, they were subject then as now to the additional assessment of tithes, poor-rates, and county-rates.*

Let us now advert for a moment to the continental landowner. More the subject is investigated, and more enviable and favoured will appear the position of the British agriculturist; less ground there will appear for perpetuating the injustice of corn-laws, and seeking relief from existing burdens.

In France, the *fonciere*, or land-tax, produces about one-fourth part of the entire revenue of the country. The landowners of Austria are supposed to pay at least one-fourth, probably one-third of the entire mass of national taxation. From the statements of Mr. Jacob, it appears that in Hanover, Mecklenberg, Holstein, and Sleswick, the land-tax on the owner's net profits varies from 20 to 25 per cent. including, however, tithes and school and poor rates, which are generally trifling in amount. In Prussia, the king's tax on rent is 25 per cent.

It thus appears that in the most improved and civilized countries of the continent, about one-fourth of the whole public revenue is derived from a direct tax on land, while in Britain the land-tax supplies only one twenty-fifth part of the revenue. The landowners of the continent pay about one-fourth of their incomes to government, those of Britain about one fifteenth part.

It is worthy of remark, too, that while the land-tax in this country has been stationary since the reign of William III. it has been in a state

* For a more detailed exposition of the inequality of the land-tax assessment, see the *Scotsman* newspaper of October 16th, 1833.

of progressive increase on the continent, the cadastres, or valuations, being raised or altered, from time to time, or superseded by new ones.

Having adverted to the privileges, exemptions, and special favour extended to agriculture, let us next inquire whether there is any ground for this preference, either in the superior numbers, industrial character, fiscal contributions, or intelligence and moral power of the agricultural classes: in a word, let us ascertain whether agriculture is, as heretofore considered, the primary, or only the secondary interest of the empire. A solution of these questions will determine the soundness of the policy, which has long been predominant in the legislature, of rendering the interests of the town subservient to the country population.

First as to *numbers*. In England, the proportion of the population employed in agriculture is smaller, perhaps, than in any other European community. In Italy, the proportion of agriculturists to non-agriculturists is as 100 to 31; in France, as 100 to 50; in England, rather more than as 27 to 100. It is a remarkable fact, that the proportion of persons employed in agriculture during the last thirty years has been gradually decreasing, while the proportion employed in trades has been increasing. A similar change in the industrial character of society is observable in Scotland and Wales, as will appear from the following statement of Mr. Rickman, inserted in the Appendix to the Report of the Agricultural Committee.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the NUMBER and OCCUPATION of FAMILIES in *England, Wales,* and *Scotland,* in the Years 1811, 1821, and 1831; also the Proportions expressed in Centesimal Parts.

—	In each Year.	Total Families.	Employed in Agriculture.	Employed in Trade, Manufacture, &c.	All other Families.	EXPRESSED IN CENTESIMAL PARTS. Year.	Total.	Agriculture.	Trade, &c.	Others.
ENGLAND	1811	2,012,391	697,353	923,588	391,450	1811	100	34·7	45·9	19·4
	1821	2,346,717	773,732	1,118,295	454,690	1821	100	33·0	47·6	19·2
	1831	2,745,336	761,348	1,182,912	801,076	1831	100	27·7	43·1	19·4
WALES	1811	129,756	72,846	36,044	20,866	1811	100	56·2	27·7	16·1
	1821	146,706	74,225	41,680	30,801	1821	100	50·6	28·5	20·9
	1831	166,538	73,195	44,702	48,641	1831	100	43·9	26·9	29·2
SCOTLAND	1811	402,068	125,799	169,417	106,852	1811	100	31·3	42·1	26·6
	1821	447,960	130,699	190,264	126,297	1821	100	29·2	42·5	28·3
	1831	502,301	126,591	207,259	168,451	1831	100	25·2	41·3	33·5

Mr. Marshall, in his *Statistics of the British Empire*, has classed the counties of England into the agricultural, manufacturing, and metropolitan, and given the following table of the increase per cent. in the population of each.

VIII.—INCREASE PER CENT. OF POPULATION.

ENGLAND.	1801 to 1811.	1811 to 1821.	1821 to 1831.	1700 to 1831.
Agricultural counties	9½	15½	10⅝	84
Manufacturing counties ..	18½	20½	22½	295
Metropolitan counties....	16½	18⅛	15½	147
Total England	14⅜	17⅞	16	154
Total Wales	13	17½	12	117
Total Scotland	13	15	13	87
GREAT BRITAIN ..	14⅛	17½	15½	144

From this and the preceding table, we derive two important facts:—First, that the number of persons employed in trade and manufactures far exceeds the number employed in agriculture, and, secondly, that the disproportion is rapidly augmenting. From 1700 to 1831, the population of the agricultural counties increased only 84 per cent., while the population of the manufacturing counties increased 295 per cent. Or, if we limit attention to the more authentic censuses taken from 1801 to 1831, it is obvious how rapidly manufacturing has been gaining on agricultural industry at each decennary enumeration.

So far then as numerical superiority is involved, the *loom* may claim decided precedency over the *plough*. This determines the most important consideration, for it is obviously men and not things that ought mainly to decide the course of legislation. But we shall find that trades and manufactures have another point of superiority, namely, in their power to augment the *wealth* of the community.

There are no authentic data for determining the relative proportion in which the different branches of industry add to the national income. Mr. Colquhoun, with his usual hardihood, has attempted to solve this question. He has given an estimate of the wealth annually realised in Great Britain and Ireland; we give his statement more as a curiosity and the conjectures of a shrewd calculator, than any thing else.

Estimate of the Property annually created in Great Britain and Ireland in the year 1812.

	£
Agriculture in all its branches (including pasture)	217,000,000
Mines and minerals, including coals	9,000,000
Manufactures in every branch	114,000,000
Inland trade	31,500,000
Foreign commerce and shipping	46,000,000
Coasting trade	2,000,000
Fisheries	2,000,000
Chartered and private banks	3,500,000
Foreign income remitted	5,000,000
	£430,000,000

This estimate is chiefly valuable, as shewing the relative productive power of the several branches of national industry in the opinion of an ingenious writer; it is not applicable to existing circumstances, being prepared when the country was involved in war and paper-money, and when agriculture was of far greater relative importance than at present. We have no data for correcting the estimate up to the present. But the superior productive power of manufactures over agriculture may be readily inferred from the obvious facts of the greater number of persons employed therein, and the higher wages and profits realised. These are infallible criteria for determining the amount of wealth annually created in the two branches of national industry. Agriculture barely provides the community with its coarser food; all our luxuries, clothing, domestic conveniences, tools and machinery, shipping, navigation, and vast exports and imports are the results of commerce and manufactures. They have been the source even of agricultural wealth, as well as provided the means for internal improvements and a vast government expenditure.

The *third* point of superiority we claim for manufacturing industry is, that it contributes in a greater proportion to the public revenue of the country; agriculture not only contributes less to the mass of taxes in proportion to the smaller number of persons connected therewith, but absolutely less as will appear from a representation which appeared in the *Times* newspaper, April 2, 1834.

Our population in round numbers is 24,300,000, of which one-third or 8,100,000 is engaged in agriculture, and the remaining two-thirds, or 16,200,000, are engaged in other pursuits.

By the English scheme of taxation, the government taxes are for the most part common, and apply uniformly, and are paid by all classes of the community.*

* Let it not be inferred from this that we consider the general principles of taxation in this country just, they are monstrously unjust. Ostensibly taxes on consumption are fair taxes, since they apparently form a voluntary contribu-

These taxes may be ranged under the following heads:—

1. The customs and excise, the gross produce of which, for the year ending 5th January, 1833, was	£36,411,482
2. The stamp duties, the gross produce of which, for the same period, was	7,119,892
3. The assessed taxes, the gross produce of which, for the same period, was	5,333,686
4. The Post-office, the gross produce of which, for the same period, was	2,175,291
	£51,040,351

And the agriculturists being one-third of the population, the proportion of this sum of £51,040,351, which they ought to pay according to their numbers, is £17,013,450: and now let us see what these men actually do pay, and then:—

1. It is quite sure that of exciseable commodities, and those paying the customs' duties, there is a much greater proportionate consumption in town than in the country; and therefore if the consumption of these commodities by the agriculturists is put down at three-tenths instead of one-third, this will be doing them more than justice, and three-tenths of £36,411,482 is..	£10,923,444
2. Of the stamp duties at least four-fifths are paid by the inhabitants of towns, and one-fifth only by the agriculturists, and one-fifth of £7,119,892 is	1,423,978
3. Of the assessed taxes four-fifths are paid by the inhabitants of towns, and one-fifth only by the agriculturists, and one-fifth of £5,333,686, is	1,066,736
4. Of the Post-office revenue 11-12ths are derived from the inhabitants of towns, and 1-12th only from the agriculturists, and 1-12th of £2,175,291, is	181,274
	13,595,432
Proportionate contribution, as before stated	17,013,450
Difference	3,418,018

So that the agriculturists not only contribute in a small degree to the general revenue, but less by £3,418,018 than they ought to contribute in proportion to their numbers. Yet *mirabile dictu!* these men are considered the mainstay of the country, and the class for whose interests, in the opinions of a majority of a reformed Parliament, the interests of all other classes should be sacrificed.

Let us advert to the *fourth* and last consideration—the superior in-

---

tion by each person according to his income or expenditure. But in practice this mode of raising the revenues is productive of great injustice; for taxes levied on articles of ordinary use are very unequal in their pressure on the several classes of the community. Taxes, for example, on beer, tea, or sugar, fall with disproportionate weight on the industrious orders. A poor man uses as much beer or tea as a rich man; but an impost is manifestly unfair which annually abstracts the same sum from an income of £50 as from one of £50,000.

telligence and moral power of the trading and manufacturing population.

The entire mind and soul no less than the industrial activity and physical power of the community are concentrated in the metropolis and great towns of the kingdom. It is here where institutions of science, of education, and benevolence are founded and maintained. It was here even where civil liberty had its origin, was first claimed and conquered for the entire nation. Among the scattered population of the country, there is as little intelligence as combination for accomplishing objects of general utility. There is hardly any thing like personal independence—from the land-owners down to the farmer and mere labourer, it is a gradation of comparative slavery without the freedom either of thought or action which animates the manufacturer and operative. Hence it is that all great political movements, all great social ameliorations have had their origin and achievement in towns, not in the rural districts. It is commerce and manufactures, not agriculture that have impelled nations onward in the career of improvement. They have been the foundation of the freedom, glory, and magnificence of all great communities, of Tyre, Carthage, and Palmyra, no less than of Venice, Genoa, and the Netherlands. Wherever we find agriculture the sole or predominant industry of a state, there we may be well assured the people are poor and abject in spirit—poor in all the comforts and luxuries of living—women socially and physically degraded—and the whole frame of society debased by tyranny and superstition. Before our eyes, it is so even now in Italy, Spain, Poland, and Hungary. Without Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles, France would have had no revolution,—she would have still groaned under the double yoke of regal and ecclesiastical bondage. Without London, Birmingham, and Manchester, England would neither have had religious freedom nor parliamentary reform, but would have still been in the trammels of a plundering oligarchy and intolerant church.

Pursuing the contrast in its moral and municipal bearings, we are led to similar conclusions. The most degraded part of the population are the cultivators of the soil. Among them it is we find the cases of improvidence, vice, and illegitimate births most numerous. It is not in Leeds, Liverpool, or Manchester, but in the domain of the squire and parson that have been found the worst examples of parochial misgovernment.

But enough: with such facts, moral, statistical, and historical, does it not appear like national infatuation to tolerate the ostentatious imbecillities propounded by sir James Graham and sir R. Peel of the superior importance of agriculture, and that the landed aristocracy is the most essential interest of the community, in whose favour not only the great principle of commercial freedom should be violated, but every man, woman, and child in the country barefacedly and openly robbed!

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH AND DISSENTERS.

I.—UTILITY OF AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

ACTIONS which refer only to individuals, not to society, are usually considered without the pale of public legislation. The minor transactions of individuals in trade, in the management of their families, and in mutual intercourse, are not within the animadversion of the law. Religion seems still less within the scope of civil government than morals. It has reference solely to the individual—to a future state, and the relations that subsist between man and his Maker. It has little or no reference to his duties as a citizen, nor has it any reference to the fundamental purposes for which government itself was principally established—namely, the security of persons, property, and public institutions.

Notwithstanding these obvious truths it has been affirmed that it is the duty of the state to tender religious instruction to all its subjects. Upon what foundation this obligation rests has not been stated. Prima facie it seems as little the duty of the state to tender religion to the people as to tender medicine, or a trade or occupation by which they may obtain a livelihood.

It is a sound principle that a government should never interfere to do for the people what the people will voluntarily do as well for themselves. Before, therefore, a church establishment supported by public endowments can be deemed defensible, it must be shewn that a benefit is conferred on society that could not otherwise be obtained. Before any portion of the public resources can be fairly appropriated to the support of any order, it must be shewn that the people derive a benefit from that order which otherwise they would not receive.

Now this ground for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical establishment of the country seems to be entirely cut away by the example of the Dissenters. The established priesthood confers no *exclusive benefit* on the people. Under the auspices of a voluntary ministry religion has thriven more than under the auspices of a stipendiary one. Nonconformists may claim precedency of the church in the support of institutions for education, of works of charity and benevolence; they may boast of their private and civic virtues, of their habits of order, peaceful industry, and devotion to the liberties of the country. On these

points the church can claim no superiority, nor hardly equality. Does it not then follow that its compulsory maintenance is an unjustifiable waste of the resources of the community, and its connexion with the state as a great public institution, an evil, not a benefit?

But a waste of the public revenue is not the only objection. All orders and all establishments that are not positively beneficial are positively mischievous. First, because they are *a cost* to the people; secondly, because they monopolize advantages at the expense of the rest of society; thirdly, because they are an obstacle to social improvement. Wherever there is a body of men enjoying exclusive profit or privilege there must be an impediment to the onward march of society—an aversion to change, and this from the very obvious motive, that, possessing above their share of social benefits, they are conscious they may lose but cannot gain by innovation. It is thus that the church and aristocracy have been mostly in the ranks of anti-reformers, and, like islands in a stream, opposed to the general current. They felt that any new disposition of social power and influence, whether educational, political, or ecclesiastical might lessen, but could not aggrandize them.

Applying these principles to the established church of this country, we find, first, it confers no exclusive benefit on the people which they would not otherwise obtain; and, secondly, that it is a positive evil by operating to the social disfranchisement of a large portion of the community. Upon the great and influential body of Dissenters its exclusive privileges inflict many and grievous injuries. Their case may be briefly stated.

1. They are excluded from the parochial registry, unless they conform to the baptismal rites of the church.

2. They cannot marry without conforming to the church ceremonial, to which they object as "superstitious and indelicate."

3. They cannot bury their dead in the parish churchyard, except according to the rites of the church.

4. They are excluded from the national universities; from Oxford entirely, and to Cambridge they are only admitted for instruction, but not allowed to graduate without subscription to the church articles.

5. By the 10 Geo. IV. c. 7, s. 25, if they hold any judicial, civil, or corporate office, they are not allowed to attend in their *official costume*, or with the *insignia of office*, except at a church or chapel of the establishment.

These are all *practical grievances*, arising out of the monopoly of office and function vested in the church ministry; they are absolute persecutions for conscience sake,—penalties inflicted for nonconformity. The two remaining grievences are of a different character.

6. They are compelled to contribute towards the maintenance of a church from which they have withdrawn, and from which they derive no benefit.

7. Their religion is stigmatized and degraded by the state preferring another denomination of religionists, first, by the grant of endowments;

second, by the grant of the exclusive privileges of registration, baptism, burial, and marriage; and third, by giving the church exclusively a political representation in the legislature.

The church is *national*, the universities are *national*, yet from the benefits of both the nation is excluded. If the Dissenters formed an insignificant fraction of the community, their complaints might be disregarded, their hardships might be considered an evil inseparable from the social state, which renders it impossible that every man's natural rights and inclinations can be respected; but when it is considered that they form a majority of the community, that they are in fact the community itself (for a majority is the community), for whose benefit all laws and all establishments ought to be framed and maintained, the case is marvellously altered; and the injustice of their position is further heightened when it is considered that there is nothing in the dogmas of their worship, in the source from whence it is derived, nor in its influence on their characters as citizens, to place them one iota on a lower level than churchmen.

For the abatement of this great social wrong there is only one remedy, and the longer it is delayed the more disadvantageously it must be applied. The remedy to which we allude is the state ceasing to patronise any sect of religionists, any more than any sect of philosophers. Let no man in purse, person, reputation, or civil privilege, suffer on account of his spiritual faith; it is, as before remarked, a matter solely personal to the individual, and of which government ought to be less cognizant than even of moral conduct.

For the adoption of this change in social polity the reasons are many and convincing. First, the separation of church and state is a catastrophe wholly unavoidable; the churchman can never compete with the dissenter; loaded with sinecure wealth, like the soldier in battle loaded with spoil, he must ultimately yield the field to his more ardent and enterprising opponent.

Secondly, it must strike all men, that an expensive church establishment is wholly unnecessary in a country where experience demonstrates that the religious instruction of the people will be amply provided for without a compulsory provision for the purpose. It is indeed alleged that in the remote districts of the kingdom religious teachers would not be found without the aid of parish endowments; but this seems sufficiently answered by the fact of the ample provision made, on "the voluntary principle," for the religious instruction of the scattered population of Wales, and in the distant settlements of North America.

Thirdly, the patronage by the state of the episcopalian form of worship is a real obstacle to the peaceful and effective government of the country. No plan of popular education, of municipal institutions, nor of civil registration, can be well introduced and established until all classes of religionists are placed on the same level as to office, favour, and immunity.

Lastly, this concession is demanded from government by the rapidly increasing numbers and wealth of the dissenters. Upon these points we

shall not enlarge, as we purpose hereafter to insert some illustrative statements.*

II.—MEASURES FOR THE RELIEF OF DISSENTERS.

THE measures introduced by ministers for the relief of dissenters were characterised by illusiveness and inefficiency. First came the Marriage Bill. Here the grievance consisted in compelling the dissenter to be married according to the forms and by a minister of the church of England. It was proposed to allow the dissenter to be married according to his own fashion, but the bans were to continue to be published in the parish church. Why such bit by bit relief? Were the Ministers reluctant to take too large a slice from the surplice fees? The dissenter wished to be relieved from the necessity of coming in contact at all with the established priesthood in the celebration of what he considers a mere civil ceremony; and why could not an indulgence be extended to the whole body of dissenters which has long been enjoyed, without bad consequence, by the Quakers and Jews?

But if the object was to amend the marriage laws, why not do it on a general and comprehensive principle? They are a disgrace to the jurisprudence of a civilized people. To prevent clandestine marriages the consent of parents and a certain term of residence are required, bans are to be published or a license obtained; but all these safeguards may be evaded by stepping over the border into Scotland. Then why not have removed the anomalies in the law of divorce, and rendered valid

* The Wesleyan Methodists have declined taking any part, as a body, in the question of the separation of church and state. It is well known this numerous sect forms a sort of trade union, governed by a conference of preachers, who sit with closed doors, and prohibit, if possible, any public report of their proceedings. At the last meeting of conference in London the Rev. Jabez Bunting quoted a letter of Mr. Charles Wesley, in the course of which Mr. C. Wesley observes,—"my brother John's principle is first the methodists, then the church; I say first the church then the methodists." The conference's view, Mr. Bunting said, was John's not Charles's—first the methodists and then the church; it was not methodism first and then dissenters.

Upon this construction one remark may be offered. Ought not the methodists to act upon what they conceive would have been John Wesley's opinion had he now lived, rather than upon an opinion expressed when the methodists stood in very different relations to the church? Mr. Wesley was a shrewd and ambitious man; with his infant sect he did not wish to create unnecessary enemies, he rather sought to increase his followers under the protecting wing of the church than wantonly provoke its hostility. Humility is the great secret by which all low and contemptible things rise into importance. With the position the methodists now occupy it is impossible to divine Wesley's course of conduct; he would have found it difficult, we imagine, to reconcile the pride, worldliness, and ostentation of the church with his own evangelical spirit.

Dr. Southey, and other episcopalians, have long been wooing the methodists to a more intimate union with mother church, as a sort of *make-weight* and means of giving them at least numerical superiority. We wish them joy of the acquisition. A sort of *mob* appears essential to the maintenance of every species of usurpation over human rights and reason.

marriages celebrated by the Roman catholic clergy. The last are a fruitful source of immorality and often of suffering: the vast body of Irish in England prefer being married by their own priests; such marriages are all invalid, the children born of them are bastards, and the mother is not unfrequently left destitute with a family, not having any marital claim on the father for their maintenance.

In their Marriage Bill the Whigs acted on their accustomed maxim of doing the *least possible*—introducing a measure not the best in kind but smallest in quantity.

The *Church Rates' Bill* was a gross attempt at delusion. It was framed on the principles then predominant in the cabinet—namely, not to diminish in the slightest degree the possessions of the Church. About £250,000 a year, it was calculated, formed the dissenters' share of the church rates; this was to be charged on the land-tax—that is, on the general revenue of the country. That is, the hand was to be taken out of one pocket to be thrust into the other: what had been a voluntary payment, assessed by the parishioners themselves, was to be converted into a compulsory tax, levied by the state on both Dissenters and Churchmen. How ingenious! but the people only laughed; so no more was heard of the Church Rate Bill.

It is not easy to conceive what practical advantages Dissenters can derive from admission into the Universities on the principles proposed by the bill of last session. They can hardly like their children to be *taught* any more than *married* by the established clergy. Besides, the government of the colleges and the fellowships, tutorships, and professorships, will be possessed exclusively by members of the Church of England. The course of instruction, too, being in great part religious, must be repugnant to dissenting tenets. This is decidedly the case at Oxford, where at one of the colleges one-third of the time of the students is occupied in religious studies. From Mr. Maberly's pamphlet it appears that at the college to which he belonged the students are occupied in reading the gospels in Greek, afterwards Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*, and the last year of their course is devoted to the study of the thirty-nine articles. Can a dissenter join in these exercises, or if he cannot how is his time to be occupied? It is clear, admission will be to him a profitless boon; the only advantages it offers are that it will qualify him to be a fellow of the college of physicians, and shorten by two years the term of attendance at the inns of court of students educating for the bar: but these can only be facilities to a few of the great body of dissenters desirous of an university education. As to the attainment of academical degrees, even if admission is allowed, that seems chimerical in the existing spirit and constitution of the universities. A dissenter is more hated and despised at college than an infidel. He may deserve degrees, but will they be conferred by the governing authorities? It will be at the universities as it is in the courts of law—where many are *called* to the bar, but few *chosen*.

The entire constitution of the Universities is vicious. They are national foundations, and were originally intended for national pur-

poses, but have become wholly unsuited to the times.* Two-thirds of the colleges of Oxford were founded in catholic times, when men believed in purgatory, transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, and the efficacy of masses in procuring the *repose of the dead*. At the Reformation, and subsequently, their constitution was altered under the mere authority of royal letters and proclamations, and the same power which assimilated their discipline to the reformed religion may be again exercised to assimilate it to the altered circumstances of society. The educational wants of the age are science and philosophy, but the instruction of the universities is scholastic and theological. It is the learning of the fourteenth rather than of the nineteenth century. Divinity formerly constituted almost the only knowledge as the sole study of all classes; the Bible in an unknown tongue was a sealed volume to the laity, and required the interpretation of priests and professors. But this is all changed. The scriptures are opened to all, and every one assumes an equal right to interpret their contents. Does not this shew the necessity of altering the constitution of the universities? Education at these national establishments ought to be secular, not ecclesiastical. Divided as the community is into sects, whoever seeks to establish tests seeks to privilege one by the proscription and plunder of another. It is an attempt to establish a mental monopoly more detestable in principle than monopoly in commerce. To abate such grievances is only following up the spirit which repealed the test and corporation acts, and relieved the catholics. Till then toleration will be incomplete; there will still be pains and penalties for conscience sake. But that the good cause will triumph we have no doubt, in spite of the imbecile conceits of Sir Robert Peel, Goulburn, Inglis, and other remnants of the pig-tail school.

Throwing open the Universities forms only a part of the advantages to which Dissenters ought to aspire. The colleges of Eton and Winchester are public foundations, intended for the advancement of learning. With ample revenues, they are entirely in the hands of the established clergy, and replete with abuses. The education given there is a farrago of obsolete learning and metrical trifling—and the discipline is detestable; it is that of the quarter-deck or cockpit, in which boys are brought up to be alternately slaves and tyrants. In the great schools and charitable foundations of the metropolis and neighbourhood, in the Charter House, Christ's Hospital, St. Paul's, Westminster, Harrow, Rugby, and the Gresham Lectures, the clergy have a monopoly of their revenues, as wardens, provosts, high masters, senior masters, ushers, lecturers, and assistants. Why, too, should the masterships of grammar-schools, throughout the kingdom, be limited to graduates of the universities? They have degenerated into sinecures, seldom having more than two or three foundation

* That the universities are public establishments may be inferred from the fact that a preacher for each university, and the professors of divinity, law, physic, history, and botany, at both Oxford and Cambridge, receive stipends payable out of the taxes.

scholars; and the buildings piously intended by their founders for the gratuitous accommodation of poor children, have been perverted into boarding and pay-schools for the emolument of their clerical masters, usually the parasites or relatives of some rotten corporation, who assume to be trustees of the foundation.

One of the benefits we anticipate from the agitation of the Dissenters is the opening and entire reform of the much-abused and long-neglected schools and charitable foundations of the kingdom. But to obtain this or any other practical advantage, they must urge their claims with zeal and perseverance. They must agitate openly and boldly; it is only by organizing a strong pressure from without that any thing will be carried: in the opinion of those from whom relief is sought, they are not, as matter of right, entitled to any concession; therefore no concession will be made except on compulsion. We would strongly advise the Dissenters to abandon their present *stealthy* mode of proceeding; they really seem ashamed to put forward their grievances with effect, lest they should be accused of political agitation, or of allying themselves with political agitators. False delicacy like this is unworthy of so just and honest a cause. They should connect themselves with all who have any thing to ask from the common enemy, regardless of misconstruction. Above all they should refrain from seeking *private* interviews with ministers; they will obtain only courtesies: nor should they listen to those who advise them not to *embarrass* government, but *wait* and see what will be done for them. This soft and illusive course has been tried, and what was the result? What did they gain by their *twenty-three* interviews* with the members of government?—the Church Rate Bill and the Marriage Bill!

Agitate—agitate boldly; let their grievances, numbers, wealth, and social importance be unceasingly brought before the public, and we will answer for the result.

Having said much on the Universities, we shall conclude the chapter with shortly noticing a few of the incongruities in the discipline and constitution of these foundations.

Dissenters, as such, are not admitted either at Oxford or Cambridge, but at Cambridge they may pass through their studies, though not allowed to graduate: thus they may *qualify* for degress, but are interdicted their attainment. At Oxford they are entirely excluded, subscription to the thirty-nine articles being requisite on entrance. At Trinity College, Dublin, catholics are admitted and allowed to graduate; yet this is a strictly protestant university, intended to promote the protestant religion, and founded by almost our first protestant sovereign, Queen Elizabeth.

England has been more slow than most continental nations in establishing entire religious freedom; that is, the abolition of all tests as a qualification for civil rights, whether political or educational. In the

* Report of the United Committee of Dissenters, May 8th, 1834.

German universities there are no religious tests; nor even in the pope's university at Bologna. In England they are comparatively of recent introduction, and rest on no great authority; for it is under no higher sanction than a royal letter of James I., dated 1613, that the universities assume the power to refuse degrees without subscription. Prior to that time all the honours of the universities were attainable, except in theology, without any subscription whatever.

In the reform of the universities the spirit that prevails there ought to be totally disregarded. During the last session they had the monstrous injustice to petition Parliament not only against the admission of dissenters to degrees, but against the grant of authority to any other university to confer degrees on dissenters. This was assuredly the climax of clerical monopoly and intolerance.

But why should the Dissenters stop at mere academic distinctions, and not seek to participate in the government and emoluments of these great public establishments. The college endowments are a part of the national domains, intended by their founders to be appropriated to national education. They were not intended for the benefit of a sect or party, but for the community. A collation of the *practices* of the universities, with their ancient charters and statutes, would show such deviations as would fairly warrant the confiscation of their revenues. To break in on such nurseries of abuse, and adjust them to the wants of society, would be an act of justice, not spoliation. The endowments of some of the colleges were meant solely for *the poor*. Thus the statutes of King's College, Cambridge, declare that it is for the benefit of "the poor and indigent"—*pauperes et indigentes;* whereas it is only the wealthy scholars of the abused foundation of Eton that enjoy its advantages.

But enough: university reform ought to have been included in the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. It is indeed contended by some that as the universities are *lay* corporations, the dissenters are eligible to all their advantages under the authority of that statute.

III.—TENURE OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

The power of truth has been singularly evinced in the progress of opinion on the tenure of ecclesiastical property. The first position taken up in favour of the Church was that the clergy hold their possessions by the same inviolate right that an individual holds his estate. This assumption was speedily disproved. It was negatived by the practice of all the continental states and of our own country at the Reformation; it was negatived by the palpable fact that the clergy have only a *life interest* in their benefices, over which they could not, neither by will, sale, nor other species of alienation, exercise any of those powers ordinarily annexed to the idea of property; and, lastly, it was negatived by the recorded proceedings of the British parliament itself, which had repeatedly interfered with the property of the church by passing acts regulating the sale, exchange, and mortgage of parsonage houses and

glebe lands, and acts actually making a new appropriation of the incomes of incumbents for the benefit of curates: all which would have been indefensible had the clergy held their revenues under the same immutable conditions that individuals hold their incomes; or had they been considered other than stipendiaries of the state, with whose office and emoluments, like those of the army, navy, or civil servants of the crown, the legislature had always a right to deal according to the exigences of the public service.

The second position taken up was that though the estates of the church might not be held in absolute property like those of individuals, yet there was no example of the property of the church being alienated for other than *ecclesiastical* purposes.

Here again it might have been sufficient to refer to the precedent of the Protestant Reformation, in which the examples were numerous of the possessions of spiritual persons alienated to laymen, or appropriated to the endowment of educational foundations. But this might be objected to as a period when right was compelled to succumb to mere arbitrary violence. Then reference was made to more recent and orderly periods, to the reigns of William III. and the Georges. Here were found examples of acts of parliament, by which masses of property were severed from the church, and appropriated to objects of an entirely secular character.

In 1797, when the cathedral of Lichfield was about being repaired, an act of parliament was obtained to defray the expense by sequestrating the revenues of two vacant prebends. Applying a portion of the clerical income to the maintenance of the fabric of the church was clearly giving it a new direction, as distinct as if applied to the maintenance of the poor. But more recently an act was obtained to appropriate part of the revenues of the see of Durham to the founding of a college for education. In both these instances it may indeed be urged that the purpose was in some degree ecclesiastical. Well, then, here is another example in which church property was severed merely for a commercial purpose. In the reign of William III. the legislature was desirous of encouraging the growth of hemp, when an act passed declaring that, in lieu of a tenth of the produce, no parson, vicar, or impropriator should be entitled to more than 5*s.* *for every acre of hemp and flax* grown in England. This act is made perpetual by 1 Geo. I. st. 2, c. 26, s. 2, and upon which it may be observed that if parliament could legally exempt hemp from tithe, why not corn, or grass, or hops? If it could make a new appropriation of a portion of the church estates for an object of secular and national advantage, why not the whole? This clearly establishes under the precedent of an act of parliament itself the legislative right to appropriate to *other* than ecclesiastical purposes the estates of the church.

The interested misrepresentations of the clergy have caused a great deal of misapprehension of the true nature of tithe property. It is something or nothing, as the cultivator pleases. It may not only be legally and conscientiously diminished, but annihilated; it is not then

even a *right*, for no right can be taken away. If I do not grow corn where is the tithe? If I do grow it, but do not sever it, but let it rot on the ground, the tithe-owner has no redress; in short, it is an uncertain interest that depends on the will of the landlord.

It is a monstrous error to consider tithe as a *tenth part* of the produce of the earth. Dr. Burn says (3 *Ecclesiastical Law*, 377) that "tithes of common right are only to be paid for such things as do yield a yearly increase by the act of God."—"I conceive," continues the same great authority, "the act of God to mean the natural and spontaneous produce of the earth, and not the act of man, arising from *artificial* cultivation."

Now there is no such thing in nature as corn, any more than there is a ship or a cotton mill; it is a creation of human industry; it does not grow as other vegetables, by the power of God, but like the tulip (which Paley says we should never have had without the gardener), hyacinth, the ranunculus, and many others; it is no where to be found only in a state of artificial culture; it is therefore the product of man, and no more the act of God than a watch or a mill; though God gave the materials, as he gave the sun and air, it is the labour of man that has given the value.

The time was when a corn-mill was considered a predial tithe, and paid the tenth dish of the corn ground, but by the case of Newls and Chamberlain, and afterwards by the case of Carlton and Brightwell,* without any legislative act the tithe of a mill was changed from a predial tithe, where no expenses of working the mill were allowed, but full tithe paid to a personal tithe where all expenses of such working were allowed: which reduced the tithe of a corn-mill to a tithe of the *profit*. Why did the House of Lords make this distinction? Obviously because the working of a mill is the effect of personal labour. Is no then the working of a farm equally an effect of personal labour and extensive outlay: and why, if both be the result of labour, should not both be subject to deduction for expenses?

It follows that, strictly, tithe is only a tenth of the produce after deducting the profit of capital and wages; it is what the landowners of Devon and Kent contend, a tenth of the rent or net profit of land: a distinction of great importance, and which we trust our readers will bear in remembrance on the approaching valuation and settlement of the claims of the Church.

---

* Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, p. 456, art. Mills.

CHAPTER IV.

WORKING OF THE EXCISE LAWS.

It can hardly be denied that during the last one hundred and forty years by far the largest portion of the active talent and intelligence of the government has been directed, not to objects of national improvement, but to picking the pockets of the people, to the watching with the vigilance of a Turkish pacha their growing riches, and then carrying off with remorseless gripe the fruits of their toil and skill, to be wasted in exhausting wars, regal pomp, and aristocratic profusion. The genius of the people has been commercial; the policy of their rulers anti-commercial. Trades' unions have been obnoxious to the charge of interfering with the freedom of industry; but the annoyances from this source are insignificant when contrasted with the vexatious impediments resulting from the unceasing inquisitions of our fiscal administration.

For proof of this we shall only refer to one department, that of the Excise;—a term giving rise to similar imaginings of judicial tyranny as the Court of Star Chamber or Holy Inquisition, and which is no less repugnant to sound principles of finance than of commercial legislation. The laws therein are for the most part unintelligible, and subjecting the individuals obnoxious to them to harassing domiciliary visits and spiteful persecutions. They are also mischievous by interfering with the conduct of business, and thereby imposing restraint on skill, enterprise, and improvement. As a tax the excise is generally unequal, being levied on commodities used by the bulk of the people, but on which the rich spend little or nothing. To get rid of it altogether is perhaps neither possible nor desirable, but we shall select a few examples to illustrate the working of the system, in which improvement would not be difficult, and which would involve no great sacrifice of revenue,—certainly not more than has been squandered in indemnifying the West Indian planters, and clearing out judicial nuisances in the courts of law.

1. Paper.—The duty on paper varies from 50 to 150 per cent. on the different kinds of paper. Except the very coarsest wrapping paper all paper is subject to a first-class duty; and even wrapping paper, to be charged at the lowest rate, must be manufactured wholly of tarred *ropes*, a regulation which causes the refuse of the finer paper to be wasted. The duty is a tax on science, on the diffusion of education and useful information. But the tax forms a small part of the expense

to which the public is put in order to repay the manufacturer for the trouble and annoyance to which he is subject in carrying on his business. There are sixteen acts of parliament regulating his trade, commencing with the 10 Ann, c. 19, and ending with 6 Geo. IV. c. 111. By one of these he is required to take out a license, and to enter his presses and engines, vats and chests, at the Excise Office. He must only carry on his business in certain places, and a maker of paper must not be a maker of pasteboard. He must letter each room of his manufactory; he must fold his paper in quires, reams, and bundles, and tie it up in a form prescribed by statute: he must give twenty-four or forty-eight hours' notice of weighing, and after weighing paper must not be removed in less than twenty-four hours. Errors in weighing to the extent of five per cent. subject paper to forfeiture. The penalties vary from £20 to £500. An excise label must be pasted on each ream or parcel; and if the maker do not account for *every* label received he is liable to a penalty of £200 for each. A master will sometimes send for 500 labels at once to the excise, and should any person get into the mill and steal or destroy them the penalties would amount to £100,000.

2. Glass.—The direct duty on glass varies from £100 to £200 per cent. Little more than half the gross duty levied is brought into the exchequer; the remained being either returned or lost in the collection. On flint glass the officers may charge the duty either at 3*d*. per pound in the pot or 6*d*. out. It is thought more advantageous to the revenue to exact the duty in the pot; and the tax is by this means virtually raised to 7*d*., whilst the manufacturer who makes the fine glass from the middle, and the coarser from the bottom and top, is compelled, whether he requires it or not, to manufacture the *whole* from having paid the duty, whereas he would often remelt the coarser parts.

This is only one vexation of the manufacturer. The laws regulating his trade are scattered through twenty-nine acts of parliament. He must take out an annual license, and enter at the excise all his workshops, furnaces, pots, pot chambers, annealing arches, &c. He must provide locks, fastenings, trays, windlasses, scales, and weights, as approved by the officer, and keep them in repair. Before filling any pot he must give twelve hours' notice, with an account of the weight of the materials and species of glass intended to be made. Officers may enter at any hour, guage, mark, and number the pots: counterfeiting or altering marks penalty £500. Officer may forbid fires to be stirred, or smoke raised, lest he be annoyed in the discharge of his duty, on pain of £100. Refusing to assist officer, penalty £100. Removing flint-glass before weighing, or any way attempting to evade the duty, subjects to a penalty of £500. The structure of the annealing arches, the number of entrances, and the different processes and stages of manufacture are all prescribed under heavy penalties. Exclusive of forfeitures there are fifty-eight penalties, amounting in the aggregate to £9740. So tied down and watched, the manufacturer neither attempts improvement nor experiment in his business.

3. Soap.—The manufacture of soap is peculiarly a chemical process,

but notwithstanding the discoveries in chemical science, there has been no improvement in the making of soap during the present century. The number and complexity of the excise regulations render deviations from the established routine almost impossible. There are twenty-nine acts of parliament regulating the manufacture, beginning with 10 Ann, c. 19, and ending with 3 Will. IV. c. 16.

A soap-maker must occupy a tenement assessed to the parish rates. If he alter any boiling-house, warehouse, room, or other place, or use any copper, vat, or other vessel, without giving notice, he is liable to penalty. All materials and utensils for soap-making found in an unentered place become forfeited. He must provide covers, locks, fastenings, and keys, as approved by the excise, and opening any copper, furnace, or ash-hole door, without twelve hours' notice, or if in the country twenty-four hours', subjects to penalty. Officers may break up the ground, or remove any wall or partition to search for a private pipe. If any hole be found for privately conveying away soap the fine is £500. Notices must be given of cleaning and beginning to work; failing to begin at the time mentioned notices must be renewed. The form of soap-frames, the depth of soap therein, and the time to elapse before it is divided into cakes or bars, are all minutely prescribed by statute. Hard soap must be sold in bars or cakes, or ball soap, and the scraps and parings, immediately after it is divided, must be put into the boiler in presence of an officer on pain of £100. Removing soap without notice is finable; or, if the quantity exceed twenty-eight pounds, without inscribing the word "*soap*" in letters two inches long on the package, and three inches long on the carriage. Dealers are liable to sundry penalties, and any person, not being an entered soap-maker, having barilla, kelp, or other materials in possession, they may be seized.

4. MALT.—The act by which the forty statutes regulating the malt-trade were consolidated imposed no fewer than one hundred and six penalties, amounting altogether to £13,500. The number and complexity of these provisions were such that neither excisemen nor maltsters could proceed in their business till they had been explained and amended by orders issued from the Treasury. By a subsequent act some of the penalties are repealed, leaving however the manufacture of malt sufficiently restricted by precautions as to the structure of cisterns and couch-frames, notice of wetting—keeping of grain in steep—the number of floors, &c.

An officer may enter a maltster's premises at any hour, by night or day. If officer *suspect* corn to have been condensed in the couch or cistern, by treading or otherwise, he may have it turned out; if, on laying the corn level again in the cistern or couch, an increase to a certain amount is found, the maltster is subject to a penalty of £100. A like penalty is imposed on the maltster if he refuse to *assist* the officer in making the trial of his own honesty!

5. BRITISH SPIRITS.—The importance of these to the revenue affords at least some extenuation of the severity of the excise-regulations. But really the act on the distilleries seems the acme of fiscal refinement and policy. It has one hundred and fifty-three sections; the number of pe-

nalties inflicted is eighty-nine, varying in amount from £100 to £500. It is quite impossible to give even an outline of this masterpiece of excise genius, and we must refer to *The Book of Penalties* for particulars.

In extenuation of the number and severity of the excise-laws it is urged that they are not strictly enforced: like capital punishments, they are only held up *in terrorem*. But this is an aggravation of their iniquity. Laws to be enforced or not at the pleasure of individuals, are equivalent to no laws at all—it is living under a mere despotism. Whether or not the excise penalties are inflicted depends on the whim, temper, or spite of the revenue officers, or perhaps an unfriendly neighbour. They are snares and scorpions to an honest man, whilst rogues escape them by cunning and bribery.

For examples of the oppressive and arbitrary administration of the Excise Laws, see the cases collected under that head in the last edition of *The Black Book*, page 321.

CHAPTER V.

POOR LAWS' AMENDMENT ACT.

THE Poor Law Commissioners have not treated the public fairly in their Reports. They have given a partial, and, in many instances, an exaggerated representation of the working of the poor laws; they have pointed out their evils, but not described their countervailing advantages. Instead of mainly confining their exposition to a few agricultural parishes, which have been in the hands of the parsons and squirearchy, why did they not advert to the state of the poor in the great towns of the kingdom, in Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, &c. where they would have found fine examples of administering the national charity with economy and intelligence, realizing all the benefits that the admirers of a compulsory assessment for the relief of indigence could desire?

Secondly, why did not they advert to the decline of pauperism during the ten years from 1820 (the period of improvement under Sturges Bourne's Acts) to 1830? It is a fact that, during the period mentioned, the poor-rates have not increased in so fast a ratio as the population; that there has been a *relative* decline of pauperism; and in the period prior to 1820, the increase was occasioned, in a much greater degree, by the increase of law charges than an additional expenditure on the poor. In some of the principal parishes there have been great and successful efforts made to effect a diminution in the poor expenditure; it has been so in the principal parishes of the metropolis, and at Leeds, Liverpool, and other places.

Thirdly, why did not the Commissioners bring down the history of the poor and the poor laws to the present time, instead of stopping at the reign of Elizabeth? Had they done so, they would have found that all their more important suggestions have been *already tried;* that the project for incorporating parishes has been tried; that for refusing relief to able-bodied poor, except in a workhouse; and for attaching wages for advances previously made to paupers out of the rates. Mention may be found of all these plans, and their failure or abandonment, in Eden's *History of the Poor* and Wade's *History of the Middle and Working Classes.* But a notice of them might have weakened their case, and lessened the confidence of the public in any schemes founded upon them.

In the reports of the Commissioners there is a singular want of comprehensiveness of view—a disregard of general principles—and an absence of correct information on the character and condition of the labouring classes. Their plans of amendment are founded chiefly on experiments made in the parishes of Southwell, Cookham, Bingham, and Swallowfield.

These are their pattern parishes, according to which all other parishes ought to conform in their parochial administration. But with what propriety can these places be adduced as examples for the entire kingdom? Their population is diminutive; they are entirely agricultural; and have been in the hands of zealous individuals, who by great personal sacrifices, and enforcing a strict system of parochial relief, succeeded in lessening the amount of pauperism, most probably at the expense of the adjoining districts. But are such insulated and peculiar examples sufficient to warrant the extension of similar principles of management to the entire country? Certainly not. With as much reason Mr. Owen might seek to establish his co-operative parallelograms throughout England, from the success of his individual experiment at New Lanark. Of the disregard of general principles by the Commissioners, and of their reckless determination to make out *a case*, the pattern parishes afford an illustration. The system pursued in these parishes was that of non-relief, except in the workhouse. The effect of this no doubt was, in part, as intended to be, to compel the able-bodied to accept work on any terms, and in any sort of employment, rather than forego personal freedom in a poor-house. But strange to say, this forced increase of competition for work had, according to the Commissioners' representations, the effect of *raising its price!* An effect so paradoxical, so contrary to the best established principles of economical science, evinces a zeal in behalf of the anti-pauper system, that reminds us of those nostrums of sovereign efficacy which cure the most opposite disorders.*

It seems not less contrary to general principles to anticipate, for a lengthened period, a reduction of parish expenditure by the operation of the Poor Law Act. The poor-laws are administered by the rate-payers, who are locally and personally acquainted with the state of their parishes, and directly interested in checking abuses and a lavish expenditure.

---

* The Poor-Law Commission originated with, and was formed by the late lord chancellor. His lordship, about twenty years ago, gulped down some raw and abstract dogmas on the tendency of a compulsory rate for the relief of the poor, and the commissioners were set to work to establish by evidence these old 'foregone conclusions.' They did their bidding certainly; for the zeal with which they got up criminatory matter against the poor was assuredly not exceeded by that with which the agents of power in Italy filled the famous *green bag* against the unfortunate queen Caroline. If we are not sadly deceived, some of them have drawn the long bow most egregiously. For example, in the budget of stuff circulated, 'BY AUTHORITY,' under the name of 'Extracts,' we cannot help thinking that the representations at pp. 216, 296, and 393, are so coloured and exaggerated as to be as remote from the plain facts of the case as truth from falsehood. We have no penchant for paupers, either parish or state, but we must protest against fighting any enemy with unfair weapons.

Will the Central Board sitting in London, or the Assistant Commissioners, in their occasional visitations, act under greater motives to to economy, or bring greater local and practical information to their task; and if they do not, what benefits are we to anticipate from their parochial superintendence? It strikes us that, *after a time*, (for we will give credit for demonstrations of zeal at the beginning,) the superintendence exercised by them over paupers will be like that exercised by the lord chancellor, in right of his office, over public charities, or of the bishops over some of our collegiate foundations; it will exist in name, but have no practical or executive efficiency.

Both the Commissioners and the late Ministers committed a great mistake in confounding the present state of society with the age of Queen Elizabeth. Lord Althorp, during the debates in the House of Commons, repeatedly declared that the main object of the Poor-Law Bill was to bring back the administration of the poor laws to the legitimate purposes of their first institution. Now the two great objects embraced by the 43d of Elizabeth are to relieve the impotent, and to set to work the able-bodied. The act of Elizabeth was chiefly an act for the *enforcement of industry*, intended to meet the mass of vagrancy that grew out of the abolition of the religious houses, and the transition from slave to free labour. But mark the difference of the two periods. Such a monstrous anomaly as an able-bodied man *willing* to labour, but unable to get employment, was unknown in the time of lord Burleigh; the great difficulty then was to overcome the propensity to idleness and vagabondage, not to find remunerative labour. At present the case is reversed; there is no lack of industry in the country, but of profitable employment. Yet the framers of the Poor Act have overlooked this fundamental distinction. They have prescribed a remedy more applicable to the age of Elizabeth than of William the Fourth. They seem to think that the main source of pauperism now as then is IDLENESS, and as a corrective of this, have propounded their grand panacea for subjecting all the able-bodied poor to the ordeal of a workhouse.

Here we think they have committed a grievous error. There is, we apprehend, a permanent redundancy of labour; there are more people than can be employed on the terms they have been accustomed to be employed, and to compel them, by any legislative machinery, to be employed on lower terms, we hold to be highly impolitic—impolitic as not tending to the improvement, but the moral and physical degradation of the community.

That there is a redundancy of labour, the low wages which have been long paid in some of the agricultural parishes are conclusive proof. For this evil the workhouse project is no remedy. It opens no new source of employment, it only provides a sort of Bridewell punishment for an offence which is not the predominant vice of the age.

We have not yet brought before the reader our main objection to this new-fangled scheme. A great deal has been urged on the *irresponsible* powers vested in the Central Board. We should care little for this if we thought they would be exercised for a salutary purpose. Irresponsible

power is not so dangerous in subordinate bodies as in the state. In the former, if it becomes an oppressive nuisance it may be promptly abated; in the latter it may rise above control.

What we most strongly object to the Poor Law project is its tendency to *deteriorate*, not to *better* the condition of the people. If such be its real tendency—and that it is such, we will by and by show—then we say that no benefit which can possibly arise from it would compensate for the social injury it will inflict. No economic savings in poor rates would be an equivalent for a permanent deterioration in the diet, clothing, and lodging of the mass of the community. Pauperism is a great evil, but there may be greater. The general insecurity of property and persons would be greater. A pauper is a bad member of society, but a beggar, a thief, an assassin, or incendiary is worse. By rigid persecution we may get rid of pauperism, but by converting pauperism into mendicity, or criminality, or into Irish or Russian helotism, we effect a social change certainly, but no improvement in the condition of society.

That some or all the evils to which we allude may result from a rigid enforcement of the New Act, we will speedily demonstrate.

The leading principle upon which it is founded is that the condition of no pauper shall be as eligible as that of the independent labourer; and for carrying out this principle, it is proposed relief shall only be given in a workhouse. Such a plan every body knows to be impracticable, and that to erect and maintain workhouses for all the paupers in the kingdom would, in lieu of diminishing, quadruple the poor assessment. We have heard, indeed, some of the strenuous advocates of the measure slily insinuate that it is really not intended to make any great addition to the number of workhouses, but to introduce such discipline there, to render them places of so much discomfort that the poor shall be deterred from seeking parish aid at all. This is the real secret we believe, but let us see the influence the working of such a system will have on the future state of the labouring population.

The state of the pauper it is assumed shall be inferior to that of the free labourer, however bad that may be. If the wages of the independent labourer are so low that he is compelled to live on potatoes and salt fish, to clothe himself in the coarsest garments, to sleep on straw, to live in a cabin, and labour sixteen hours a day—bad as all this may be, something worse shall be provided—' a lower deep' still awaits the unfortunate wretch who is compelled to resort to the parish for assistance. Although he may be already as poor in comfort and as degraded in condition as the Russian serf or the Irish cotter, a still worse fate awaits him in a workhouse. Now, we crave attention to the effects of this system on the *price of labour* and the condition of the labouring classes. Rather than accept relief in a workhouse on such onerous conditions—what will not the working man do?—he will submit to work for any wages, however small the pittance, to feed on any garbage, to live in any hovel; in a word, to be screwed down to a level with the most miserable peasantry in Europe. And is this a consummation to be

wished? Is this an enlightened mode of raising the character of the people and improving the condition of society? The greatest calamity that can befal the working people is the submitting to an inferior standard of living. This is the opinion of every writer of authority. From the writings of Ricardo, Malthus, Macculloch, Torrens, and lord Brougham himself, we might quote passages without number to show the hopeless degradation of a people who once submit to a low standard of diet, clothing, and lodging. Physical discomfort precludes all hope and desire of personal independence, moral and intellectual improvement. Yet this is the vital principle of the Poor Law project—it is its sole talisman of reform—a lower scale of relief for the pauper as a preliminary to a lower scale of living for the independent labourer; it is, in short, a screw for lowering wages and abridging the comforts of the poor.

The discipline of the workhouse is to be such as to be held *in terrorem* of all paupers. Applications for relief are to be discouraged by hard labour, coarse fare, degrading attire, and other contrivances of pain and ignominy. Pauperism for the first time is to be made a crime; it is to be a crime in any man to be in want and unemployed; and the workhouse is to be converted into a house of correction for his reception —with this difference—that in the former he will have to work harder and fare worse; so that in future it will be the interest of every man to be a criminal rather than a pauper—to steal rather than resort to the parish for assistance. What enlightened principles of legislation to confound misfortune with delinquency; what benevolent projects of the Whigs for bettering the state of society! How consistent, too, is their philanthropy, for while they are mitigating the punishments for house-breaking and forgery, they are devising new punishments for that which never since the world began was deemed an offence at all, but an object of commiseration!

The pretexts on which the workhouse ordeal is introduced, are to get rid of the abuses of the allowance system and the impositions of the able-bodied poor. That evils have arisen from both sources is indisputable. They afford strong reason for improving the administration of the poor laws, but none for acting unjustly. If parishes have been imposed upon, apply *a test*, establish a tribunal for separating the pauper from necessity from the worthless vagabond, but do not confound the innocent with the guilty by subjecting both to indiscriminate punishment.

Looking at the workhouse scheme in another point of view, it appears only an adoption of the plan of the Dutch pauper colonies. The object of these is to find work and economically maintain the indigent. This has been objected to by Dr. Chalmers and others as having no tendency to eradicate the seeds of pauperism, only permanently to create a new and degraded caste in society. Such is precisely the tendency of workhouses; it shuts out a section of society from community of right and feeling with their fellow-men; it permanently degrades them without either instructing them or warning others to avoid a similar fate.

Such, then, is our chief objection to the Poor Law Act,—if vigorously

carried through in the spirit in which it has been framed, it will operate as a powerful engine of social degradation. It will effect no reform in the habits, character, or condition of the poor, but will merely compel them to accept lower wages and accommodate themselves to a lower standard of living. If such be really the result—if it will really tend to the moral and physical degradation of the people—no accompanying advantages can countervail its evil tendency, and the Whigs have inflicted a greater national calamity by its introduction than can be counterbalanced by all the public improvements they have effected.

We see little to object to in the establishment of a Central Board of Commissioners acting on sound views; the magnitude of our pauper administration requires the superintendence of an exclusive tribunal, whose functions shall be to suggest improvements and enforce uniformity of practice: but we object to the principles on which they propose to proceed. They seem to have mistaken the disease and the tendency of their own remedies. Of the rashness of their conclusions, the suggestions adopted for the reform of the BASTARDY LAWS are a pertinent example. A few instances had occurred of lewd women having more bastards than one, for which they received the parish allowance; hence it was concluded a general trade was carried on in bastardy, and, as a preventive, the burden of maintaining an illegitimate child has been thrown entirely on the mother. The ordinary parish allowance for a bastard in the metropolis is eighteen-pence weekly; it is not more—most likely less—in the country;—can any one suppose such a pittance holds out a bounty to incontinence? But see how many principles have been outraged by the new law! First, it violates one of the most general maxims of jurisprudence, namely, that which imposes on both parents, equally, the obligation to maintain their offspring whether legitimate or not. Secondly, it violates natural justice; for, if incontinence be an offence at all, it is equally so in both parties, and equally ought the punishment to be apportioned. Lastly, it is monstrous and inhuman to throw the entire burden on the weaker, and, in our opinion, more venial transgressor.

Notwithstanding these obvious objections to this strange innovation on pre-established principles and feelings, it is urged that the alteration is *expedient*, that it will work well in practice. We deny it. It will impose no additional restraint on females, while it will give greater license to the low and profligate of our own sex, who may now spawn away with impunity at the parish expense. That it will not impose further restraint on women, one observation will suffice. If the destitution and pains of child-birth, coupled with the shame of public exposure—the dread of which, in the present state of moral feeling, often leads to frightful crimes—fail to curb female indiscretion—how can it be supposed that superadding thereto the mere pecuniary penalty of the maintenance of the child can have any such tendency? It is a poor, hasty, and impotent piece of legislation, bottomed on gross ignorance of society and human nature; and the worst of it is, that its evil con-

sequences may eat long and far into the core of domestic life before they become manifest to the public eye.

The alterations in the SETTLEMENT LAWS are good as far as they go, but why such piece-meal legislation?- Were the Whigs afraid to take too large a slice from the fat emoluments of lawyers? Litigation arising out of settlement claims has been the fruitful source of parish expense, and it is to this and similar defects in the Poor-Laws themselves rather than the increase of pauperism that the oppression of poor-rates may be traced. *Residence* seems the only fair ground of eligibility to parish relief. The law about removals and the distinctions kept up about each parish keeping only its own poor are absolutely ridiculous when applied to a community living under the same institutions and government.*

By the new act the Whigs have dealt a harsh measure to the poor, and stripped them of their most valued rights. First, in case of want, they have lost their old and undeniable claim to parish aid. They have no general right of appeal from an unjust or hardhearted overseer to the magistrate; nor can the magistrate order relief except in special and extreme cases.

Secondly, by the introduction of a plurality of votes - by giving votes both to *owners* and occupiers—and by allowing the former to vote *by proxy*, it is sought to vest the management of the poor and the administration of the poor-laws in a rich and absentee proprietary.

It has always been represented as a pre-eminent advantage of the poor-laws that they created community of interest between the several classes of society—that neither prosperity nor adversity could visit one without effecting a corresponding influence on the other—and that the rich were identified with the poor themselves in every circumstance influencing their condition. Such ties will be weakened, if not dissolved, by the operation of the poor-act;—first, by the interference of non-resident landlords and their agents in parish affairs; and, secondly, by the interference of the Poor-Law Commissioners, who, partly assuming the powers, will also assume the responsibilities formerly borne by the middle ranks, and who will thereby feel relieved from that concern hitherto felt in the welfare of their poorer neighbours.

But this may turn out an exaggerated apprehension. Our own opinion is that the Commissioners' operations will be chiefly limited to

* In their Report the Poor-Law Commissioners suggested that the place of *birth* should alone determine the place of settlement; that is the event in a man's personal history the most remote and often the most obscure and debateable. How frequently it happens in the London parishes that an applicant for relief cannot tell the magistrate where he was born! The last thing we know of a person is often his birth-place. The honour of giving birth to Homer was contested by nine Grecian cities. In modern times the examples are numerous. There have been many wagers and disputes about the birth-place of Mr. Moore and the ex-Chancellor. That one was born in Ireland and the other in Scotland is obvious enough to those who have seen or heard them; but the "whereabouts" in the two incorporated kingdoms is the mystery.

the rural districts. Indeed, the entire scheme may be chiefly intended as another mode of affording relief to the agricultural interest at the general expense of the community. Under the auspices of the squires, the farmers, and parsons, flagrant abuses had crept into the administration of the poor-laws, and the plan may be to supply their remissness and incapacity by the establishment of a corps of commissioners, secretaries, messengers, and so forth, payable out of the general revenue of the empire!

But we must hasten to conclude. Both in the general Report of the Commissioners and in the act of parliament founded upon it, grievous errors have been committed. In neither is there much benevolence or science; nor do they evince an intimate acquaintance with the history or causes of pauperism, nor a practical knowledge of the habits and state of the people. In the chief remedies suggested, we recognize only a revival of an old system—a new attempt to apply the barbarous machinery of despotism;—do not seek to instruct, reform, and make the poor wise to their true interests,—that is too troublesome a task; adopt the olden process—punish! punish!—punish!—degrade, torture, and incarcerate, and if they do not submit quietly, at least they will assume some other shape than the detested one of a burden on their richer neighbours. For one vicious system another vicious system is substituted; it is not a social reform, but a transmutation of social evil!

But though the main provisions of the Poor-Law Act are bad—for we concede there are good points in it—our comfort is that it is only a sort of *paper* constitution, and, like other paper constitutions, its practical working will be controlled by the action of public opinion. Fortunately there exists in this country a standard of humanity and love of justice—more omnipotent than the boasted laws—that will not long suffer any *wrong without a remedy*. For this guarantee of the rights of all we are not indebted to a sinecure Church, nor a "bread-tax fed" Aristocracy; but to an ever-watchful Press. Further we have a guarantee against extensive mischief in the intelligence of the Commissioners themselves. It is obvious they cannot act without the concurrence of the rate-payers by whom the funds raised for the poor are paid and disbursed. Any thing like a general collision with popular feeling would at once terminate their official career. For their own sakes therefore they will proceed cautiously. They will promulgate their "rules, orders, and regulations;"—if opposed, impracticable, or mischievous, they will cease to meddle, their duties will become nominal, and chiefly exist, like those of the mob of commissioners appointed by the Whig ministry, in the receipt of their salaries.

So that after all there is "balm in Gilead!" The ominous thunder cloud may pass over without consuming, or even seriously scotching the pauper world: but no thanks to the framers of this savage and aristocratic law.

LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH ON THE POOR LAWS.

We felt curious to see the speech of the ex-Chancellor on this subject. We had read many long speeches of his lordship, but they mostly comprised only a grouping, or detail of facts, or vehement tirades directed against passing measures or party opponents. But the poor laws formed a great moral and economical question; they called for an exposition of principles, and the application of these principles to the existing habits and institutions of society: they were a test for a philosophical and practical statesman. But we fail to recognize a union of these endowments in the exhibition of lord Brougham, and we feel assured that if he has nothing better to bequeath to posterity, as the product of his matured years, than his rambling oration on the 21st of July, it will not rank him in the first order of intellects.

Although lord Brougham is a legislator and has been a judge, he still remains the veriest advocate. His speech on the poor laws might have very well been sketched by any clever attorney, and stuffed into his brief-bag to be delivered to "My Lord and Gentlemen of the Jury!" It is a one-sided view—a forced effort to establish a case in the worst fashion of the bar by the most culpable suppressions of truth and gross exaggerations of fact.* We say nothing of the morality of this way of doing the thing; but we hold that it is not strictly just to calumniate even paupers, nor is it consonant with strict veracity of mind to raise fears in the minds of any body of men about the security of their estates, when the speaker knows in his heart there is not the smallest ground for any such apprehension.

Whatever the ex-Chancellor may think, he is only imperfectly acquainted with the history and object of the poor laws. He has got that glancing view on this subject, as on many others,† which tends to mislead rather than safely guide the understanding. He professes, indeed, to be a political economist, and so do we, and we feel as much contempt as he can for the efforts made to depreciate a science so intimately connected with social happiness. But the economical dogmas of his lordship are those that were fashionable some twenty or thirty years ago, and which other persons, with more leisure perhaps for investigation, have found reason to correct or abandon.

The leading position of lord Brougham is this:—If you raise a poor-

---

* For specimens see pages 31—34 of the printed speech, or still better, the morning newspapers, which gave a more authentic version of what was actually uttered. By similar flights of extravagance a late barrister, Balderdash Phillips, some years since attracted great crowds of ladies to Bible meetings.

† The flight of birds for instance. In the first edition of his 'Discourse on the Objects of Science,' lord Brougham had stated (p. 27) that birds which build in the rocks drop or fly from height to height in cycloids; that being the most rapid mode of moving from one point to another. On being told of the incorrectness of the statement, he replied, "Let it stand notwithstanding; though not true it is pretty." *Effect*, not truth, the object sought.

rate or any other fund for the relief of indigence, the support of the unemployed, or the mitigation of any other human calamity; such fund will be sure to be abused, or it will be inadequate to its purpose, or tend to multiply the evils it was meant to alleviate.

Now these contingencies may happen, but the fault is not in the creation of the fund itself, but its maladministration. It may be just as politic in society to make a public provision for evils inseparable from it, as it is virtuous in individuals to make a provision for the incidents of life. And this brings us to the gist of the poor laws.

There is a mass of destitution in the country; it may arise from fluctuations in employment—changes of the seasons, or, if you will, from the improvident and ill-educated habits of the people. Now, we ask, how can this calamity be best met? Mind, we do not ask how it can be best met under any future or Utopian state of social life, when all men are to be prudent and well-instructed; but how it can be best met under the existing circumstances of society? You may leave the destitute to be relieved by the voluntary benevolence of individuals; or you may leave them to what may be termed their natural resources; that is to starve, beg, or steal.

All these are a choice of evils. To die of hunger is what few men would quietly submit to; a general practice of begging or stealing renders the whole community insecure and uncomfortable, and for the charitable to be constantly putting their hands into their pocket, while their more close-fisted neighbours refuse to contribute is far from agreeable. In lieu of such alternatives, is it not more fair and equitable to raise a general fund from each according to his ability, and let it be disbursed by the contributors to the needy in sums proportioned to their wants and character? This is our poor-law system, and for its beneficial influence on the national character, we challenge comparison with any country where no such system exists.

Lord Brougham comprehends in the poor laws nothing beyond an institution of mistaken benevolence, fostering vice and improvidence. Here he betrays that half-knowledge to which we have alluded. They were not instituted for the destitute merely, but for the *peace and security* of the community, and well did they answer their purpose, for they were the first commencement of social order in the Elizabethan age! They are not maintained as an institution of charity only, but of POLICE, to shield society from the evils of mendicity and lawless depredation.

He would make a public provision for *accidents*, as lunacy or a fever, but not for old age, which comes on gradually and may be foreseen and provided against. Ah, my lord, it is a futile distinction! Who shall say what are the accidents of life? A reckless improvident mind is often as much an accident as a broken leg, and which no example, no previous education could have averted or cured. The only difference is, that one is a physical, the other a mental misfortune.

In one sense society has little interest in the origin of destitution, its chief concern is in averting its perilous consequences. If a man be

destitute, no matter how his destitution originated, whether from chance or his own default, he will not starve. If the public has not made a provision for him, he will speedily devise a provision for himself. This is a law of nature which no social law can supersede. But we say it is better society should make a provision for absolute want of all kinds, than that the peace and security of the whole community should be endangered; for if society did not do it openly and directly, it would, in such extreme cases, by the necessities of the sufferers themselves, be compelled to do it indirectly. Which course is most economical, and most consonant to the interests of a rich and civilized community appears plain enough to our apprehension.

But we must conclude these hasty observations, without we fear fully putting our readers in possession of our views of the Poor Laws. Lord Brougham complains that they have (addressing his brother peers,) "reduced YOUR PEASANTRY (this atrocious insolence of phrase, though indulged in, has been omitted in the printed speech) to a state of abasement I am ashamed to think of." Now, my good lord, by whom and in whose hands have "YOUR PEASANTRY" been abased? It is quite a *non sequitur* to say the poor laws did it. These laws have been in force in towns as well as in the country, and no such lamentable effects have ensued. In Liverpool, Leeds, and Birmingham, they know little of workhouse wages; and in Sheffield, according to the testimony of our brave poet Elliott, they still retain their "bit of beef, their pint of ale, and well-paid Saturday." Who then has robbed the poor rustic of these just rewards of industry? Is it not, rather than the poor laws, your "bread-tax eating lords" and your tithe-fed pluralists, combined with the ignorance of a university educated, or non-educated gentry?

P.S. The inactivity of the Poor Law Commissioners confirms what we have previously advanced of the impracticable nature of the Poor Law Act. During the three months of their administration they have done nothing, save appoint eight assistant commissioners, and promulgate three circulars, the last two of which have been issued to explain the *meaning* of the first, and all three are simply meant to inform the overseers that they must *go on as before!* In the circular dated Nov. 8th, the overseers are informed that the Poor Law Act was passed "not for the purpose of abolishing the *necessary relief* to the indigent, but for preventing various illegal and injurious practices which had by degrees grown up in the administration of such relief." This had become necessary, in consequence of the eagerness with which overseers, in various parts of the kingdom, had availed themselves of the New Act as a pretext for *refusing* relief to the poor. It shows that the right of appeal to magistrates from the ignorant and often inhuman adjudications of parish officers ought not to have been hastily abolished. It shows too that the existing system did not need tightening in the way of *pinching the poor;* the present instruments of poor-law administration being mostly prompt enough in that direction.

CHAPTER VI.

CATASTROPHE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

It is not the dilatory illusiveness of a Whig, nor the direct hostility of a Tory administration, with which the people have principally to combat; their great foe is in the House of Lords, and until that foe be subdued—until the constitution of the second estate of the realm be so far modified as to be brought into harmony with the Reform Parliament—it is plain the government of this country cannot go on. There is a conflict of antagonist forces in the state; in the Lords there is a spirit and power of anti-reform that baffles and defeats the reform spirit of the Commons. The experiment has been tried; all the salutary measures of last session—the Jewish Disabilities Bill—the University Admission Bill—the Warwick Bill—the Prevention of Bribery Bill—and the Coroners' Court Bill, were either so mutilated as to be made totally inefficient or entirely frustrated by the Lords. It was only in measures which had the semblance of abridging popular liberty and comforts—the Poor Law Bill and the Sale of Beer Bill, for instance—that the Upper concurred with the Lower House.

The question then is, shall this state of things continue—shall all the benefits anticipated from reform in the representation be defeated? In our opinion the constitution is still unsettled—we are still in the *course of revolution*. It is quite an historical blunder to suppose that the government of this country ever consisted of three branches, possessing equal and co-ordinate powers. Such a form of rule, when conflicting interests intervene, is and ever must be a chimera as fabulous as the phœnix. In England, one estate of the realm has always possessed predominant authority, to which the others have been subservient. Until the Orange revolution of 1688, the crown was paramount; thenceforward the aristocracy, and the great object of the Reform Bill was to abase their power. But see the issue; they have indeed been driven from the lower house, but have entrenched themselves on an adjoining eminence, where they are as omnipotent for mischief as ever. Thus the friends of reform—those who battled so long and stoutly for the amendment of parliamentary representation—have only achieved an absurdity—they have covered themselves with ridicule!

But is their error irretrievable? By the altered constitution of the house of commons the people have obtained an engine of vast power,

when backed by the public voice, and shall not this engine be brought to bear on their old enemy in his altered position? What are the Lords that the nation should be mindful of them? They consist, for the most part, of hereditary imbeciles, steeped in the prejudices of birth, education, rank, and association. If we look into their history, as the *Spectator* has suggested, what is the result? Who are they that have generally been made peers—and why? Is a peerage the reward of virtue, of talent, of patriotism, of a long course of noble doings? Can any one say that, even in the selection of a virtuous man for a peer, his virtue has been the cause of his ennoblement; or, if a man of talent, that he has been chosen because his talent has been patriotically directed? No; the actual peerage is chiefly the result of TORY misrule—'an efflorescence of war and taxation.' It has been one of the means by which the great JOB of government has been carried on. If a patriot was troublesome, he was bought off by a peerage; if a powerful individual was importunate, he was quieted by a peerage; if votes were in demand, the possessor or manager was paid by a peerage; if a minister's place was desired, he vacated it for a peerage. The lawyer, who proved the ablest tool of power, was rewarded by a peerage. Next to the public exchequer, the peerage has mostly been the treasury of Corruption.

The peers represent only THEMSELVES, not any great element of the social state; neither its property, intelligence, nor population. Even in personal income they are insignificant, not possessing above three or four millions of territorial revenue, which is not one-hundredth part of the national income, and this diminutive share of the general wealth is every year growing less in proportion to the increasing wealth of the other classes of society: for, be it remembered, that the income of the peerage, being derived principally from the soil, is comparatively limited in amount, and unlike the income derived from trade and manufactures, which, by skill and industry, admits of almost indefinite augmentation. Shall then a *caste* like this—stunted in its physical as well as moral developments--mostly ignoble in origin—belonging to nothing nor nobody—poor in purse as in intelligence—be allowed to be an obstacle to a nation's progress—be suffered to delay, fritter down, or stifle every project of national amendment? The question admits of only one reply —*the nuisance must be abated:*—it is monstrous that an irresponsible conclave, thrown up by chance, unconnected with and not deriving its powers from the great interests of the empire, should be able to thwart the people's representatives, who really embody, are amenable for, and, of course, without let or hindrance, ought to direct the weal of the state. Unless reform has given this supremacy and directive power to the house of commons, it is an entire failure. We are still in the grasp of the Boroughmongers, as much so as when they filled the lower house with their nominees. In lieu of the substance we have embraced a shadow. The end sought was the triumph of the democratic branch of the constitution—the placing the commons on the pedestal of power heretofore occupied by the Lords, and making the third estate, that had been subservient, paramount to the two other estates of the realm,

which, in future, were to be tolerated, as we conceive, rather in deference to old habits and prejudices, as 'monarchical forms surrounding republican institutions,' than as integral branches of authority, having a veto on the national will expressed through its constitutional organs.

To this state, both in name and reality, the government must be brought, otherwise it will not work. There was manifestly a hitch in affairs under the Melbourne ministry. The last session terminated abruptly with the question, arising out of Irish tithes, ripe for decision, namely, whether lords or commons should be the ascendant? This point must be decided before we can permanently hope for a liberal administration. If the Conservatives, of which there appear strong indications, prefer a fair stand-up fight, be it so. We will again back the ROUNDHEADS against the CAVALIERS, commanded even by the hero of the Malpurba (see *The Black Book*, last edition, p. 405.) We have no fear of the issue—the organized masses of this vast metropolis and great towns of the kingdom would soon dispose of a scattered military, (many of whom, smarting under their own wrongs, sympathise with the popular cause,) aided, though they might be, by a stupid yeomanry, the raff of the club-houses, the Horse-guards, and universities. Victory would not long be in suspense, and after victory *there is spoil*—there would be confiscation and forfeiture—the pensioners and dead-weight people would disappear in the turmoil—and in the escheated domains of a defeated Oligarchy, it is possible resources might be found for compromising those monstrous incumbrances which now weigh heavily on the springs of national industry!

Whether, however, the nation's difficulties be surmounted by a moral or physical struggle—the former is our prayer—it behoves the people in the existing crisis to be awake. Above all it is important they should look forward to the coming session. The last year of the Whig administration has been 'mere fooling.' They fairly succumbed to in lieu of facing the enemy. Their measures were framed, not in accordance with the wishes of the people, nor of their representatives, nor even according to their own estimate of the public wants, but absolutely according to what they thought might be agreeable to the interests and prejudices of the House of Lords. They even went lower than this in their prostration to the Tories and bench of bishops. They not only kept back all measures that were unlikely to pass the straight gate of the upper house, but actually did their utmost to take upon themselves and shield from their opponents the unpopularity of their rejection!

With a Ministry that obviously quailed before the public foe the people could feel little sympathy. The men they sought, and which the times required, were such as would be totally regardless of the upper house—who would consider it non-existent—and pursue a policy, not in accordance with the views of a few prejudiced nobles and ecclesiastics, but of the commons of England. This alone would have been the consummation of parliamentary reform: without it we have only the theory, not the practice, of good government—we are still writhing in the fetters of Gatton and Old Sarum.

The test, then, of a Reform Ministry really in keeping with a reform parliament, is short and simple—it is its determination to frame its measures in accordance with the lower not the upper chamber. If such measures are pertinaciously rejected by the upper house, this shows that the several parts of the government are incompatible with each other—that the branch which represents the property, intelligence, and population of the empire is thwarted in its course by that which represents none of these social elements. Hence the issue would be forced onward—the obstacle to the common weal removed—and the question so often asked—*What must be done with the lords?*—be at once solved!

As we have not yet answered this question, we might as well do it in this place. Its solution is unavoidable, and will be hastened rather than retarded by the startling re-apparition of the Tory plunderers. Only one leg of the constitutional tripod has undergone a curative process, and at least one more remains to be subjected to medical treatment. Let us see how this may be best accomplished.

It seldom happens that constitutional changes can be effected by constitutional means. As the object sought is a new disposition of political power, a little violence and departure from ordinary forms are usually essential to its achievement. The Reform Bill itself was not carried without coercion. An intimation, not to say a menace, was conveyed from a high quarter that constrained the refractory peers to withdraw their opposition. But a threat arbitrarily to *increase* the peerage is just as strong a measure, and as wide a departure from the constitutional objects for which the power to create peers is vested in the crown—as a threat arbitrarily to *diminish* their number. As, however, a sudden augmentation of the number of the lords is a change not at all to be desired, let us see whether the other alternative—a reduction—may not be adopted.

About the utility of ejecting the thirty bishops from the Lords no doubt is entertained by any sane and disinterested observer. They have long disgraced themselves and the church by their presence. Besides, it would only be an act of justice to the great body of Dissenters, who are not represented in either branch of the legislature.*

But supposing the bishops got rid of, there would still be too much Toryism in the upper house for the wholesome and practical working of the government. Lord Grey reckoned up a majority of eighty tory peers always lying in ambush ready to crush him and his measures; it was this, more than divisions in the cabinet, which gave such a feeble

* We have before remarked (p. 26) that the Dissenters are the *community*, being a majority of the population. This is a fact. In round numbers at the present moment the Dissenters have been estimated in *Tait's Magazine* to be in

Ireland	7,000,000
Scotland	1,000,000
England and Wales	7,000,000
Total Dissenters	15,000,000

While the total population of the United Kingdom is only 24,271,763.

and wavering character to the noble lord's administration. Let us then see how this phalanx of evil can be further and least offensively reduced. Our purpose is to avert civil strife by a timely restoration of the balance of the constitution, which has been disturbed by the extinction of the nomination boroughs—by the abstraction of an aristocratic mass from one end of the beam without a corresponding diminution of weight at the other.

Next to the episcopal bench the chief strength of the Tories lies among the representative peers of Ireland and Scotland. It was the bishops and the Irish and Scotch peers, who had obtained their promotions or been elected under Tory influence, that defeated the Reform Bill on its first introduction into the House of Lords. Of twenty-three bishops who voted, twenty-one were against and two for the bill; of the sixteen representative peers of Scotland twelve were against and four for the bill; of twenty-three Irish peers nineteen voted against and four for the bill: thus, of fifty-four votes against the Reform Bill forty-three were the votes of bishops and Irish and Scotch peers; the proportion of Scotch peers being as three to one, of the Irish nearly five to one. So palpable an anti-reform spirit shows the utility of excluding from the lords the representative peers, along with their right reverend brethren.

For this mode of reduction two substantial reasons may be given.

First, a representative peerage is an anomaly in the constitution of recent introduction. Constitutionally, a peer is supposed to sit in his own right, by descent or creation, and to represent only himself, not others. Upon this principle he exercises the right of voting by proxy, which is a privilege denied to the members of the House of Commons, as inconsistent with their representative functions. To exclude the Irish and Scotch representative peers would therefore be a renovation of the constitution of the House of Lords, by bringing it back to that state of consistency and integrity in which it subsisted prior to the innovations introduced at the unions with Scotland and Ireland.

Secondly, the exclusion of the Scotch and Irish peers would be an improvement scarcely attended with personal sacrifice. The Irish peers sit only for life; the Scotch are chosen only for one parliament; so that the interests of both are terminable, unlike the legislative functions held by the hereditary peerage.

Against this proceeding it may be urged that the nobility of Scotland and Ireland would be unrepresented in the legislature. No such thing. If not sufficiently represented in the upper house, they have recently gained an indirect representation in the lower, by that clause of the Reform Act which gives the elective franchise to their dependents as leaseholders and tenants-at-will.

By the exclusion of thirty spiritual peers, and the forty-four temporal peers of Ireland and Scotland, a reduction would be effected to the amount of seventy-four members. If this should not be enough to bring the Lords into due keeping with the Commons, we would next suggest that all PAUPER PEERS be excluded from the upper house. There is an instance, mentioned in *The Cabinet Lawyer*, in the reign of

Edward IV. of the degradation of George Nevile, duke of Bedford, on account of his poverty, which rendered him unable to support his dignity. Acting on this precedent, aided by the pension list, names might easily be selected, the exclusion of which from parliament would tend materially to elevate its character as well as harmonize the two branches of the legislature.

But if all these reductions should not suffice, we must resort to the peers created during the ministry of Mr. Pitt. In the two last reigns, there was a clear addition of two hundred and twenty-five members to the House of Lords.* Toryism being the ascendant school of politics, the character of the peers created was, of course, determined by that of the minister from whom the honours were obtained. The effect of this was evinced on the introduction of the Reform Bill in 1831. Of the *old* peers of the United Kingdom, there was a majority of two *for* the second reading of the bill. Of the *new* peers of the United Kingdom created subsequent to 1792, the majority was *against* the second reading of the bill, and their number was only balanced by the creations under the Whig ministry. The entire subject will be made manifest from the following statement, copied from a tract 'On the Adjustment of the Peerage.'

	Voted against the Bill.	Voted for the Bill.
Peers of the United Kingdom, created previously to the end of 1792	79	81
Peers of the United Kingdom, created subsequently to 1792, (including the creations during the administration of Earl Grey)	66	66
Archbishops and Bishops	21	2
Representative Peers for Scotland	12	4
Representative Peers for Ireland	19	4
Royal Dukes	2	1
	199	158

How to make a selection from the Pitt peers we are unable to suggest, unless they be at once *black-balled* by name, by a vote of the House of Commons, and declared ineligible to sit in parliament. It may be urged there is no precedent for this. But, in great emergencies, every age creates its own precedents. There was no precedent for the reduction of the French Chamber of Peers on the accession of Louis Philippe. There was no precedent for declaring the throne *vacant* when James II. was alive and well, and had only stepped over into Ireland: but it was done by the Whig revolutionists of 1688. A legislature which has disfranchised the rotten boroughs may, without greater violence, disfranchise their proprietors, who are alike unsuited to the times and an obstacle to the common weal.

* Letter to the duke of Wellington, on creating peers for life.

The constitution is manifestly in a dilemma, and neither his "Highness" of Waterloo, sir R. Peel, nor any body else, can rescue it, except by the adoption of expedients analagous to those we have indicated. No Tory ministry can go on with the present House of Commons; nor can any liberal ministry go on with the present House of Lords. What, then, is to be done? Must the nation or a junta give way? Must the Reform Act be repealed, and Gatton and Sarum be re-established in their ancient glory, or must the House of Lords be adjusted? The last appears the most rational alternative. The peerage must be brought into that position of subserviency to the other branches of the legislature which the commons, previously to the Reform Bill, occupied. It would still have full power to discuss and debate public measures, but no power vexatiously to oppose the proceedings of the Reformed Parliament. As a liberal ministry would always have the means for preserving the liberal character once given to the Lords, there would be no danger of deterioration, or necessity for a second application of the first remedy.

Such appears the most natural solution of existing difficulties, and the final issue of the much-talked-of "COLLISION." It is the catastrophe of the House of Lords,—the hand-writing on the wall,—the fulfilment of which neither Whig nor Tory ministry can avert. From the passing of the Reform Act, the aristocracy lost their supremacy; the *deed* was then executed, though possession not fully given, by which political power was transferred to the great and increasing MIDDLE RANKS of England. The people only now claim THAT for which they virtually stipulated, and which if timely conceded, the Lords may subsist a century longer, though not as *hereditary* legislators. As the yearly convocation of the Clergy subsists as a type of bygone ecclesiastical domination, so may the Peerage, as a type of lost feudal sovereignty.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF THE REFORM PARLIAMENT.

THE House of Commons, backed by the people, is the medium through which we look forward for the ultimate attainment of good government; but whether its composition is such—so independent of aristocratic influence and prejudice—as to be prepared to adopt the remedial suggestions of the last chapter, is a point we are unable to determine. We do not yet despair of the reformed representation. Although the ballot, triennial parliaments, and alterations in the elective suffrage are points which ought not to be delayed, practical ameliorations claim the first consideration. Both the people and their representatives have still much to learn. That there is a large body of independent men in the House we infer from two facts; first, that in spite of the contrary disposition of government, a majority of the members were determined to support Mr. Ward's motion (*May* 27th) for the secular appropriation of ecclesiastical property; and secondly, they were determined to throw out the more objectionable clauses of the Irish Coercion Bill: in the one we had evidence of a sound and firm judgment in regard to a great economical question; in the other of a constitutional jealousy, which would not, without imperative necessity, submit to abridge the civil liberties of the people. That they were not disposed to support other popular measures may be ascribed to an impression that they were premature, or were unseasonably introduced, or had a tendency to embarrass—perhaps to cause a change of ministers!

The last is a consideration, we confess, that always puzzled us amazingly; it does, indeed, appear an astounding fact that a majority of the honourable members should have laboured under the strange delusion that no 'great men' could be found capable of governing this vast empire save Thomas Spring Rice and my lords Lansdowne, Auckland, and Melbourne. The thought never seems to have occurred that great occasions always produce their great men to direct them. So far from sharing in this infatuation, our opinion is that if the whole of the late cabinet, —or, indeed, the three estates of the realm, as Guy Fawkes intended, —had disappeared in the recent combustion of the parliamentary walls, the entire community would have gone on much in the same way as if no such catastrophe had happened. We are quite sure the 'Collective

Wisdom' (we cannot forget old names) will look back to this part of their conduct with the same ludicrous feelings that they look back to the phantasmagoria of the nightmare, occasioned by swallowing too much of Bellamy's old port and rump-steaks.

A *second* hallucination under which the Reformed Parliament laboured, and which gave a wrong direction to their legislation, was mistaken notions of the importance of the agricultural interest. Hence their negative vote on the corn-laws and their dealings with fiscal burdens. In our chapter on the '*Plough and the Loom*' we have tried to place this question in its true light. The middle classes, as well as their representatives, share in the misapprehension of the national importance of rural industry, and it is a fact which may partly account for the proceedings of the House of Commons in this respect, that nothing like an energetic and consentaneous expression of public opinion on the injustice and impolicy of the bread-tax could be elicited.

There is another subject on which we think the people are quite as much at fault as their representatives,—namely, the projected dealings with church property. The idea of giving upwards of *one-third* part of the tithes to the landlords instead of applying as much of the redundant revenues of the clergy to some purpose of public utility, surpasses our comprehension. Yet this intended spoliation, of what we consider the national resources, did not call forth any loud expression of disapprobation. The truth is, the people did not generally comprehend it; many of them, we verily believe, conceived it to be a generous act of the landlords to undertake to pay, in lieu of their tenants, three-fifths of the tithes on consideration that the remaining two-fifths should be abated; not reflecting or not knowing that the *whole tithe* is a rent-charge on the land belonging to the public, and which the public has as much right to exact to the full amount from the owners of the soil as a mortgagee has to exact the amount of his mortgage.

Much of the other business which has been before parliament has been of the same character as the commutation of tithes. Referring to property rather than *personal* rights, it has not excited a high degree of popular interest. If a pension is lavished on the cast-off mistress of a minister, attention is excited to the profligacy of the transaction from the Land's End to John-o'-Groat's; but legal reform, the slave-question, and the renewal of the charters of the Bank and East India Company have been more interesting to lawyers and political economists than the mass of the people. Hence the House of Commons has been left, as we may say, to itself, and its members have been influenced neither by the watchfulness nor excitement of their constituents.

Another circumstance tended to give flatness and inefficiency to the proceedings of the Reform Parliament. There is nothing like a regular opposition in the House of Commons. The Tories never reckon to exert themselves unless they are amply paid for it, and having no expectation of the recent turn-up in their favour, they were mostly content during the late sessions lo look on and laugh while the Whigs tried to wriggle out of the difficulties created by their long course of

misgovernment. Exclusive of Tories there is a somewhat numerous corps of RADICALS—one hundred and twenty at the least—a number far exceeding that of the old opposition, which under Charles James Fox struggled against the war faction, and the profligate administrations of Liverpool and Castlereagh. With discipline and the support of the towns the Radicals in the house might make the English aristocracy quail for their corn-laws, church abuses, and hereditary privileges, but they are a body without a soul; having no leader in whose superior character and ability they can acquiesce, they are a disorganized mass, many of whom had no higher object of ambition than the dinners of lord Althorp!

While we are on the popular party, we might as well drop an observation on the conduct of some of its chief members. Mr. HUME appears to have been amalgamated, in part at least, with the late ministers, and his economical vocation became so diminutive, that at the end of the session he had only to complain of the wastefulness of using *gilt* instead of plain edged paper. The conduct of the member for Middlesex on agricultural questions has puzzled us exceedingly. His motion for a fixed duty on corn at the high rate fixed by him was more favourable to the landlords than the existing graduated scale. If such were the intention of the honourable member, we cannot reconcile it with our notion of a popular representative, and that it was so may be inferred from Mr. Hume's subsequent vote in favour of the marquis of Chandos's motion, that 'agriculture be specially considered in any reduction of taxation.' Mr. Buckingham too, *(proh pudor!)*—the representative of the operatives and tradespeople of Sheffield—voted (disinterestedly we suspect) with the 'lords of the soil'!

Knowing Mr. Hume's sentiments on the slave question, we were not surprised to find him among the foremost supporters of the Poor Law bill—a measure which certainly required the stomach of a Scotchman to swallow whole and undivided. It may be inferred from this that he is a disciple of that school which has long been labouring to substitute a heartless selfishness for the more generous impulses of our nature. We have before adverted to the tendency of this mis-named philosophy, and which in substance amounts to this:—that the miseries of life result from the absence of individual prudence, and that this prudence will be best taught by abandoning the destitute to the consequences of their vices or misfortunes; thereby extinguishing all the charities which hitherto it has been the business of science and religion to inculcate, and bringing society into that primæval state in which the predominant rule is—*Take care of yourself without regard to any body else!* A man who thinks that social existence can be bettered by the dissemination of such a doctrine must have a very peculiar organization himself, and have had a very limited and peculiar observance of human nature.

Mr. O'CONNELL is usually enrolled in the popular file, but with little pretension to popular principles. His idea of church reform is limited to the transfer of tithe to the landlords; he is opposed to poor laws and to popular education, which last he identifies with the spread

of DEISM; thus covertly insinuating that Christianity is incompatible with the diffusion of general intelligence. His quarrel with government is a personal quarrel merely; it is a dispute about the disposal of the 'loaves and fishes,' not about popular rights and benefits. Ireland is the patrimony of O'Connell and his heirs, and the sway of the 'Saxon' is in the way of his ambition.

Two truths are satisfactorily illustrated in the career of this redoubtable agitator,—first the power of a clever man to mislead a community; secondly, the deplorable ignorance of the Irish, who can be duped by so palpable an adventurer, who fights not for them but himself only.

It is one of the imputed weaknesses of the late administration that it sought to open a negotiation with O'Connell; or, as we understood it, to *buy him over*. But how was this possible? Like the Times newspaper, O'Connell may boast of being placed by circumstances in such a position that he is above the *price* of any ministry. What pension or place could they give him which would be an equivalent for the 'rint' and professional gains? There is only one—the kingly office—and that is not yet vacant.

The position of sir FRANCIS BURDETT in the reform calendar cannot be overlooked. For some reason—we know no good one—the Baronet has fallen to leeward. This may be the mere caprice of popular favour, which posterity will correct. We shall, however, stick to first impressions; we shall not transfer our allegiance from those who cherished reform in its weakness and nonage to those who have only adopted it in its triumph and maturity. It is often painful to observe how the 'honours are divided.' The Whigs claim all the laud of reform, but what did they do for the cause during the thirty years' public life of sir Francis Burdett save treat its advocates with sneers, revilings, and contumelious silence? Not many years since there appeared in the organ of the party, the *Edinburgh Review*, an article recommending to the people to withdraw from the pursuit of parliamentary reform as a primary object, and concentrate attention on retrenchment in the public expenditure. Even so late as 1830 (Nov. 2d) earl Grey declared in the House of Lords that he was 'unprepared with any plan of reform,' and perhaps would have long continued unprepared had he not had at his elbow lord Durham, lord John Russell, and one or two more who loved the cause more with the heartiness of a first love than the ex-Premier.

We have no taste for minute retrospections into public conduct, for we have an aversion to try men either by words or deeds, having their own by-gone circumstances to justify them. We will never deny—it cannot be denied—that the Whigs at length, as soon perhaps as they had the power—gave the people a measure of reform ample beyond their expectation. For this they owe them forgiveness and perhaps gratitude. But if it comes to the apportionment of individual merit, we say that of *living men*—we pass over the early martyrs, Wyvil, Sharpe, Jebb, Wakefield, Cartwright, and Walter Fawkes—we repeat, of living men there is none to whom the cause is so much indebted as to sir Francis Burdett, and next to him a few honest and indefatigable men of West-

minster. Among the upper ranks sir Francis long fought the good fight single-handed, and for the achievement of what he conceived the birth-right of Englishmen he sacrificed that which is most painful to bear—the friendship and association of his equals. For a long time the Baronet was sent to Coventry by Whigs and Tories, and when he walked into the House of Commons not a member would speak to him. He had committed high treason against the usurping few by identifying himself with the rights and interests of the oppressed many:—

> From kings and nobles will I seek no more
> Aid, friendship, nor alliance. With the POOR
> I make my treaty, and the heart of man
> Sets the broad seal of its allegiance there,
> And ratifies the compact.—*Philip von Artevelde.*

The present *inertia* of sir Francis may be easily explained. His task is done. He never sought more than the constitutional immunities of his countrymen. Fiscal, commercial, and economical questions, which now form the chief topics of parliamentary discussion are not in his department; but if he takes no further share in public affairs, he has well earned a *life interest* in the representation of Westminster and the gratitude of his country after.

It is not our purpose to go through the entire roll of 'good men and true' in the House of Commons. They are a formidable body, and will, no doubt, be ultimately omnipotent there, but they cannot accomplish national objects unless they have the zealous support of the people. If we look to the composition of the lower house, we shall find that what may be termed aristocratic interests have still a *numerical* preponderance. On the first meeting of the reformed parliament, the sons and heirs presumptive of peers returned amounted to seventy-three; of other relatives of peers there were seventy-eight, making one hundred and fifty-one members united by consanguineous ties with the House of Lords. Besides the direct influence of the aristocracy, there is the influence of the crown. From the returns of 1833, (*Parl. Pap.* No. 671,) it appears there are sixty members holding offices and receiving emoluments from civil appointments, pensions, and sinecures to the amount of £86,291 (exclusive of eighty-three members holding naval and military commissions.) There are four members holding offices at the pleasure of public officers, the emoluments of which are £7,500; ten members holding offices or pensions for life under the crown, £1,311; four members hold offices under the chief-justice or other public officers, of which the emoluments are £9,233; four members with pensions, or sinecures, or offices executed by deputy, the annual emoluments of which are £5,764. One member (the speaker!) has the reversion of an office after one or more lives, the annual value of which is £4,000. Sixty-four members hold commissions in the army, and nineteen in the navy. In the militia and yeomanry there are forty-five members who receive pay and emolument when their corps are on service. Seventy-five members have church patronage.

It is worthy to be remarked that in the house there are only forty-

nine merchants, manufacturers, and traders, while there are seventy-one LAWYERS. The Whig administration was the harvest of gentlemen of the long robe, and this was the spring of a good deal of the scribbling and talking support it received. Of four hundred and twenty-four new offices created by the late ministers, one hundred and five were given to barristers. When one million had been voted by parliament to assist the Irish clergy, no fewer than seventy-two barristers, at five guineas *per diem*, aided by seventy clerks, were immediately put into active service to distribute the loan. The lavishness of this creation was the more palpable, as only sixty persons had been appointed to distribute the twenty millions among the slave-holders in the West-India colonies. But patronage at home is more valuable than patronage abroad, and the advantages derived from confining it to legalists are obvious enough. Lawyers usually move in the better circles; they are educated men—have the power of explaining and diffusing their opinions—and they are accustomed to advocate causes of all descriptions. Set them to make a report on any public subject—give them, for example, a brief to fill up against the Poor and the Poor-Laws, and they will do it to their employer's satisfaction: it is their vocation faithfully to serve those by whom they are paid, or hope to be paid, and little of conscientious responsibility to truth or justice is felt in the execution of the appointed task.*

But the elective bodies of the kingdom must see what injury they are doing the public cause by returning so many hungry Swiss to parliament. Lawyers are eaten up by mutual rivalry and ambition; it is a profession into which no one enters without views of aggrandizement; if by any contrivance or clap-traps the representative function be obtained, it is mostly used only as a stepping-stone to wider practice at the bar or to government employment. As legislators they seek only to serve themselves, not their constituents, and their course is rarely marked by patriotic independence. If their connexions lie among the opposition, it is mere factious hostility to government; if among ministers, it is either silent acquiescence or clamorous advocacy of all their measures, according to the bribes of office received or expected. But the mischief they openly do by impeding or misdirecting public affairs is only a part of the evil. It is among the vulgar errors of common life to consider barristers more competent and better informed than other men; in grammar and elocution, and in Coke and Littleton no doubt they are, but not in the mass of questions which ought to occupy parliamentary attention,—connected with trade, manufactures, commerce, currency, and the condition of the several classes of the population.

* A commission has been appointed to ascertain the suitableness of poor-laws for Ireland. It consists almost exclusively of *embryo barristers*—mere boys, some of them—who are furnished with a number of cut and dry questions, ranged under the heads of 'bastardy, old age,' &c. to direct their inexperience, and most likely prepared by the 'dowager chancellor.' What confidence can be placed in the results of an investigation conducted by such instruments? With the exception of one or two English gentlemen, not a person on the commission is qualified for the undertaking.

Yet owing to this false estimate of legislative fitness, they are at all times looked up to as guides and finger-posts; by their speeches in the house, and their promptings and whisperings out of it, on the back benches, and in the lobby, smoking-room and supper-rooms, members of plain minds and honest purposes are overlaid and misled by them.

It is to this preponderance of legal influence we ascribe much that has been wrong or inefficient in the proceedings of the Reformed Parliament. But this is another evil in addition to those already suggested, which may be traced to the conduct of the people themselves. Why have the manufacturing towns and some of the more populous boroughs returned lawyers to parliament? What have they got by it? Have they got vigilant attention to the conduct of ministers, or zealous watchfulness over their local interests or the more general interests of the community? To these inquiries we fear the answer, in most cases, must be a very simple figure of arithmetic. Some of the popular law representatives have not even vouchsafed *a speech* in return for the favour of their constituents; others have deserted their trust for valuable appointments in the colonies; others are fructifying at home on commissionerships or Treasury practice; others again have been reposing on the file of king's counsel, waiting in silence a joyful resurrection as solicitor or attorney general, master of the rolls, vice-chancellor, or judge of the superior courts: but few or none have laboriously served the people.

But the error of misplaced confidence may be corrected. As a general election seems inevitable, if the projected formation of a Tory ministry is persisted in, the electors will soon have an opportunity of getting rid of faithless and negligent servants, and of not again accepting their services unless it be under such guarantees of devotion to the public, and not their own gains, as even lawyers cannot evade.

CHAPTER VIII.

DISSOLUTION AND CHARACTER OF THE REFORM MINISTRY.

THE abrupt dismissal of the Reform Ministry had more resemblance to the capricious movements which happen within the courtly atmosphere of despotism than of a constitutional monarchy. So far as has yet transpired, the blow was unexpected, and at least undeserved, from the quarter it came. Like Cardinal Wolsey, the errors of the Whigs consisted rather in excess of devotion to the service of their 'royal master' than of their country. Whatever may have been the cause of their downfall, the change in the king's councils augurs no good to the people. If the design were to form a more popular administration, the court would not have resorted to the chancellor of Oxford, but to Lord Durham, Lord John Russell, Mr. Hume, or some other of the more thorough-going reformers. As the SOLDIER has been called in, it is plain a retrograde movement is intended—the repeal of the Reform-Act, or some other desperate effort of expiring conservatism. It is a mad resolve, as events will prove; but before endeavouring to 'trammel up its issue,' let us advert to the position and character of the displaced ministry. As they have been suddenly dismissed, they may be suddenly recalled; in the latter case it is important to ascertain their claims to the confidence of the nation.

It must be conceded that the difficulties which beset the late go-government were of no ordinary character. If the measures they brought forward had any thing of a radical hue about them, they were immediately at issue with the House of Lords; and if they were not of a popular character, they were at issue with the people: so that between both their situations were both precarious and uncomfortable.

It may be urged that they might easily have escaped the dilemma by allying themselves heart and soul with the popular cause and boldly leading on the battle against the Peerage. So they might. This is what they ought to have done, and what must be done, as we have shown in the chapter on the House of Lords, before the constitution can be brought into equilibrium. But, to say nothing of the obstacles which might have been opposed in a higher quarter, there are two reasons why the late government was not so patriotically devoted. First, it was much too aristocratic in its composition; many of the ministers

were peers themselves, and to have joined in an attack like that to which we have alluded, they, doubtless, considered would be to attack themselves, and terminate in the extinction or humiliation of their own order. Besides motives of self-preservation there were others. In the opinion of some of them, no doubt, they had already gone as near the *quick* as they safely could without coming into the jaws of democracy; they thought, therefore, it was time to make *a stand*,—at least they were not disposed individually to share the responsibility of any farther advance into radicalism.

Besides these, which may be considered the external difficulties of ministers, there were others of an internal character, originating among themselves. Upon the great questions impending relative to church, corporation, and law reform, it would perhaps be impossible to find in the united kingdom twelve persons exactly agreed in opinion; we do not mean as to the necessity of reform at all, but as to the degree, kind, and extent. For shades of difference, therefore, excuses may be found; but there were important differences in the Cabinet, especially as regards the Church;* and this was a constant source of weakness and disunion. In fact the original Whig ministry had been constantly sloughing away ever since its formation.

The first cast-off was earl DURHAM, whose general inability to agree with his colleagues called into play a portion of Whig wit, and he was designated the 'dissenting minister.' His retirement was ascribed, in the newspapers, to *indisposition*. Indisposition no doubt—indisposition to co-operate with wavering apostacy! The plain and straightforward mind of his lordship could not comprehend the policy of neglecting the tried friends of the people to keep up a sort of bribery and coquetry with their old and irreclaimable foes. Neither could the noble lord understand the sophistries by which it was sought to substitute illusive procrastination for the prompt and substantial removal of 'recognised abuses.'

The next swarming away from the ministerial hive consisted of the *Stanleyites*. By the secession of Mr. Stanley, the earl of Ripon, the duke of Richmond, and sir James Graham, a positive improvement was effected in the *sentiment* if not in the speaking organs of the administration. These gentlemen were infected with a semi-conservatism that much impeded the full development of the reform principle. Besides entertaining very exalted notions of the social importance of the landed interest, they were opposed to the secular appropriation of eccle-

* Without adverting to the position taken up by the Stanley party on ecclesiastical reform, see the conflicting opinions, as reported in the Parliamentary Debates of June 23d and August 14th, of lords Brougham, Lansdowne, Russell, and Althorp, on the future disposal of the surplus property of the Irish church. To be sure, dissentions from this source might have been averted, in consequence of the subsequent principle adopted by the Cabinet. As the Melbourne ministry had determined to give a large portion of the tithes to the landlords, it is not likely any great surplus would have remained to dispose of either in the Irish or English church.

siastical property, and maintained, as part of their creed, the very fantastical conceit that the revenues of the church ought not to be graduated to the number of its members but of its ministers—the clergy themselves, forsooth! Dogmas like these are irreconcileable with reason; and the ministry must have felt greatly relieved by the withdrawal of the political mystics who held them. An opportunity was thus afforded of infusing more common sense and robustness into the ministry, but it was thrown away; instead of recalling lord Durham, and strengthening themselves in public confidence by bringing forward Mr. Hume and sir H. Parnell, they filled up the vacuum with such unmeaning and unknown things as lord Auckland, and the marquis of Conyngham, and thus put together 'the lath-and-plaster' administration.

After this what could be expected? Next and closely after followed the *Littleton mess*, and embroilment with Mr. O'Connell, which terminated first in the resignation of lord Althorp, and then of the premier himself. The retirement of the last has been ascribed to *an intrigue*. We believe, however, there is no ground for this imputation. According to the statement of the Chancellor (House of Lords, July 29th) earl Grey had six times during the preceding twelve months expressed a wish to resign, and it was only by the earnest entreaty of his colleagues that he had been prevailed upon to remain in office. The testimony, too, of lord Lansdowne on the same occasion is decisive of the charge of 'treachery.' There is no need, indeed, of resorting to the mysteries of a conspiracy, to account for the resignation of the premier. The noble lord's *case* was palpable enough. He shrunk from carrying out the principle of the Reform Acts; he must have felt that he could not successfully carry through the practical ameliorations the country expected from him without a 'COLLISION' with the House of Lords, and this was an alternative he seems to have declined either from the *morgue aristocratique*, or unwillingness to falsify his previous pledge to 'stick by his order.' To escape from so equivocal a position and secure his own retreat, he availed himself of the hasty retirement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The difficulties which beset the ministry of lord Grey descended to his successor. In the approaching session of parliament only two courses were open to the Melbourne ministry—either they must *face the peers or the people*. Upon these alternatives, differences of opinion may have subsisted; one part of the cabinet may have inclined this, and the other that way, and there may have been a *third* portion that inclined to neither, but preferred leaving the task to the DUKE: and hence may have originated the break-up of the administration; or it may have originated solely in royal caprice, or in the desire to get rid of *one* unruly member, and which could only be effected by an internal effort, like that with which the lobster is said to cast off its shell.

Leaving these surmises to be confirmed or not by subsequent disclosures, we shall here observe that the Melbourne ministry was perhaps as good as any of its predecessors under the Reform Act. There

was a great deal of rubbish in it certainly, but there were also good materials. There was merit even in its errors. Although the Poor Law Act and the Irish Tithe Bill were both, as we have shewn, highly objectionable in principle and detail, yet they were bold measures, and the way they were adjusted and forced through parliament evinced an energy—a determination to *go on*, without which it is impossible the difficulties of the country can be surmounted. As a Tory government would be a complete upsetting of all that has been done during the last four years, we consider its permanent existence an utter impossibility; it is likely, therefore, that the whole, or a portion of the late ministry will be recalled: let us ascertain then by personal analysis the good and evil in its composition, so that the people may be apprised of what they ought to wish for and what they ought to reject in its possible reconstruction.

We shall begin with the noble ex-Premier, about whom the public knows little, and whom we had always considered rather in the light of an epicurean aristocrat than a man of business. He certainly left a favourable impression of talent as Home Secretary, having evinced good sense and firmness in the little he had to do during his fair-weather administration of that mostly irksome department. But his lordship is an 'old stager' in public life, and he has not, to our knowledge, placed on record either word or deed calculated to inspire very exalted hopes of future development as an enlightened and very superior statesman. Some years since we remember sir F. Burdett took him to task for an attempt to apply the arbitrary principles he had deduced from a recent study of Roman history to the government of this country. Our impression is that he has more of the inertness of conservatism in him than his predecessor. He obviously views with no favourable eye the admission of Dissenters into the Universities; and if his recent declarations in respect of the church may be trusted, great things need not be expected in that direction.

On the 9th of August lord Melbourne said, 'He reverenced and *loved* the mild and tolerant spirit of the church:'—of course he did; all lords love the church because it is a church for lords, not for the people. On the same occasion he said, 'If he were to speak his own individual opinion, he would say that he for one was *not dissatisfied* with the church as it stood at present.'—No, my lord, not *dissatisfied* with the legislation of the bishops, nor with the dignitaries, pluralists, and non-residents! This is disheartening enough in all conscience; the only three great reforms remaining are ecclesiastical, municipal, and legal, and if the Whigs do not intend to come up to the mark on the first and most important, we shall say, in the language of Portia, they are 'no men for us,' nor we believe the country.

Some allowance may be made for the atmosphere in which the preceding *morceaux* were delivered. The ex-premier, as well as his colleagues, was often compelled to throw a kind of verbal dust into the eyes of his opponents, in order, if possible, to steal a march upon them. We have heard that lord Melbourne is more a man of *expe-*

decency than inflexible principle. It may savour perhaps of laxity to observe that, in the existing crisis, we do not like him the worse for it. Our opinion is that no set of men can cut through present difficulties unless they will adapt the means to the end. Tithes, and other great and complicated questions, can never be settled on principles of strict equity, no more then a man can walk the crowded pathways of the metropolis in a direct line. If ministers cannot go straight, they must go awry;—at all events they must do the thing and get on!

As to the poor ex-Chancellor, he is politically dead, and we shall allow him the privilege of dead men, by speaking of him tenderly. He has sinned against all the *proprieties;* as minister, legislator, judge, and ci-devant reformer. His '*lark*' in the North cleared up whatever mystery attached to his character, and his name is no longer a 'tower of strength.' He is obviously a man of the most pitiable foibles, a lover of vulgar notorieties of all sorts, and which wise men mostly despise. That he has done much for liberal government—has exposed and helped to amend many devouring public abuses—and possesses great industry and cleverness are undoubted facts; but he grievously lacks the discretion, steadiness, and comprehension which constitute a safe and leading mind. If a vague desire of the premiership ever flitted across his ambitious thoughts, he may erase it from remembrance, for we verily believe not one person—save one—in the united kingdom would countenance his pretensions.

Lord Brougham, like Napoleon, sinned against the 'spirit of the age' and has fallen. In his latter days he affected conservative principles—lauded the duke of Wellington, and prostrated himself before sir Edward Sugden, both of whom he had reviled. At one place in Scotland he told his hearers that he was no radical, (he had been though, as well as an admirer of Mr. Pitt and many other things,) and that he could hold no disputation with persons who denied the utility of a House of Lords. How could he? he ought to have been sworn on a *voire dire* first; of course the parvenu and vain Henry Brougham considered himself, as well as Brougham Hall, pieces of the 'order,' without which this great empire could not hold together.

The fatal delusion of this unhappy man appears to have been, that he alone was the ATLAS to support the tottering throne and peerage of England; that he could say to the march of reform, as Canute said to the waves,—'so far shalt thou go and no further.' Hence, like another Peter the Hermit, he went to and fro in the country declaiming against republicans and rash innovations. But what an ungrateful return for his conservative labours—for all his fulsome eulogies of prince and peers to receive only a most ungracious *kick-out!*

In one respect we rejoice at the unceremonious *turn out* of the Whigs; it has given that proud aristocracy a taste of the *sweets* of monarchy, as well as the people who pay half a million a year for it, and three or four times as much more for its trappings. The fall of their chief has had one bad consequence, it has thrown discredit on science by showing how much learning may subsist—though the remark is

trite—with little sense. We had always our misgivings of lord Brougham; a certain etourderie of organization conjoined with mental impetuosity, precluded all nice discrimination of both men and things. On his first assumption of the great seal we said of him (*Black Book*, edit. 1831, p. 426.) that,—"It is the JUDGMENT more than anything else we distrust in the noble and learned lord, and if he does not bring his resolves to wait on a more patient discretion, it is probable his chancellorship will be signalised by some very *unusual eccentricities*." All we apprehended has come to pass; but we trust the noble lord's pension will be saved. The Tories may not think him a fit person to be keeper of the king's conscience, for, in truth, he needs a keeper himself; but why not put him into the Exchequer agreeably to his own desire, in room of Lyndhurst, who received the appointment from the Whigs, in part at least from the economical consideration of saving his retiring allowance?

Lord Brougham has been so fully dissected by the public press, that it is needless to enlarge further in his illustration. His lordship said, "the school-master is abroad," and he did something to set him forth, therefore he cannot complain that he has had a wipe of his birch. Among his evil and faulty deeds we shall not forget all his good ones, for we are not of that class who are constantly seeking out bad motives for virtuous actions.—Let us proceed to the next.

We heard so little of the noble ex-President of the council during the reform ministries, that he reminded us of the lady Egeria, who was better known as an oracle of wisdom in private than a speaker in public. Lord Lansdowne always recommended himself to us by his junction with GEORGE CANNING; for though the last was a trickster, the union with him was a fortunate jostling or breaking up of the relations of the two great factions, and the first shove to perdition the hulk of Toryism received. Earl Grey was well nigh making a shipwreck of his reputation by some unseasonable, not to say envious speeches directed against the coalition ministry, and which, as a step towards a more enlightened administration and consistently with his own principles, he ought to have steadily supported. In some sort the marquis appears to have an orbit of his own, and though as liberal perhaps as a lord may be, he has not always mixed himself up with the party combinations of the Whigs. He is reputed to be the foster-father of the first brood of Edinburgh Reviewers, who during the last four years have virtually grasped the government of the country. A dubiousness about consequences, which results from viewing questions too abstractedly and on all sides, will prevent him, we apprehend, as well as lord Holland, from going very far or fast in the way of effective reformation.

Of lord Duncannon we know little, and of lord Auckland nothing at all, nor have we ever met any body that did. The last, we had concluded, was dead and the title extinct, till we met the names of his sisters and himself on the Court Pension List as a pauper peer. He seems to have been thrust into the 'arm-chair' of the Admiralty as a short and easy way (two years' sitting only) of acquiring for life the £2000 retiring pension, under the infamous Civil Offices Pension Act.

The late Chancellor of the Exchequer had long subsisted rather on an indulgent system of public credit, than any thing great or brilliant actually performed by him. The dogged manner he stood to the worst parts of that curious 'boon (query bone?) to the female population' as he called the Poor Law Bill, was more like the bite of a mastiff than any thing else. Still we cannot help thinking well of a man so highly esteemed by all who intimately know him. If there is really any thing good in him, and we are inclined to think there is, we trust in the new sphere into which his lordship is removed it will be produced, and in such a way that the reporters may be able to transmit it to the public. The little that has been usually given of earl Spencer's speeches is mostly distinguished by brevity and good sense, and in honesty of purpose he is unsuspected.

Little need be said of the right hon. THOMAS SPRING RICE. Every body knows that the ex-secretary of the Colonies is a keen landlord and a first-rate *artist** in politics. He disposed satisfactorily of Mr. O'Connell on the 'repale' question, but was not so successful in his encounter with the honourable M. P. for Oldham on the stamp duties.

The motion of lord JOHN RUSSELL at the end of the session for postponing the issue of the writ for the corrupt borough of Warwick, and his prompt abandonment of the Bribery Bill after its maltreatment by the Lords, show that he is not disposed to acquiesce in all the freaks of hereditary wisdom. The name of Russell is a guarantee of attachment to constitutional rights, but has his lordship truly interpreted the change effected by the Reform Acts? It is no longer king, lords, and commons, but in the inverse order—commons, lords, and king!

The hearty and straightforward speech of sir JOHN HOBHOUSE at the Edinburgh festival ought to be accepted as a peace-offering for prior transgressions. Bating a little petulance, the Baronet possesses sterling qualities, and we are glad to see him again in parliament, though the absence of his opponent, Mr. Eagle, is a real loss to the country; inasmuch as his learning, acuteness, and popular principles would have been of essential use in the approaching discussion of ecclesiastical matters. We cannot, however, forget *old services;* the rejection of sir John by the electors of Westminster always appeared to us a harsh and hasty measure of justice. What claims his opponent had to supersede him we could never discover. Colonel Evans seems to us a revival of that famous knight-errant sir Robert Wilson,—one very fond of leaving his *name* at the palace, and of asking questions about our '*foreign relations!*' Now we have a great contempt for M.P.'s whose diffusive patriotism is such that it extends to Turkey, Russia, or Mehemet Ali, rather than to Lancashire, Yorkshire, or the southern counties. If the Westminster people *will* have a colonel, why not take colonel Jones, a man who has really done the cause some service, and against whom, in our opinion, there prevails a very undeserved prejudice?

Notwithstanding the startling advent of the Duke and his myrmidons,

* For a definition of this term, see Mrs. Austin's *Characteristics of Goethe*.

we are progressing in good government. Democracy is the advancing flood which must ultimately level all monopolies. The times have marvellously changed! Lord Brougham, after his rejection by the universal-suffrage men of Westminster, always affected a great distaste for men of *low politics*, and we remember, during a pending election for that city, he thought there was little to choose between Hobhouse and the devil – and said as much. Yet the would-be premier has lived to sit in the same cabinet with the despised radical!

We pass over that 'pure old Whig,' lord PALMERSTON. If the noble lord, by any sort of jockeyship, can manage to keep the saddle under the contemplated ducal ministry, he may be considered a second Talleyrand, destined to survive all vicissitudes of rule. Under the ex-secretary the foreign policy of the Whigs has been the best part of their administration, as their Irish has been the worst. What weakness to send a doting voluptuary to preside over a country that has never yet known the blessings of civil government—that is a complete scene of want, violence, and rapine—a moral and physical chaos which nothing less than the genius of a Peter the Great or some such master-mind could rescue from its complicated maladies!* It was this, and the pensioning, salarying, place-finding, and church-jobbing for sycophants, dependents, and undeserving relatives, that abated public zeal in favour of the fallen ministry.

We come to the lower and best stratum, consisting of Messrs. Abercrombie, Ellice, and Poulett Thomson, all of whom are plain men of honest purposes, and we wish the defunct government by incorporating lord Durham, sir H. Parnell, and some others, had consisted more of the same description. They are not shining characters, but they are free from the aristocratic *prestige* and historical associations which were the chief source of bewilderment of the higher section of the cabinet on the great questions of church and state reform. They are men of the age we live in; whereas the others belong to the by-gone times of Bubb Doddington, Rockingham, Shelburne, Pitt, Fox, and other magnates of the Georgian era. Poulett Thomson's dividing with Mr. Hume on the corn laws shows that he is not only a person of sound and consistent principles, but of independence, and his rated scale of tea duties deserves public support.

Sir JOHN CAMPBELL was a great promiser of legal reforms, but ex-

---

* In some parts of Ireland it is 'safer to violate the law than to obey it.' According to Mr. Littleton, the late or present secretary, (for we don't know which it is at the time we are writing,) *two murders* upon an average are daily reported to the Castle; how many unreported ones are perpetrated cannot be estimated. Among Irish horrors the most revolting are the fights between the clans. At the last Ballyheagh races (June 24th) there was a faction-battle of this sort between the Cooleens and Lawlors, in which upwards of 1000 persons were engaged, of whom eight or ten were killed in the affray, and thirty-five drowned in the river; the savage wretches on the bank, by stones and sticks, doing their utmost to prevent the escape or rescue of their sinking opponents! Yet there is no police—no magistracy—no priesthood—no resident proprietary—to prevent the repetition of these frightful outrages against social order.

cept laying the first stone and giving a name, he perfected nothing. There were one or two more, which we forget, on the Whig roll, but as late events have rendered the whole, in lieu of a living calendar, a mere *bill of mortality*, it is not a matter of consequence.

Having thus gone through the ex-Ministry rather in the line manner than with fulness of detail, the important inquiry is—*What prospect did it hold out of good government?* Our opinion, as before hinted, is, that it was too aristocratic, that it did not sufficiently represent the Commons of England. It consisted of respectable functionaries—liberal in the abstract—intelligent, and within a certain pale, of good intentions—but not intently bent on great practical ameliorations. Unless acted upon by a strong pressure from without, they would have *stood still;* if they had moved, it would only have been when every excuse for delay had been exhausted, and then with the least possible momentum against abuses. Their prevailing disposition was not to change—for they had no interest in change—but to maintain, with a few unimportant amendments, things as they are—a church with a gorgeous hierarchy—a privileged peerage with an extortionate rental and irresponsible power—and a House of Commons with freedom of debate, but no efficient power of action. What good there was in them had been nearly extracted, and for the future, we believe, they had determined (as lord Brougham prematurely, and to the great mortification of his colleagues, divulged) to incline to a conservative rather than a more radical course. But as all men of 'woman born' are the creatures of circumstances, it is impossible to predicate the precise track they would have taken; it would have depended on the *spirit of the community*—on the relative force of the two great conflicting parties between which they stood—and to the most potent of which they would doubtless have felt the necessity as well as policy of yielding.

We may further observe that the preceding remarks apply in their full extent only to the upper, and not to that lower and better section of the ministry to which allusion has been made, and which, besides the names already mentioned, included those of sir John Hobhouse, earl Spencer* and lord John Russell, and perhaps of lords Duncannon and Mulgrave. From these there was ground to hope for substantial reform, and had it not been for the intervention of the DUKE it is possible they might have succeeded, backed by a Reform Parliament, in ejecting their timid and more fastidious colleagues, and then formed a really popular administration.

---

* Notwithstanding we must remind this nobleman of an unperformed engagement. In the House of Commons, Aug. 16, 1833, lord Althorp pledged himself, *next* session, to bring in a bill to modify one of the SIX ACTS, which imposed restraints on periodical works of a political character. Did the influence of lord Melbourne, who voted *in favour* of the Six Acts, prevent the redemption of this pledge by his lordship?

CHAPTER IX.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND THE TORIES.

The irruption of the Duke and his pandours, like the invasion of the French people by the duke of Brunswick, has united all classes of reformers. Differences of opinion may have subsisted among us, but there can be none as to the claims of a reforming and totally unreforming ministry. The Whigs may have been slow and niggardly in their concessions; but they were pledged to do something, and would have done something; whereas the Duke comes before us in no 'questionable shape,' but as an open, avowed, an out-and-out champion of abuse—an incarnation of the principle of evil—a foe to the freedom of his own and every European community.

Insidious attempts have been made to bring in the Duke, like sir George Murray and the Lord Mayor, under false pledges and representations. So silly a device scarcely merits notice. *Reynard is Reynard still though he put on a surplice.* But his Highness himself is not a man to counterfeit any more than change sentiments; nor is any man who has attained the age of the Duke prone to alter his political creed, especially from a love of despotism to liberty.

But supposing such a miracle, as a conversion from Toryism to liberality, then why bring him forward at all? It cannot be imagined that the Duke or sir R. Peel is prepared to go farther in reform even than Spring Rice, or lords Melbourne and Lansdowne, and if not, why turn them out—why agitate the whole country for a change without an amendment? Never since Britain became an isle was it in a more hopeful state, so well-disposed to wait for salutary but efficient ameliorations, and so little in need of a coercive government. A spirit of watchfulness is abroad, but there is no political excitement, no plots nor revolutionary designs. Intelligence and moderation are spreading, and all the great branches of industry are rapidly extending Why then should the cheering prospect be blighted—be broken in upon for the mere purpose of an *experiment*, to try whether an old soldier has repented him of his errors?

But it is no experiment—nobody thinks it is—every one knows that the Duke is and ever must be hostile to popular reforms. For this he is brought forward—the Tories have resolved to make *a stand*, and the old battering ram is again brought forth in defence of the church and corporations.

It is a hopeless struggle. The Whigs were doing their best for the Tories, and much better than they will be able to do for themselves, and their true policy was to remain quiet. We thought the hated faction had been disposed of now and for ever, but as it is has once more taken the field, we trust the next onset will be final—that its discomfiture and overthrow will be such that it will never again venture to show itself in hostile array. There can be no doubt of the result. Scotland will rise almost to a man. That country, by the amendment of her representation, her burghs and police institutions, has been almost created under the Reform Acts, and she will never see the benefits she has derived endangered by Tory misrule. The vast mass of English Dissenters is with us, and in Ireland there are seven millions.

Were not great national reforms in jeopardy, the Duke is not qualified for the civil government of the country in ordinary times. He is great in war, but mediocre in peace. He is shrewd certainly, and a selfish man, but his endowments are not various. In tact and judgment, as a minister, he has often shewn himself as defective as the late chancellor. With the mind and great social interests of the empire he is not conversant. We could cite examples of want of information of which a Lancashire weaver would be ashamed. It is not long since (April 20th) he classed 'ATHEISTS' in the number of English Dissenters. In political economy he is barely so far learnt as to see the superiority of machinery to manual labour. Notwithstanding the schooling he received from Mr. Huskisson, he does not fully appreciate the policy of *free trade*, and is disposed to increase the duty on foreign silks, to give, as he says, a 'change to the home market.' His external policy is notorious; it is that of Don Miguel, of Nicholas, and Metternich. The old pragmatical Dutch king is the duke's *beau ideal* of a monarch. But it is unnecessary to proceed—the reader will find in the ADDENDA extracts from the speeches of his highness, illustrative of his sentiments on nearly all public questions.

It is said that the influence of the Duke with his party is such that he will be able to carry measures that nobody else could, that the peers will follow him when they would not follow earl Grey or lord Melbourne. The *hereditaries* are a queer set certainly, and it is impossible to say who they will follow. Gibbon relates that the Crusaders had the emblem of a goose at their head, and they always followed that in full confidence of victory. We do not mean that his highness is a goose, or any thing like it; he is something very different. But we know that the liberal and enlightened portion of the British community will not follow him, nor will that portion which is the reverse of liberal and enlightened—for it is notorious that there is a section of the Tories for whom even the duke is too expansive in his views, and there is another section who think him a very good Ajax, but no Nestor, in politics:—so that between them his party is far from multitudinous. There is one faithful band we dare say will follow him to the world's end, provided he has any thing to give them;—we mean that corps of *attaches*, male and female, whom his highness, to save his own pocket, threw on the pension list at the

close of his last administration. The Grevilles and William Holmes will come forth again no doubt, as well as John Wilson Croker, Peregrine Courtenay, Joseph Planta, and other survivors of that plundering phalanx who abetted Castlereagh and Sidmouth in all their atrocities. Besides these, the duke will have other adjuncts even after death—namely, the *glories* of the MALPURBA, and of the death of the brave marshal Ney!

As the Duke's chance of success has become dubious, a new candidate has been started in the person of sir Robert Peel, and posterity will scarcely believe that the government of this vast empire has been suspended—laid on the shelf we may say—to wait the return of this great personage from a tour of pleasure in Italy.

Sir Robert is a respectable man - he is a scholar and a gentleman, and that is saying much for any one in private life, but they are not the qualities to constitute a great public character. He is a good debater—the best, perhaps, in the House, save Stanley; and though inferior to Stanley in energy, he is superior to him in the arrangement of his matter, and a discreet and balanced mind. But after all he is only a second or third-rate statesman, well enough in ordinary times, but not fit for the existing crisis, and in a country that contains as many sects, parties, and divisions, as the Roman empire contained tribes and nations. A long speech on an important subject will mostly set forth the grasp of a person's mind, and if any one wishes to appreciate sir Robert's, let them read his oration of December 20th, 1830:—it comprises what may be termed his general views at that critical period; but a more brainless exhibition of common-place, conceit, Joseph Surface candour, and dowager politics we never before witnessed. Sir Robert is a timid and accomplished man, and would grace a peerage much better than the premiership. Moreover, he is—saving a slight and recent amendment—a regular university Tory, therefore quite out of season; and, besides, has always been a slow learner: he only discovered the policy of Catholic emancipation when too late—when the concession could only be made without grace, and was received as no favour. Of the two we prefer the bold, blunt, blundering, Duke; but our fervent prayer is for neither, and this we are confident is the prayer of the united British people.

From some cause the country has been convulsed by anticipation, and most unexpectedly; for it is plain even the Tories did not anticipate the sudden turn in their favour, otherwise they would not have been to collect from all parts of the continent. In the course of the ensuing session, a change of ministry or rather of ministers may have become necessary, but it was yet premature. The people might have their misgivings about a portion of the cabinet; indications may have got abroad of the secession of a squad of alarmists like that of the Portland clan in 1793; but as a body the Melbourne ministry was untried, and the people were not so unreasonable as to wish its dismissal before being subjected to that ordeal. That it possessed energy we have shown, and that the larger part of it was of a sterling kind, we have the cheering testimony of its opponents. According to the Quarterly Review,—"There were two parties in the

cabinet: one—the MAJORITY, we fear—thought that they could not meet Parliament without announcing some *strong measures* of what they called church reform, or to speak more truly and plainly church spoliation; the other (to which lord Melbourne himself *is said* to have inclined) were reluctant to pledge themselves to this extent, and declared that they *must resign* if such measures were proposed."—*Postcript, Nov.* 19, 1834. Very well, they could have resigned; if they were so very opinionated that they could not agree with a *majority* of their colleagues, supported by a Reform Parliament, their best course was to take up their bag and walk, as the Stanleyites had done before them. Perhaps their places might have been supplied when the time came without a break-up of the ministry, and why not wait and see? Our opinion of the intelligence of the Lansdowne party and its notions of civil government is such, that if it found the mind and strength of the community, expressed through constitutional organs, were really bent on searching ecclesiastical reforms, it would have succumbed and not withdrawn. But if it had, successors might have been found, and then we should have had a ministry in harmony with the Reform Parliament, and together, backed by the people, they would have been in a state to *speak* to their high mightinesses of the upper chamber.

This in truth is the real dilemma of the British constitution. A liberal or illiberal ministry is only prefatory matter. Take which you will, there is a 'lion in the way.' With a reforming ministry the question is—*What shall be done with the* LORDS? With an unreforming one—*What shall be done with the* COMMONS? But is it possible—can it be believed that this great empire, more lofty than ever in its elevation, and looking forward to a still better futurity—bursting with energy at every pore—and enlightened by the immortal *Black Book* on the causes of past misrule and present difficulties;—can it be believed, we repeat, that this empire will go backwards? Never! Up, then, Britons! one victory more and you have done. You fight not for Whigs nor for Tories, but for yourselves. The hated faction which has again reared its head, and which for a century plundered, duped, and misled you, will be for ever exterminated. By your noble efforts in 1831 you reformed the lower house, and by another such struggle—if the Duke vouchsafe the opportunity—you will reform the upper—and then rest in peace!

A portion of the public press has adopted a very silly, not to say insidious course. The Times and Morning Herald never made a weaker point than to attempt to write up the Duke—to induce the people quietly to let his highness get into the saddle to see how he *would go*; just as if he had not been there before.

"Pray, Mr. Speaker, shall we let him in,
To—try if we can turn him out again?"

It is easier to keep the devil out than to turn him out,—so the people thought, and with their characteristic good sense, they were not to be misled even by the 'leading journal'—the changeling Times, which, not long since, was called 'Brougham's Gazette,' then the *anti*-Brougham, and now it is the Duke's or Peel's Gazette as it may best turn up!

ADDENDA.

I. REVENUES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF ECCLESIASTICAL REVENUE INQUIRY.

To the KING'S *Most Excellent Majesty.*

YOUR Majesty having been pleased to issue a Commission under the Great Seal, dated the twenty-third day of June, in the second year of your Majesty's reign, authorizing and directing the Commissioners therein-named to make a full and correct Inquiry respecting the Revenues and Patronage belonging to the several Archiepiscopal and Episcopal Sees in *England* and *Wales* to all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and to all Ecclesiastical Benefices, (including Donatives, Perpetual Curacies and Chapelries,) with or without Cure of Souls, and the Names of the several Patrons thereof, and other circumstances therewith connected; and your Majesty having been further pleased, on the expiration of the said Commission, to issue a second Commission, extending the period within which the Commissioners were required to make their final Report, and authorizing them to extend their Inquiries to the Islands of *Jersey* and *Guernsey*, and the *Isle of Man*:—

We, your Majesty's Commissioners, whose hands and seals are hereunto set, humbly report to your Majesty, that in obedience to your Majesty's commands, we have proceeded to execute the duties committed to us.

In prosecuting our inquiries, we have, from the extent and complexity of the various matters to be investigated, encountered many difficulties, which, though not unexpected, necessarily required a *considerable length of time* to surmount.

We believe that we are now in possession of materials sufficient to enable us to make a *full report* to your Majesty on all the topics within the range of our Commission; but to arrange and digest into a tabular form so large a mass of returns, comprising so many different heads of information, and thus to present a distinct view of the whole revenues of the Church and their distribution, has been a work of no ordinary labour, which, though nearly completed, must still occupy some further time.

It would have been more satisfactory to us to have awaited the period when we could have completed our task by a *final report*; but we are impressed with a conviction that it is expedient to lay before your Majesty, without delay, a statement of the total income of the Church, and of the manner in which it is divided between the archbishops, bishops, corporations aggregate and sole, and the incumbents and curates of benefices.

The total amount of the gross annual revenues of the several archiepiscopal and episcopal sees in England and Wales is £180,462, affording an average of £6,683; and the total amount of the net annual revenues of the same is £160,114, affording an average of £5,930.

The total amount of the gross annual revenues of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, together with the separate gross annual revenues of the several dignitaries and other spiritual persons, members of cathedrals or collegiate churches, is £350,861, and the total amount of the net annual revenues of the same is £272,828.

The total number of benefices with and without cure of souls, the incumbents whereof have made returns to our inquiries, omitting those which are per-

manently or accustomably annexed to superior preferments, and which are included in the statements respecting those preferments, is 10,498; the total amount of the gross annual revenues of which benefices is £3,191,950, affording an average of £304; and the total amount of the net annual revenues of the same is £3,000,393, affording an average of £285.

The total number of benefices with and without cure of souls in England and Wales, including those not returned to us, is 10,701; the total gross income of which, calculated from the average of those returned will be £3,253,662, and the total net income thereof will be £3,058,248.

The total number of curates employed both by resident and non-resident incumbents returned to us is 5,282, whose annual stipends in the aggregate amount to £424,796, affording an average annual stipend of EIGHTY POUNDS; and the total amount of the stipends of curates, if one hundred and two be assumed as the proportionate number on the benefices not returned, and the same be calculated on the average of those returned to us, will be £432,956.

From a scale which we have prepared of the benefices with cure of souls returned to us, it appears that there are 294, the incomes of which are respectively under £50; 1621 of £50, and under £100; 1591 of £100, and under £150; 1355 of £150, and under £200; 1964 of £200, and under £300; 1317 of £300, and under £400; 830 of £400, and under £500; 504 of £500, and under £600; 337 of £600, and under £700; 217 of £700, and under £800; 129 of £800, and under £900; 91 of £900, and under £1000; 137 of £1000, and under £1500; 31 of £1500, and under £2000; and 18 of £2000, and upwards.

The number of sinecure rectories returned to us, and which sinecure rectories are included in the number of benefices above stated, is sixty-two; the aggregate gross annual revenues of which amount to eighteen thousand six hundred and twenty-two pounds, affording an average of three hundred pounds, and the aggregate net annual revenues of the same amount to seventeen thousand and ninety-five pounds, affording an average of two hundred and seventy-five pounds.

We regret that it is not at present practicable to offer a full explanation of the various items which compose the difference between the gross and net amounts; but, to prevent misapprehension, we think it advisable to observe, that no deduction is made from income on account of payments to curates, nor for the reparations of episcopal residences, or of glebe houses and offices, nor on account of payments of rates and taxes for the same, nor has any deduction been made on account of arrears due at the time of making the returns, or of any payments not being of a compulsory nature.

The returns of income have been generally made upon an average of three years, ending December the thirty-first, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-one.

Received this day of June, 1834.

W. CANTUAR.	(L. S.)	C. W. W. WYNN.	(L. S.)
E. EBOR.	(L. S.)	J. NICHOLL.	(L. S.)
LANSDOWNE.	(L. S.)	N. C. TINDAL.	(L. S.)
HARROWBY.	(L. S.)	E. J. LITTLETON.	(L. S.)
C. J. LONDON.	(L. S.)	S. LUSHINGTON.	(L. S.)
J. LINCOLN.	(L. S.)	G. CHANDLER.	(L. S.)
C. BANGOR.	(L. S.)	CHR. WORDSWORTH.	(L. S.)
WYNFORD.	(L. S.)	JOSEPH ALLEN.	(L. S.)
W. S. BOURNE.	(L. S.)	CHAS. THORP.	(L. S.)
H. GOULBURN.	(L. S.)	HUGH C. JONES.	(L. S.)

Dated this 16th day of June, 1834.

Remarks on the Ecclesiastical Report.

THE preceding outline is the only result, known to the public, of the two years' labours of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and, meagre as it is, was only conceded after urgent inquiries in parliament by Messrs. Hume and Baines. Between the industry of the Church Commissioners and Poor-Law Commissioners the contrast is as striking as the objects of their respective investigations. But the delay in making a *full report* by the former is the more extraordinary as the returns from the clergy appear to have been received so early as April 17th, 1833; lord ALTHORP on that day having prefaced his motion for a commutation of tithes in England by a general statement of the revenues of the church, as now given to the public. Surely in the long interval that had elapsed between the date of the report and of his lordship's speech there was sufficient time to 'digest and arrange the materials,' without keeping them back until the untoward advent of the DUKE, who may deem it unnecessary to have any further report at all on the Church.

Leaving these mysteries to be solved by the commissioners, we shall submit a few brief remarks on the matter of the Report such as it is. We have no enmity to the church, only we desire all the good that can be obtained from it at a less cost to the public.

ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.—The net average income of these is £5,930. But the Primate of *all* England has an income of £32,000, according to the statement of Dr. Lushington, and the right reverend bishop of London an income of £15,000, according to his own admission. Such incomes are exorbitant, and quite out of keeping with the incomes of other public servants; as of military and naval officers; or of the first lord of the treasury, and chancellor of the exchequer. In France an archbishop has only £1041, and a bishop £625 a year. A cardinal at Rome, next in dignity to the pope, has between £400 and £500 per annum. These latter sums are enough for Christian pastors. The English bishops have not, we suspect, included in their returns of revenue the annual value of their parks, and '*palaces*,' and their '*thrones*.'

DEANS AND CHAPTERS.—The gross revenue of these is £350,861. They were deemed a 'superfluous condition,' even in popish times, by archbishop Cranmer; and, in a letter to Henry VIII. he says, a prebendary is neither a 'learner nor a teacher, but a good *viander* who wastes his substance in superfluous BELLY CHEER.' By a reform of the cathedral and collegiate churches a saving of a quarter of a million might at once be effected.

RECTORIES AND VICARAGES.—The net average income of these is £285. If there were as many incumbents as benefices, and each received only this very moderate stipend, there would be no complaint that the clergy are overpaid. But the waste and injustice consist in the *disproportion* between the number of livings and the number of individuals among whom they are shared. From authentic returns it appears that the number of incumbents in England and Wales, among whom the 10,498 benefices are divided, is under 7,000; so that some fortunate persons, with good connexions, have two, three, or four livings,

or more, besides dignities in cathedrals, preacherships, chaplainships, and other *tit-bits* of preferment too numerous to mention, but which together swell the incomes of favoured individuals to an enormous amount. It is not only the aggregate revenues of the church, but their unequal and partial distribution which excites public indignation. In this consists its chief iniquity; but, for a complete elucidation of the subjects of PATRONAGE, SINECURISM, and PLURALISM, we must refer to *The Black Book* itself, especially the edition of 1832, pages 29, 31, and 56.

CURATES.—From the incomes of these we may form an estimate of the expense really necessary to the maintenance of an efficient church establishment. It is notorious that the curates and poor clergy who are unable to bear the charge of curates, form nearly the only *labouring bees*, and that it is by them that the chief business of preaching, burying, baptizing, and marrying is performed. The 5,282 curates, it seems, have an average salary of £80, amounting for the whole to £424,796; so that, for about double that sum an efficient clergy might be maintained, adequate to the discharge of all the practical offices of the national worship.

POOR CLERGY.—It seems there are 4,506 benefices with cure of souls, having incomes under £150. The worst of the poor livings is, that they are mostly held *single*, while the 'fat ones' are held double, treble, or quadruple, and often with a stall or some other good thing appended. But there is no help for this class of incumbents any more than for the curates, until they obtain a radical ecclesiastical reform. All we can do for them is to recommend their case to the merciful consideration of the bishop of London, who, now that he has got through his poor-law duties, and perhaps, too, his jobbing and exchanging of church preferment with a brother prelate—of which such curious examples were recently given in the *Morning Chronicle*—may have leisure to attend to their situation.

We shall not enter into the subject of the total revenues of the established clergy, having already done that in another place; but shall only remark, that the exclusion from the returns of the income derived from college and school foundations, and from lectureships, chaplainships, and other sources, renders the estimate of the commissioners far from unsatisfactory. Why, too, ought not church rates to be included in ecclesiastical revenue, and which, according to the last return, amounted to £554,295? Are surplice-fees, mortuaries, Easter-dues, &c. included in the returns of the clergy?

II. THE CHURCH AND DISSENTERS.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND DISSENTING PLACES OF WORSHIP.

(From the Black Book, edit. 1832, p. 25.)

COUNTIES.	Roman Catholics.	Presbyterians.	Independents.	Particular Baptists.	General Baptists.	Quakers.	Wesleyan Methodists.	Calvinistic Methodists	Other Methodists.	Missionary Stations.	Total Dissenting Congregations.	Church Livings.
Bedfordshire	1	—	8	21	—	4	35	—	1	1	71	115
Berkshire	6	1	14	11	1	6	34	7	—	1	81	150
Buckinghamshire	1	—	21	28	—	8	25	1	—	37	121	190
Cambridgeshire	1	1	23	19	6	3	29	1	1	1	85	162
Cheshire	7	12	27	5	9	6	48	8	30	1	153	145
Cornwall	2	—	31	12	—	10	219	3	39	4	320	187
Cumberland	4	10	16	8	—	22	32	—	11	2	105	139
Derbyshire	8	7	36	5	11	5	84	3	22	1	182	161
Devonshire	9	15	65	31	—	6	93	—	18	10	247	442
Dorsetshire	7	3	22	5	—	5	21	—	22	3	88	248
Durham	14	7	13	8	—	7	72	—	28	28	177	91
Essex	7	2	64	24	—	20	36	1	—	21	175	413
Gloucestershire	5	4	38	27	—	13	53	11	7	19	177	290
Hampshire	11	4	49	22	1	5	27	6	—	3	128	258
Herefordshire	4	—	11	9	—	4	16	1	—	4	49	201
Hertfordshire	1	1	28	13	1	12	2	4	—	—	62	129
Huntingdonshire	—	1	9	12	1	3	9	1	—	—	36	74
Kent	8	4	44	30	4	9	90	15	—	6	210	395
Lancashire	81	36	88	29	5	25	156	9	75	—	504	287
Leicestershire	7	3	17	13	17	4	68	—	13	2	144	208
Lincolnshire	12	2	18	14	11	9	211	2	24	1	304	598
London and Middlesex	21	15	91	55	2	12	59	22	7	5	289	233
Monmouthshire	4	—	24	28	—	3	10	—	—	3	72	118
Norfolk	8	1	21	32	2	13	74	1	24	5	181	683
Northamptonshire	3	1	35	40	4	7	61	—	—	2	153	303
Northumberland	19	50	8	3	1	4	29	—	22	—	136	97
Nottinghamshire	3	3	12	7	6	3	77	—	41	—	152	178
Oxfordshire	8	3	14	12	—	10	44	—	2	6	99	203
Rutland	—	—	3	1	1	1	7	—	—	—	13	40
Shropshire	7	2	25	15	—	3	32	—	18	—	102	209
Somersetshire	8	7	47	37	—	17	94	3	20	21	254	456
Staffordshire	21	5	32	16	3	6	82	—	41	7	213	178
Suffolk	4	2	33	35	2	10	40	1	—	5	132	486
Surrey	4	1	27	21	—	10	—	11	—	27	101	142
Sussex	6	4	31	13	—	5	20	6	—	2	87	300
Warwickshire	11	5	30	16	7	12	18	2	2	5	108	209
Westmoreland	2	1	12	—	—	11	13	—	1	1	41	68
Wiltshire	3	1	38	31	3	3	37	1	8	4	129	274
Worcestershire	8	8	10	22	—	7	24	3	21	1	104	175
Yorkshire	46	13	154	51	9	64	532	1	147	2	1019	809
North Wales	6	23	172	52	—	3	214	3	6	6	1100	299
South Wales			202	107	—	5		0	9	0		526

III.—PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

1. ALTERATIONS IN PUBLIC OFFICES.

An account of the increase and diminution in the year 1833 in the number of persons employed, and in the salaries, emoluments, and allowances in the public offices. In the Admiralty there has been an increase of 4 persons; in the Navy and Victualling-yards at home, 51; in the Excise, 33; in the Post Office, 33; and in the Board of Education, 7.—Total, 128. In the Colonial Department there has been a diminution of 2; in the War Office, 4; in the Army Medical Board, 6; in the Paymaster-General's Office, 4; in the Commissariat (Ireland), 1; in the Ordnance, 37; Chelsea Hospital, 4; Royal Military College, 1; Royal Military Asylum, 16; Navy Pay Office, 1; Navy and Victualling-yards abroad, 5; Customs (United Kingdom,) 113; Stamps and Taxes, 10; Audit Office in Ireland, 15; Tellers of the Exchequer, 1; Barons of Exchequer (Scotland), 1.—Total, 221. The total amount of the increase of salaries in the various departments, £5,650 : 16 : 7; Emoluments, £405 : 2 : 9; Retired Allowances, £16,662 : 17 : 9; Expenses, £2,980 : 11 : 4.—Grand total of increase, £25,699 : 8 : 5. The total amount of the diminution of the salaries in the various departments is £44,806 : 19 : 9¼; Emoluments, £2,136 : 3 : 10¼; Retired Allowances, £7,736 : 0 : 7; Expenses, £55,927 : 14 : 1½.—Grand total of diminution, £110,606 : 17 : 4.

2. COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY.

Abstract of a Return of the number and description of the existing Commissions of Inquiry, showing the total cost of each commission, from its appointment to the 29th of April, 1834.

	Date of Commission.	Total cost from commencement.
Commissioners of Charities	1831	£26,637*
Commissioners of Royal Burghs, and other Burghs in Scotland	1833	1,653
Commissioners of Ecclesiastical Revenues, England and Wales	1832	2,192
Do. Ireland	1833	710
Commissioners of Excise	1833	2,150
Commissioners of the Courts of Law, Scotland	1833	1,606
Commissioners of the Poor, Ireland	1833	935
Commissioners of Poor Laws	1832	6,408
Commissioners of Municipal Corporations, England	1833	6,665
Do. Ireland	1833	4,046

3. PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS TO IRELAND FROM THE UNION TO JANUARY 1, 1833.

For charitable and literary institutions	£4,225,750
For the encouragement of agriculture and manufactures	1,340,421
For public works and employment of the poor	3,072,160
Total	£8,638,331

* That is, from the *re-appointment* of the commission in 1831, not from the commencement of the charity inquiry in 1818, which must have cost nearly a million, though with few practical benefits to the country.

4. INCOME OF CHARITY PROPERTY.

A Return made by the Secretary to the Commissioners for inquiring concerning Charities in England and Wales, of the Amount of the Income of Charity Estates, and Property of all Kinds, and distinguishing those for Education, in the several Counties under-mentioned.

	Annual Income of all Charities.			Portion of the whole Income applied for Education in established Schools.			Portion of the whole Income applied for or appropriated to Education, otherwise than in established Schools.			Total applied for Education.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Bedford	13,579	16	8	1,608	11	10	214	3	6	1,822	15	4
Cumberland	3,279	1	10	1,802	18	7	85	14	3	1,888	12	10
Derby	12,515	14	11	3,547	19	4	127	1	6	3,675	0	10
Devon	28,438	3	7	5,755	14	2	785	5	1	6,540	19	3
Durham	17,124	16	4	1,783	3	6	80	4	6	1,863	8	0
Gloucester	19,435	14	11	4,510	16	10	691	13	9	5,202	10	7
Huntingdon	3,733	7	6	854	4	10	172	0	0	1,026	4	10
Lancaster	35,734	11	10	18,455	12	5	259	10	3	18,715	2	8
Northampton	17,823	6	6	3,088	13	0	687	6	5	3,775	19	5
Northumberland	5,648	6	2	2,478	14	5	40	4	6	2,518	18	11
Nottingham	15,477	2	11	2,103	4	6	224	16	1	2,328	0	7
Oxford	13,112	4	1	1,621	16	11	118	7	4	1,740	4	3
Rutland	4,783	6	4	1,290	0	0	197	8	0	1,487	8	0
Salop	20,030	0	0	6,231	4	11	197	10	7	6,428	15	6
Somerset	34,925	0	11	7,581	16	5	574	9	5	8,156	5	10
Southampton	10,589	4	3	2,730	17	4	623	0	2	3,353	13	6
Stafford	19,171	15	6	6,693	7	4	440	4	5	7,133	11	9
Suffolk	26,364	13	4	2,938	15	9	1,018	5	1	3,957	0	10
Surrey	26,729	8	7	5,547	19	2	1,049	15	11	6,597	15	1
Westmoreland	5,145	13	11	1,952	8	5	220	3	4	2,172	11	9
York	81,399	18	5	18,621	15	11	2,453	5	1	21,075	1	0
	413,041	8	6	101,199	15	7	10,260	9	2	111,460	4	9

IV.—REPRESENTATION OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

1. COUNTIES.

Counties.	Population.	Population exclusive of the population of unrepresented towns.	Registered last general election.	Polled last general election.
Bedford	95,383	88,424	3,966	£3,484
Berks	145,289	112,854	5,582	4,863
Bucks	146,529	121,730	5,366	4,189
Cambridge	143,955	123,038	..	5,023
Chester, N.	334,410	118,420	5,103	..
„ S.		120,990	5,130	..
Cornwall, E.	302,440	114,919	4,462	..
„ W.		147,255	3,853	..
Cumberland, W.	169,681	70,337	3,848	3,266
„ E.		55,535	4,035	..
Derby, S.	237,170	115,743	5,541	4,789
„ N.		103,804	4,370	3,677

Counties.	Population.	Population exclusive of the population of unrepresented towns.	Registered last general election.	Polled last general election.
Devon, S.	494,168	187,205	7,453	6,660
" N.		157,901	5,368	..
Dorset	159,252	118,856	5,632	..
Durham, N.	253,827	77,114	4,267	3,841
" S.		78,506	4,336	3,994
Essex, N.	317,233	146,747	5,163	4,513
" S.		145,131	4,488	3,592
Gloucestershire, E.	386,904	86,164	6,437	5,752
" W.		152,822	6,521	5,940
Hants, N.	314,313	96,623	2,424	1,810
" S.		82,462	3,143	2,746
Hereford	110,976	95,447	..	..
Hertford	143,341	133,322	4,245	3,845
Huntingdon	53,149	47,736	..	..
Kent, W.	479,155	313,631	6,678	5,562
" E.			7,026	6,144
Lancaster, N.	1,336,854	624,465	6,593	..
" S.			10,039	8,453
Leicester, N.	197,003	157,570	3,658	3,063
" S.			4,125	..
Lincoln	317,244	270,446	9 134*	8,338
			7,956†	..
Middlesex	1,358,541	188,603	6,939	5,132
Monmouth	98,130	93,214	3,738	..
Norfolk, E.	390,054	290,997	7,041	6,229
" W.			4,396	..
Northampton, N.	179,276	158,372	3,363	3,063
" S.			4,425	..
Northumberland, N.	222,912	130,317	2,322	..
" S.			5,192	4,696
Nottingham, N.	225,320	162,592	2,889	2,548
" S.			3,170	..
Oxford	151,726	118,360	4,721	..
Rutland	19,385	19,385	1,296	..
Salop, N.	222,503	186,258	4,682	4,297
" S.			2,791	661
Somerset, E.	403,908	315,271	8,996	7,694
" W.			7,884	5,812
Stafford, N.	410,485	118,931	8,756	7,886
" S.		129,745	3,107	..
Suffolk, E.	296,304	138,637	4,265	3,326
" W.		112,211	3,326	2,920
Surrey, E.	486,326	107,472	3,150	2,211
" W.		81,229	2,912	2,527
Sussex, E.	272,328	107,703	3,437	2,757
" W.		51,454	2,365	..
Warwick, N.	336,988	83,194	3,740	..
" S.		71,994	2,550	..
Westmorland	55,041	43,464	4,392	3,584
Wight, Isle of	..	..	1,167	824
Wilts, N.	239,181	185,551	3,614	..
" S.			2,540	..

* Lindsey. † Kesteven and Holland.

Counties.	Population.	Population exclusive of the population of unrepresented towns.	Registered last general election.	Polled last general election.
Worcester, W. } E. }	211,356	134,222	{ 8,122 / 5,161	*2,647 / 4,349
York, N. Riding	226,235	160,796	9,539	8,487
„ E. Riding	168,646	106,234	5,559	
„ W. Riding	976,415	607,048	18,056	
WALES.				
Anglesey	48,325	45,379	1,187	
Brecon	48,325	43,299	1,168	
Cardigan	64,780	61,985	1,184	
Carmarthen	100,655	90,660	3,887	3,503
Carnarvon	65,753	58,111	1,688	
Denbigh	83,167	79,381	3,401	3,050
Flint	60,012	57,796	1,271	
Glamorgan	126,612	85,086	3,080	
Merioneth	35,609	35,609	580	
Montgomery	66,485	65,297	2,523	
Pembroke	81,424	70,998	3,700	
Radnor	24,651	24,179	1,046	

2. CITIES AND BOROUGHS.

	Population.	£10 Houses.	Registered £10 Houses.	Registered Freemen.	Polled last general election.	Expenses of the Returning Officer.
Abingdon	5,259	451	300	..	201	no charges
Andover	4,966	322	229	17	no contest	
Arundel†	2,805	254	351	..	..	£10
Ashburton†	4,165	342	146	52	..	5
Ashton-under-Lyne	33,597	610	433	..	383	72
Aylesbury	4,907	314†	1,654	..	1,269	143
Banbury†	5,906	365	329	..	..	109
Barnstaple	6,840	607	459	261	684	100
Bath	50,802	7,314	2,853	..	2,329	248
Beaumaris, &c.	2,946	..	329	..	..	
Bedford	6,959	493	975	597	961	249
Berwick	8,920	582	269	436	653	172
Beverley	8,302	507	146	865	972	50
Bewdley†	4,132	484	312	25	..	
Birmingham†	146,986	6,532	4,309	..	..	46
Blackburn	27,091	623	626	..	607	127
Bodmin	5,228	311	222	30	222	10
Bolton-le-Moors	43,396	1,612	1 040	..	..	210
Boston	12,818	1,000	885	372	788	103
Bradford	43,537	1,083	1,139	..	967	65
Brecon	5,026	350	242	..	224	116
Bridgnorth†	6,284	339	746	..	..	11
Bridgewater†	7,087	611	484	..	..	no charges
Bridport	4,242	342	111	322‡	400	43
Brighton	41,994	2,763	1,649	..	1,434	426

* Second election. † Towns only. ‡ Scot and Lot.

	Population.	£10 Houses.	Registered £10 Houses.	Registered Freemen.	Polled last general election.	Expenses of the Returning Officer.
Bristol	103,886	9,785	5,000†	5,309	6,333	£874
Buckingham	7,418	367	300	..	270	30
Bury	19,140	765	535	..	459	126
Bury St. Edmunds	11,436	719	550	30	521	8
Calne*	4,876	519	176	15	..	
Cambridge	20,917	1,160	1,420	79	1,247	134
Canterbury	15,314	667	302	1,209	..	82
Cardiff, &c.	6,187	827	687	..	533	104
Cardigan, &c.	2,795	672	466	564	none	none
Carlisle	20,006	893	571	406	649	41
Carmarthen, &c.	9,995	936	404	280	597	78
Carnarvon, &c.	7,642	774	544	311	773	
Chatham	24,670	1,174	677	..	572	76
Cheltenham*	22,942	2,100	919	..	..	27
Chester	21,363	1,800	649	1,379	1,574	87
Chichester	8,270	680	503	349‡	771	32
Chippenham	5,270	312	112	96	183	34
Christchurch*	6,077	363	206	..	..	23
Cirencester*	5,420	329	604	..	..	64
Clithero	8,915	359	288	18	281	28
Cockermouth	6,022	356	305	..	255	30
Colchester	16,167	500	623	476	991	77
Coventry	27,070	1,500	529	2,756	1,989	189
Cricklade*	1,642	..	1,534	..	..	51
Dartmouth	4,597	422	221	22	..	none
Denbigh, &c.	3,786	743	350	781	..	none
Derby	23,607	1,684	1,012	372	1,136	66
Devizes	4,562	409	292	23	276	116
Devonport	41,454	2,500	1,777	..	1,477	344
Dorchester	3,033	333	322	..	no contest	
Dover	11,924	1,743	367	1,284	1,396	156
Droitwich	6,493	311	236	7	..	none
Dudley	23,043	800	670	..	540	61
Durham	10,125	448	314	492	768	70
Evesham	3,991	330	195	164	332	67
Exeter	28,201	3,016	2,336	586	2,092	232
Eye	7,015	330	200	53	..	37
Finsbury	22,086	23,266	10,309	..	7,344	463
Flint, &c.	2,216	709	303	976	..	7
Frome	12,240	450	322	..	263	64
Gateshead	20,601	750	454	..	..	12
Gloucester	11,933	760	802	725	1,197	48
Grantham	7,448	475	202	496	650	24
Greenwich	64,336	6,142	2,714	..	2,391	215
Great Grimsby	6,836	338	303	353	455	4
Guildford	3,813	431	269	73	303	25
Halifax	34.437	1,300	531	..	492	105
Harwich	4,297	202	188	16	186	41
Hastings	10,097	1,125	554	20	473	93
Haverfordwest, &c.	3,915	584	539	184	..	none
Helston	10,845	225	281	60	..	none
Hereford	10,280	617	459	461	..	126
Hertford	5,247	273	700§	..	671	140

* Towns only. † Including freeholders. ‡ Including Scot and Lot voters.
§ Freemen not distinguished.

	Population.	£10 Houses.	Registered £10 Houses.	Registered Freemen.	Polled last general election.	Expenses of the Returning Officer.
Honiton	3,509	318	511*	..	503	£47
Horsham	5,105	365	257	..	188	26
Huddersfield	19,035	140	608	..	415	39
Hull	54,110	3,133	2,350	1,513	3,305	327
Huntingdon	5,413	200	384	..	287	30
Hythe	8,919	537	481	51	424	37
Ipswich	20,454	1,800	875	344	953	78
Kendal	11,577	682	327	..	..	none
Kidderminster	20,865	500	390	..	332	39
Knaresborough	6,894	369	278	..	260	50
Lambeth	160,613	16,405	4,768	..	3,220	227
Lancaster	12,613	658	261	848	..	none
Launceston	5,414	327	243	..	223	
Leeds	123,393	6,683	above 4000	..	..	161
Leicester	39,433	1,900	1,200	1,569	2,795	147
Leominster	5,249	195	756	23	no contest	14
Lewes	8,592	832	188	690†	..	65
Lichfield	6,499	420	563	298	563	136
Lincoln	12,624	652	461	582	878	64
Liskeard	4,042	315	211	7	no contest	13
Liverpool	165,175	17,427	7,655	3,628	8,551	358
London (City)	132,803	14,568	9,057	9,527	11,500	522
Ludlow	5,253	514	300	59	339	none
Lyme Regis	3,345	300	212	..	183	20
Lymington	5,472	..	249	..	219	112
Lynn Regis	13,370	660	583	253	no contest	none
Macclesfield	23,129	1,000	718	..	588	53
Maidstone	15,387	1,417	652	456	873	29
Maldon	4,895	..	716‡	..	671§	75
Malmesbury	6,136	351	278	13	no contest	20
Malton	6,802	397	375	292†	no contest	none
Manchester	187,002	12,723	6,726	..	..	729
Marlborough	4,186	299	no return	..	..	
Marlow	6.175	349	95	862†	..	39
Marylebone	240,294	21,630	8,901	..	6,076	338
Merthyr Tidvil	22,088	830	502	..	no contest	
Midhurst	3,819	339	252	..	no contest	none
Monmouth, &c.	4,916	1,140	..	..	..	102
Montgomery, &c.		740	657	66	656	216
Morpeth	6,856	446	190	131	no contest	
Newark	9,557	510	1,575	..	1,518	95
Newcastle-under-Lyne	8,192	360	973‖	..	941	84
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	53,613	2,916	2,286	1,619	2,850	422
Newport	3,385	445	405	15	365	75
Northallerton	4,839	294	232	..	209	29
Northampton	15,351	1,087	2,497¶	..	2,406	325
Norwich	61,110	2,316	1,043	3,195†	3,817	794
Nottingham	50,680	2,950	2,187	3,033	3,322	152
Oldham	50,513	1,128	1,131	..	848	165
Oxford	20,434	2,389	904	1,408	2,139	not settled
Pembroke, &c.	6,511	682	341	967	no contest	none
Penryn and Falmouth	3,521	796	875¶	..	717	72

* Scot and lot, 31; potwallopers, 480. † Old scot and lot voters.
‡ Including freemen. § Scot and lot; of these, 113 only were householders.
‖ Including freemen. ¶ Scot and lot voters.

	Population.	£10 Houses.	Registered £10. Houses.	Registered Freemen.	Polled last general election.	Expenses of the Returning Officer.
Peterborough	5,553	396	285	488*	no contest	none
Petersfield	5,892	305	234	..	205	£7
Plymouth	31,080	2,271	1,376	115	no contest	none†
Pontefract	9,305	519	418	538*	no contest	41
Poole	8,216	298	301	111	360	75
Portsmouth	50,389	463	1,280	15	983	88
Preston	33,871	1,277	826	5,526‡	5,538	444
Radnor, &c.	..	455	253	276	no contest	
Reading	15,595	1,050	1,001	..	..	
Reigate	3,397	276	152	..	101	8
Retford	2,491	..	2,174	138	1,980	150
Richmond	7,243	301	273	..	no contest	none
Ripon	5,735	403	299	42	330	145
Rochdale	41,308	1,014	687	..	632	72
Rochester	12,791	1,124	550	423	650	100
Rye and Winchelsea	8,538	328	382	40	290	38
Salford	50,810	1,244	1.497	..	1,220	158
Salisbury	9,876	627	539	37	531	133
Sandwich	12,183	796	487	429	847	54
Scarborough	8,760	508	429	3	385	65
Shaftesbury	8,698	145	296	338§	328	62
Sheffield	91,692	4,383	3,508	..	3.056	273
Shoreham	1,503	..	1,925‖	..	1,154	173
Shrewsbury	21,227	1,651	823	891	1,314	37
Southampton	19.324	1,284	1,403¶	..	1,046	83
South Shields	18,756	1,400	475	..	419	55
Southwark	134,117	9,923	4,775	..	2,810	441
Stafford	6,998	468	193	983	1,049	9
St. Albans	4,772	286	264	118 / 275§	637	109
St. Ives	7,115	302	130	454§	509	16
Stamford	7,062	460	851	..	766	206
Stockport	29,456	842**	1,012	..	955	229
Stoke-upon-Trent	52,090	1,450	1,349	..	1,245	160
Stroud	41,719	1,600	1,247	..	1,156	148
Sudbury	4,677	301	59	450	474	52
Sunderland	40,735	2,500	1,378	..	1,132	248
Swansea, &c.	13,256	1,200	826	481	no contest	
Tamworth	3,917	528	162	424*	no contest	
Tavistock	5,602	380	247	..	193	31
Taunton	11,139	848	588	361††	no contest	31
Tewksbury	5,780	262	295	91	364	51
Thetford	3,462	203	124	22	no contest	none
Thirsk	4,558	315	254	..	no contest	11
Tiverton	9,766	643	443	19	..	58
Totness	3,442	316	175	42	179	11
Tower Hamlets	367,854	23,187	9,906	..	7,320	617
Truro	11,417	237	388	17	386	209
Tynemouth&NShields	23,206	1,150	760	..	590	170
Wakefield	24,538	1,001	722	..	no contest	15
Wallingford	5,931	278††	287	166*	367	43

* Scot and lot voters. † The town clerk demands as his fee £150.
‡ Inhabitant voters. § Scot and lot voters.
‖ Including freeholders and scot and lot voters.
¶ £10 householders not distinguished. ** Township of Stockport only.
†† Potwallopers.

	Population.	£10 Houses.	Registered £10 Houses.	Registered Freemen.	Polled last general election.	Expenses of the Returning Officer.
Walsall	15,066	300	597	..	535	£75
Wareham	5,207	..	218	152* / 7	315	39
Warrington	18,184	973	456	..	379	39
Warwick	9,109	500	1,340‡	..	1,248	106
Wells	6.649	383	193	163	318	10
Wenlock	3,481	450	489	202	635	54
Westbury	7,324	318	185	..	no contest	none
Westminster	202,891	17,681	11,576‡	..	..	362
Weymouth	7,655	490	368	20 / 43†	..	34
Whitby	10,399	443	422	..	356	107
Whitehaven	15,716	863	458	..	384	31
Wigan	20,774	900	423	60	341	25
Wilton	9,758	299	197	17	no contest	41
Winchester	9,212	807	465	66	..	36
Windsor	5,650	778	507	..	461	4
Wolverhampton	67,514	2,405	1,700	..	1,463	155
Woodstock	7,026	373	241	76	no contest	none
Worcester	18,610	2,000	854	1,512	..	42
Wycombe, Chipping.	6,299	446	270	28	264	164
Yarmouth	21,115	1,113	643	1,040	1,555	198
York	25,359	2,141	531	2,342	2,655	555

In England 40 counties return 144 members, and previous to the election of 1832 had 344,564 registered electors. The cities and boroughs are 185; they return 327 members, and their registered electors up to the same date were 274,649. The total for England was thus 619,213 electors, and 471 representatives of counties and boroughs.

In Wales, 12 counties return 15 members, and their registered electors in 1832 were 25,815. The 14 districts of boroughs return 14 members, and their registered electors were 11,309.

In Scotland, 30 counties have 30 members, and their registered electors in 1832 were 33,114. Seventy-six cities and boroughs return 30 members, and their registered electors of the above date were 31,332. Total for Scotland, 53 representatives, and 64,447 electors.

In Ireland 32 counties have 64 members, and their registered electors in 1832 were 60,607. The cities and boroughs are 34; they return 41 members, and their registered electors are 31,545. Total for Ireland 105 members, and 92,152 electors, according to the registration of 1832.

The first remark that occurs is upon the proportion of the *town* to the *county* suffrage. In round numbers, the gross population of cities and boroughs of England and Scotland is half the population of counties; and the representation of cities and boroughs is about double the representation of counties. Wales gives an advantage to the counties; and the returns for Great Britain stand thus:—County population 10,446,241; Borough population 5,816,060. Members for counties, 189; members for boroughs, 364. So that the county population is two to one against the town, and the town representation two to one against the county.

In Ireland the case is different. The county representation exceeds the borough representation, but the county population is rated at 7,000,000, and the

* Scot and lot voters. † Freeholders. ‡ Scot and lot voters included.

borough at little more than 700,000. In Ireland the registered electors for counties in 1832 about doubled those for towns.

Taking Great Britain and Ireland together, the population of cities and boroughs is about one-third of the population of counties; the electors for counties are to the electors of towns about as four is to three—the numbers of the first being 403,494, of the latter 317,290; the number of members for counties is 253, the number of members for boroughs 405. According to the registration of 1832 the electors for the towns and counties of Great Britain and Ireland were altogether 812,936.

V.—QUESTIONS AND DIVISIONS IN THE TWO FIRST SESSIONS OF THE REFORMED PARLIAMENT.

QUESTIONS AND DIVISIONS DURING FIRST SESSION.*

A. D. 1833. *Jan.* 29. — First session of Reformed Parliament opened by Commission. C. M. Sutton re-elected Speaker by a large majority, in preference to E. J. Littleton proposed by Mr. Hume.

Division in favour of address in reply to King's Speech	A. 322 / N. 23
Hume's motion to reduce seamen from 27,000 to 20,000 and take £6910 from wages and food	A. 244 / N. 347
Hume's motion for discontinuing Naval and Military Sinecures	A. 138 / N. 232
Division on the first Irish Coercion Bill	A. 446 / N. 89
Robinson's motion to substitute a Property-tax for such as press heavily on productive industry	A. 157 / N. 228
Hume's clause to Mutiny Act, to abolish flogging, except in cases of mutiny or drunkenness (as suggested by sir F. Burdett)	A. 142 / N. 153
Grote's motion for Election by Ballot	A. 108 / N. 211
Attwood's, M. motion for inquiry into general distress, and the effects of our monetary system on the industrious classes	A. 139 / N. 331
Ingilby's, Sir W. motion to reduce Malt-Tax from 20s. 8d. to 10s.	A. 162 / N. 152
Ingilby's, Sir W. ditto, *versus* Lord Althorpe's Resolution, that a Property-Tax be substituted	A. 133 / N. 255
Key's, Sir J. motion to repeal the Window-Tax	A. 157 / N. 355
Amendment to 147th clause of Irish Church Reform-Bill, that Parliament may dispose of surplus money proceeding from sale of Bishops' Lands	A. 150 / N. 281
Agnew, Sir A.—Division on his first Sabbath Observance Bill	A. 73 / N. 79
Whitmore's motion to repeal Corn-Laws	A. 206 / N. 305
Harvey's, D. W. motion, that the Speaker publish Divisions of Parliament	A. 94 / N. 142

---

* With some trifling alterations the questions and divisions have been taken from the *Book of the Reformed Parliament*. They exhibit a synoptical view of the business brought before parliament, and the proportion of negative and affirmative opinions thereon. The tables of *Minorities* and *Majorities* on the more important divisions have been subjoined, and may be of use in the event of a general election.

Chandos's, Marquess, motion to consider Agriculture in any reduction of Taxation	A.	90
	N.	118
Hume's motion to reduce the number of the Army . .	A.	71
	N.	239
Irish Church Reform-Bill, Division on	A.	317
	N.	78
Hume's motion to reduce Yeomanry one-half . . .	A.	54
	N.	256
Gillon's, W. D. motion, that after demise of present Incumbents, the Revenues of of the Irish Established Church be appropriated to purposes of general utility	A.	18
	N.	126
Walley's, Sir S. S. B. motion for repeal of House and Window Tax	A.	124
	N.	273
Grant's, Right Hon. R. first Bill to remove Jewish Disabilities (lost in House of Lords)	A.	191
	N.	54
Lambert's, H. resolution, that ministers are pledged not to use powers of Irish Coercion Bill in collecting tithes	A.	47
	N.	197
Fryer's, R.C. motion for leave to alter and amend Corn Laws	A.	49
	N.	75
Evans's, Lieut.-col. motion to repeal that part of Reform Bill, which requires payment of rates and taxes before registration . . .	A.	26
	N.	84
Brougham, W.— Division by which his first General Register of Deeds' Bill was lost	A.	69
	N.	82
Hay's, Sir J. amendment on Scotch Burgh Reform Bill, that £5 be the qualification to vote, instead of £10 . .	A.	53
	N.	54
Finch's, G. motion for the suppression of political unions	A.	10
	N.	78
Torrens's, Col. motion to postpone consideration of Bank Charter	A.	83
	N.	316
Buckingham's, J. motion for inquiry into practicability of reducing National Debt	A.	40
	N.	59
Gillon's, W. D. amendment to Scotch Burgh Police Bill, that Hamilton Palace, being in the township, is liable to burthens for support of police	A.	25
	N.	42
Motion for inquiry into bribery and corruption at Liverpool election	A.	168
	N.	86
Attwood's, M. motion to inquire what would be a fit compensation to Bank of England for managing public business	A.	88
	N.	176
Ashley's, Lord, motion for proceeding with Factory Bill	A.	164
	N.	141
Gillon's, W. D. amendment on third reading of Scotch Burgh Reform Bill, that £5 householders may vote	A.	38
	N.	102
Shiel's, R. L. amendment, that the property of Irish Established Church is public property	A.	88
	N.	177
Fergusson's, R. C. motion to address the King on behalf of Poland, its present state being a breach of treaty of Vienna, to which England was a party	A.	97
	N.	179
Ruthven's motion to diminish public burthens, and abolish unmerited sinecures, as the only means to relieve the country	A.	90
	N.	81
Division on clause in Bill for appointing two additional bishops for India	A.	86
	N.	48
Hume's amendment, that Englishmen may settle without license in E. I. Company's territories	A.	21
	N.	111
Hay's, Col. clause to India Bill, that legislature sanction the branch of Scotch Church in East Indies . .	A.	63
	N.	35
Motion to add to 94th clause of India Bill, that governor-general, &c., may aid Dissenters with grants of money, as well as Church of England	A.	94
	N.	10

Lennard's, T. B. motion to restore clause in Bill allowing tenants to kill game on land they occupy . . .	A. 29	N. 43
Hume's motion to postpone grant of £20,000 for building schools in England, till inquiry be made, if there are not ample charity funds	A. 28	N. 73
Howick's, Lord, amendment to Slavery Abolition Bill, that no apprenticed labourers be flogged unless convicted of mutiny, &c. .	A. 75	N. 13
Buxton's, T. F. motion to reserve half the grant of 20 millions till expiration of slaves' apprenticeship, as a check	A. 94	N. 145
Buxton's, T. F. abandoned motion, taken up by D. O'Connell, that apprenticed labourers be paid wages	A. 42	N. 324
Buxton's, T. F. motion, that apprenticed slaves be subject to no more restraint than is necessary for their own and public good . .	A. 153	N. 160
Division on clause allowing 20 millions to compensate slave proprietors	A. 133	N. 52
Jew's Civil Disabilities Bill passed	A. 189	N. 52
Tennyson's, Right Hon. C. first motion for shortening duration of Parliaments .	A. 166	N. 215
Division on Bill for granting Irish Clergy, &c. a million in lieu of arrears of tithes .	A. 111	N. 54
Hume's motion, that any balance due to the nation of the million granted to Irish Clergy, &c. in lieu of tithe, be charged on Irish Church temporalities	A. 29	N. 69
Division by which first Labour Rate, or Bill to enable parishes to provide employment for pauper labourers, was lost	A. 19	N. 81
Grote's, G. motion for reducing duty on currants, from 44s. 8d. to 8s. per cwt.	A. 55	N. 69
Division on the grant of £60,000 towards support of Metropolitan Police . . .	A. 49	N. 20
Buckingham's, J. S. first motion for manning British navy without impressment	A. 56	N. 61
Torrens's, Col. motion to limit Bank Charter to five instead of ten years' duration	A. 48	N. 123

QUESTIONS AND DIVISIONS DURING SECOND SESSION.

Feb. 4, 1834. Hume's amendment to the address that the church and its temporalities be considered in reference to its affecting the Dissenters	A. 41	N. 193
O'Connell, D.'s, amendment to ditto, that the paragraph be omitted relating to repeal of the union with Ireland .	A. 25	N. 191
O'Connell's, D. motion for inquiry into charges against Mr. Sheil	A. 192	N. 54
O'Connell's, D. motion for inquiry into Baron Smith's conduct in the capacity of judge	A. 169	N. 76
Knatchbull's, Sir E. motion to rescind order obtained by D. O'Connell, for inquiry on Baron Smith . .	A. 161	N. 155
Ruthven's motion for reducing salary of first Lord of the Admiralty, and abolition of the offices of two Lords of ditto	A. 30	N. 162
Harvey's, D. W. motion for inquiry into each grant of the pension list	A. 184	N. 192
Grattan's H. amendment that a land-tax be not substituted for tithe in Ireland	A. 22	N. 219

Cobbett's motion that the malt-duty cease	A. 61 N. 162
Chandos', Marquess, second motion, that agriculture be considered in any reduction of taxation	A. 202 N. 206
Pryme's, G. motion to inquire if land have been allotted, in every Enclosure-Bill, to be let to the poor at reduced rents . , . .	A. 31 N. 136
O'Dwyer's, A. C. motion to inquire into the jury-panel which tried *King* v. *Barrett* (and convicted the defendant of libel, as the publisher of the famous letter attributed to Daniel O'Connell)	A. 32 N. 130
Division on Liverpool Disfranchisement-Bill . . .	A. 192 N. 40
Ingilby's, Sir W. motion to inquire what reduction can be made in the malt-tax .	A. 172 N. 273
Hume's motion to reduce the army 9,000	A. 46 N. 282
Hume's motion to reduce general staff of army at home, to annual amount of £8,870; as recommended by Sir H. Parnell when in office.	A. 60 N. 244
Buckingham's J. S. second motion for inquiry, with a view to abolish impressment	A. 132 N. 220
Wigney's, J. M. motion for remitting sentence of editor of *Brighton Guardian*, convicted of a libel on Surrey magistrates. (A similar motion was made by F. O'Connor, on behalf of the editor of the *True Sun*, confined in the King's Bench Prison for a libel. . . .	A. 27 N. 58
Hume's motion for inquiry into Corn Laws, with a view to a fixed duty in lieu of a graduated scale . . .	A. 157 N. 312
Hume's motion to withdraw vote of £82,170, for support of yeomanry and volunteers, leaving the public to arm for the protection of their homes	A. 54 N. 136
Agnew's, Sir A. motion for bill to change Monday and Saturday fairs and markets to other days	A. 137 N. 181
Rippon's, C. motion to relieve the bishops from their legislative duties in the House of Lords	A. 60 N. 127
Fancourt's, Major, motion for the abolition of flogging in the army	A. 94 N. 227
Peel's, Sir R. amendment to Hertford Disfranchisement Bill, that only those be included proved guilty of bribery. (Similar motions were made, with a like result, by Mr. Bethell, in favour of the freemen of Liverpool, and by Mr. Halcomb, on behalf of the Stafford freemen, not guilty of bribery	A. 44 N. 79
Williams's, Col. motion to address the king, that Dissenters may be admitted at Oxford and Cambridge without being liable to subscribe to the 39 Articles .	A. 187 N. 46
Hume's amendment to Church Rates' Bill, that the land-tax be not charged with £250,000 per annum, in lieu of the church rates, till it is shown the church funds are insufficient to meet the expense. . . .	A. 141 N. 257
Evans', Col. amendment to Hertford Disfranchisement Bill, that the votes be taken by ballot	A. 88 N. 192
O'Connell's, D. motion for the Repeal of the Union with Ireland	A. 40 N. 525
Agnew, Sir A.—division by which his second Bill for better Observance of the Sabbath was lost	A. 125 N. 161
Grant's, Right Hon. R. motion for leave to bring in his second Bill for Removing Jewish Disabilities. (Subsequently passed in the Commons, but thrown out in the Lords)	A. 55 N. 11

Harvey's, D. W. motion to address the king for inquiry into Pension List, that none may receive public money but for useful services, discoveries, or attainments in arts or literature	A. 150 N. 392
Strutt's amendment to Harvey's motion, for a Committee to inquire into the nature and extent of abuses in granting Pensions . .	A. 232 N. 313
Davies', Col. amendment, that pensions of £1,000 per annum to officers of state commence after five instead of two years' service, and that a service of ten years entitles them to a pension of £2,000 per annum . . .	A. 35 N. 93
Hardy's, J. Bill, to repeal 52d Geo. III. imposing penalties on religious assemblies of more than twenty persons, meeting for public worship in private unlicensed houses with closed doors	A. 38 N. 13
Division which rejected Christchurch, Surrey, Rectory Bill, for fixing an annual payment in lieu of annual parish gratuity . .	A. 35 N. 76
Brougham, W. — Division which threw out his second General Register of Deeds Bill	A. 45 N. 161
Tennyson's, Right Hon. C. second motion for leave to bring in a bill to shorten the duration of Parliament	A. 187 N. 237
Bulwer's, E. G. E. L. motion to repeal stamp duty on newspapers	A. 60 N. 92
Division on second reading of Irish Tithe Bill, by which it was proposed to secure to the Irish clergy, on the faith of the goverment, three parts of the value of their tithes, the fourth part to be deducted for expense of collecting them, &c. (Subsequently thrown out in the Lords)	A. 250 N. 54
O'Connell's, D. motion for the immediate conversion into a rent-charge upon the land of Ireland, and for securing to the occupying tenantry, the abatement of 40 per cent. proposed to be given by the Irish Tithe Bill to the Irish landlords.	A. 82 N. 33
O'Connell's, D. motion, that the surplus of Irish tithes be appropriated to purposes of utility and charity . .	A. 101 N. 362
Ward's, G. H. motion, that Parliament may dispose of surplus revenues of church of Ireland	A. 122 N. 398
Hume's amendment to Irish Tithe Bill, that holders of tithe be paid with surplus revenues of Irish church, instead of granting money from the Consolidated Fund for that purpose	A. 73 N. 356
Buckingham's, J. S. motion for inquiry into the causes of drunkenness	A. 66 N. 49
Burrell's, Sir C.—Division which threw out his Labour-Rate, or Bill for enabling Parishes to employ Pauper Labourers . . .	A. 38 N. 82
Jervis', J. amendment to 53d clause of Poor Law Bill, that landlords do not vote by proxy	A. 31 N. 126
Torrens', Col. amendment to Poor Law Bill, that absentee-owners give but one vote (by Proxy), the same as rate-payers, and not six votes, as contemplated by the bill. (This was subsequently taken up by lord Wynford, whose amendment to the 38th clause passed the Lords without a division, that where the owner had six votes in the election of guardians, the occupier should have three votes)	A. 36 N. 129

Young's, G. F. motion to repeal Huskisson's Free Trade, or Reciprocity Act	A. 52	N. 117
Division on passing Poor Law Bill	A. 189	N. 52
O'Connell's, D. motion to examine into the evidence on which a renewal of the Coercion Bill is demanded	A. 73	N. 157
Division on second reading Irish Coercion Bill	A. 89	N. 34
O'Connell's, D. motion to omit 28th and 31st clauses of Irish Coercion Bill, as tending to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act	A. 36	N. 173
Ward's, G. H. motion for providing means to secure accurate divisions of the House, &c.	A. 76	N. 32
Wood, G. W.—Division on third reading of his Bill (subsequently lost in the Lords), for enabling Dissenters to graduate at Oxford and Cambridge	A. 166	N. 77
Division on third reading of bill for reducing salary of Speaker and Officers of the House of Commons (the present Speaker to be excepted from the operation of the Bill), and to abolish certain sinecure offices	A. 39	N. 24
Wood's, G. W. clause to Beer Bill, on third reading, not to license houses under £10 value, in cities and towns containing 3000 inhabitants	A. 37	N. 26
Hume's motion, that the Lords' amendment to Beer Bill (providing that constables may pay domiciliary visits to beer-houses at all hours of the night), be rejected	A. 14	N. 31
Russell's, Lord J. motion, that the writ for Warwick be suspended till 20th Feb. 1835. (The bill for disfranchising that place, passed by the Commons, having been rejected by the Lords for want of sufficient evidence)	A. 69	N. 20

VI.—LISTS OF MAJORITIES AND MINORITIES

DURING THE SESSION OF 1833.

1. THE BALLOT.

On the 25th of April, Mr. Grote moved "That all elections of members to serve in Parliament should in future be by ballot."

For the motion 108
Against it ..... 211 } tellers included.

Total in the House 319

MINORITY.

England.

Adams, E. H.
Aglionby, H. A.
Astley, sir J.
Attwood, T.
Barnett, C. J.
Bayntun, capt. S. A.
Beauclerk, major
Berkeley, G. C. F.
Berkeley, C.
Barnard, E.
Biddulph, R.
Bish, T.
Blandford, marq. of
Brotherton, J.
Buckingham, J. S.
Buller, C.
Bulwer, E. L.
Chichester, J. P. B.
Clay, W.
Cobbett, W.
Divett, E.
Dundas, J. C.
Dykes, F. L.
Ellis, W.
Evans, W.
Ewart, W.
Faithful, G.
Fellowes, H. A. W.
Fellowes, N.
Fenton, J.
Ferguson, sir R.
Fielden, J.
Fitzroy, lord J.
Fryer, R.
Gaskell, D.
Guest, J. J.
Gully, J.
Hall, B.
Hardy, J.
Hawkins, J. H.
Hill, M. D.
Hodges, T. L.
Hornby, E. G.
Hume, J.
Humphery, J.
Hutt, W.
Ingilby, sir W. A.
Kemp, T. R.
Key, sir J.
King, E. B.
Lambton, H.

Lamont, capt. N.	Romilly, J.	Tynte, C. J. K.	Fitzsimon, N.
Lister, C.	Romilly, E.	Thompson, ald. W.	Grattan, H.
Lloyd, J. H.	Scholefield, J.	Wigney, I. N.	Lalor, P.
Lushington, Dr. S.	Simeon, sir R. G.	Wood, ald. M.	Maclachlan, L.
Molesworth, sir W.	Stanley, H. T.	Walker, R.	O'Connell, D.
Marshall, J.	Staveley, J. K.	*Scotland.*	O'Connell, C.
Moreton, H. G.	Strickland, G.	Gillon, W. D.	O'Connell, M.
Palmer, general	Strutt, E.	Maxwell, sir J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.
Parrott, J.	Tancred, H. W.	Parnell, sir H.	Roche, W.
Pease, J.	Tayleur, W.	*Ireland.*	Roe, J.
Philips, M.	Tennyson, C.	Bellew, R. M.	Ruthven, E. S.
Potter, R.	Thicknesse, R.	Chapman, M. L.	Ruthven, E.
Penleaze, J. S.	Tooke, W.	Evans, G.	Vigors, N. A.
Ricardo, D.	Torrens, col. R.	Finn, W. F.	Tellers.
Rider, T.	Trelawney, W. L.	Fitzgerald, T.	Grote, G.
Rippon, C.	Turner, W.	Fitzsimon, C.	Warburton, H.

MAJORITY.

England.	Dick, Q.	Hope, H. F.	Patten, J. W.
Althorp, lord	Dillwyn, L. W.	Hyett, W. H.	Peel, sir R.
Apsley, lord	Dugdale, W. S.	Ingham, R.	Pelham, C. A. G.
Ashley, lord	Dundas, sir R.	Jermyn, earl	Pendarves, E. W.
Astley, sir J.	Ebrington, viscount	Jervis, J.	Peter, W.
Bankes, W. J.	Egerton, W. T.	Johnstone, sir J. V.	Phillips, sir R.
Baring, F. T.	Fancourt, major	Johnstone, sir F. G.	Philips, sir G.
Baring, F.	Fenton, capt. L.	Jolliffe, col. H.	Pigot, R.
Baring, H. B.	Folkes, sir W.	Kerrison, sir E.	Pinney, W.
Bell, M.	Fordwich, viscount	Kerry, earl of	Plumptre, J. W.
Benett, J.	Forester, G. C.	Labouchere, H.	Ponsonby, W. F. S.
Bentinck, lord G.	Forster, C. S.	Langston, J. H.	Price, R.
Bethell, R.	Fox, S. L.	Lee, J. L. H.	Pryme, G.
Bewes, T.	Gaskell, J. M.	Lemon, sir C.	Ramsbottom, J.
Blackstone, W. S.	Gladstone, W. E.	Lennard, T. B.	Rickford, W.
Blake, sir F.	Gordon, R.	Lennard, sir T. B.	Ridley, sir M. W.
Briggs, R.	Gore, M.	Lennox, lord W.	Ramsden, J. C.
Brocklehurst, J.	Goring, H. D.	Lennox, lord G.	Rolfe, R. M.
Brodie, W. B.	Graham, sir J. R.	Lennox, lord A.	Ross, C.
Bruce, lord E.	Grant, R.	Lincoln, earl of	Rotch, B.
Bulkeley, sir R. W.	Greville, sir C.	Lopes, sir R.	Rumbold, C. E.
Buller, J. W.	Grey, col.	Lumley, viscount	Russell, lord J.
Bulteel, J. C.	Grimston, viscount	Lygon, col. H. B.	Russell, C.
Burdett, sir F.	Grosvenor, lord R.	Lyall, G.	Sandon, viscount
Burrell, sir C.	Guise, sir B. W.	Maberley, col.	Sanford, E. A.
Byng, G.	Hughes, H.	Madocks, J.	Sebright, sir J.
Calvert, N.	Halford, H.	Mangles, J.	Shawe, R. N.
Carter, J. B.	Handley, H.	Martin, J.	Shaw, sir F.
Cavendish, lord	Harcourt, G. V.	Mildmay, P. St. J.	Skipwith, sir G.
Cavendish, col.	Harland, W. C.	Miller, W. H.	Slaney, R. A.
Cayley, sir G.	Hawes, B.	Milton, lord	Smith, J. A.
Cayley, E. S.	Heathcote, J. J.	Molyneux, lord	Smith, R. V.
Chaplin, col. T.	Heathcote, G. J.	Moreton, A. H.	Somerset, lord G.
Chaytor, sir W.	Heuniker, lord	Morpeth, viscount	Spankie, serjeant
Clive, E. B.	Herbert, S.	Nicholl, J.	Stanley, E.
Clive, R. H.	Hobhouse, sir J. C.	Norreys, lord	Stanley, E. J.
Collier, J.	Hodgson, J.	North, F.	Staunton, sir G. T.
Crawley, S.	Horne, sir W.	Paget, F.	Stewart, J.
Curteis, capt. E. B.	Howard, P. H.	Palmer, C. F.	Stewart, P. M.
Dare, R. W. H.	Howick, viscount	Parker, J.	Talbot, C. R. M.
Darlington, earl of	Halcomb, J.	Parker, sir H.	Talbot, W. H. F.

Throckmorton, R.G.
Todd, R.
Tower, C. T.
Townshend, lord C.
Trevor, H.
Verney, sir H.
Vernon, G. J.
Vyvyan, sir R.
Walsh, sir J. B.
Walter, J.
Waterpark, lord
Welby, G. E.
Whitmore, W. W.
Wilbraham, G.
Williams, W. A.
Williams, T. P.
Williams, R.
Willoughby, sir H.
Wood, C.
Wrottesley, sir J.
Wynn, C. W.
Yorke, capt. C. P.
Young, G. F.

Scotland.

Agnew, sir A.
Bannerman, A.
Dalmeny, lord
Dalrymple, sir J. H.
Dunlop, capt. J.
Elliott, capt. G.
Ewing, J.
Ferguson, R.
Hay, col. A. L.
Jeffrey, F.
Johnston, A.
Loch, J.
Mackenzie, J. A. S.
Macleod, R.
Murray, J. A.
Ormelie, earl of
Oswald, J.
Ross, H.
Traill, G.
Wemyss, capt. J.

Ireland.

Acheson, viscount
Christmas, J. N.
Cole, lord
Cole, A.
Conolly, col. E. M.
Hayes, sir. E.
Jones, capt. T.
Lamb, G.
Macnamara, maj. W.
Macnamara, F.
Martin, J.
Martin, J.
Stawell, colonel
Young, J.

ABSENT.

England.

Andover, lord
Anson, sir G.
Anson, G.
Atherley, A.
Attwood, M.
Baillie, J. E.
Baring, A.
Beaumont, T. W.
Bernal, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Blake, sir F.
Blamire, W.
Blunt, sir C. R.
Bolling, W.
Boss, J. G.
Bowes, J.
Brodie, W. B.
Brougham, J.
Brudenell, lord
Burton, H.
Buxton, T. F.
Calcraft, J.
Calley, T.
Campbell, sir J.
Cartwright, W. R.
Chapman, A.
Chaytor, W. R. C.
Chetwynd, capt. W F
Childers, J. W.
Clayton, col. W.
Clive, viscount
Cockerell, sir C.
Codrington, sir E.
Cookes, T. H.
Cooper, A. H.
Cornish, J.
Cootes, J.
Cripps, J.
Crompton, J.
Curteis, H. B.
Dashwood, G. H.
Davenport, J.
Denison, J. E.
Donkin, sir R. S.
Duffield, T.
Duncannon, visc.
Duncombe, W.
Eastnor, viscount
Ellice, E. R.
Estcourt, T. G. B.
Etwall, R.
Fazakerley, J. N.
Feilden, W.
Finch, G.
Fitzroy, lord C.
Fleetwood, P. H.
Foley, J. H.
Foley, E. T.
Fort, J.
Frankland, sir R.
Fremantle, sir T.
Gisborne, T.
Glynne, sir S. R.
Greene, T.
Godson, R.
Goulburn, H.
Gronow, capt. R. H.
Grosvenor, earl
Halse, J.
Handley, W. F.
Hanmer, col. H.
Harvey, D. W.
Heathcote, sir G.
Heron, sir R.
Herries, J. C.
Hill, sir R.
Hoskins, K.
Hotham, lord
Howard, F. G.
Hudson, T.
Hurst, R. H.
Irton, J.
Ingestrie, viscount
Inglis, sir R. H.
James, W.
Jerningham, H. V. S.
Keppel, major G.
Leech, J.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lester, B. L.
Lewis, T. F.
Littleton, E. J.
Locke, W.
Lowther, viscount
Lowther, col. H.
Macaulay, T. B.
Manners, lord R.
Marryat, J.
Marsland, T.
Maxfield, capt.
Mills, J.
Mosley, sir O.
Mostyn, E. M. L.
Nanney, major
Neale, sir H. B.
Neeld, J.
Newark, viscount
Noel, sir G.
Owen, H. O.
Owen, sir J.
Palmerston, visc.
Pechell, sir S. J. B.
Peel, col. J.
Penruddocke, J. H.
Pepys, C.
Petre, E.
Phillips, C. M.
Pollock, F.
Poulter, J.
Powell, col. W. E.
Poyntz, W. S.
Pryse, P.
Reid, sir J. R.
Richards, J.
Robarts, A. W.
Robinson, G. R.
Rooper, J. B.
Russell, lord
Russell, lord C. J. F.
Russell, W. C.
Ryle, J.
Sanderson, R.
Scarlett, sir J.
Scott, J. W.
Scott, sir E. D.
Sheppard, T.
Smith, J.
Smith, R. S.
Smith, T. A.
Spencer, capt. F.
Spry, S. T.
Stanley, E. G. S.
Stormont, viscount
Stuart, lord D.
Stuart, W.
Surrey, earl of
Talmash, A. G.
Tapps, G. W.
Taylor, M. A.
Thompson, P. B.
Thomson, C. P.
Townley, R. G.
Tracy, C. H.
Troubridge, sir E. T.
Tullamore, lord
Tyrell, sir J. T.
Tyrell, C.
Vaughan, sir R.
Vernon, G. H.
Villiers, viscount
Vivian, sir H.
Vivian, J. H.
Wilks, J.
Williams, col. G.
Williamson, sir H.
Wilmot, sir J. E.
Winnington, sir T.

Wood, G. W.	Grant, col. F. W.	Browne, D.	Lefroy, Dr. T.
Wood, col. T.	Hallyburton, D. G.	Butler, P.	Lefroy, A.
Wall, C. B.	Hay, sir J.	Callaghan, D.	Maxwell, J.
Ward, H. G.	Hope, sir A.	Carew, R. S.	Meynell, capt. H.
Watkins, J. L.	Kennedy, T. F.	Castlereagh, lord	Mullins, F. W.
Wason, R.	Marjoribanks, C.	Chichester, lord A.	Nagle, sir R.
Watson, R.	Maxwell, J.	Clements, viscount	O'Brien, C.
Wedgwood, J.	Oliphant, L.	Cooper, E. J.	O'Callaghan, C.
Whitbread, W. H.	Oswald, R. A.	Coote, sir C. H.	O'Connor, F.
Whitmore, T. C	Pringle, R.	Corry, H. L.	O'Ferrall, R. M.
Wyndham, W.	Steuart, R.	Daly, J.	O'Grady, col. S.
Wynn, sir W. W.	Stewart, E.	Dobbin, L.	O'Neill, general J.
Whalley, sir S. B.	Stewart, sir M. S.	Don, O'Conor	O'Reilly, W.
Yelverton, W. H.	Stuart, capt. C.	Ferguson, sir R. A.	Oxmantown, lord
Scotland.	Wallace, R.	Fitzgibbon, R.	Perceval, col.
Abercromby, J.	*Ireland.*	French, F.	Perrin, L.
Adam, admiral C.	Archdall, general M.	Forbes, viscount	Roche, D.
Balfour, J.	Baldwin, Dr. H.	Galwey, J. M.	Ronayne, D.
Callender, J. H.	Barry, G. S.	Gladstone, T.	Shaw, F.
Colquhoun, J. C.	Bateson, sir R.	Grattan, J.	Sheil, E. L.
Fergusson, R. C.	Belfast, earl of	Hill, lord A.	Stewart, sir H.
Fleming, admiral C.	Bernard, W. S.	Howard, R. A.	Sullivan, R.
Gordon, capt. W.	Blaney, capt. C.	Keane, sir R.	Talbot, J.
Grant, C.	Browne, J. D.	Knox, col. J. J.	White, S.

PAIRED OFF.

FOR.		AGAINST.	
Dawson, E.	Seale, col.	Grey, sir G.	Heneage, G. F.
Phillpotts, J.	Langton, col. G.	Hill, lord M.	Weyland, major
Talbot, J. H.	Methuen, P.	Tynte, C.	Palmer, R.
Walker, C.	Ord, W.	Hanmer, sir J.	Ossulston, lord
Lambert, H.	Handley, B.	Ferguson, G.	Knatchbull, sir E.
Langdale, C.	Roebuck, J. A.	Arbuthnot, general	Rice, T. S.
Sharpe, general	O'Connell, Maurice	Johnstone, J. J. H.	Dundas, capt.
Lynch, A. H.	Barron, W.	Warre, J. A.	Hardinge, sir H.
O'Connell, J.	Brigstock, W. P.	Byng, sir J.	Verner, col.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Bulwer, H. L.	Houldsworth, T.	Fox, col.
Jephson, C. D. O.	Davies, col.	Brougham, W.	Windham, W. H.
Sinclair, G.	Morrison, J.	Mandeville, visc.	Marjoribanks, S.
Vincent, sir F.	Tennant, J. E.	Price, sir R.	

2.— MILITARY AND NAVAL SINECURES.

Minority, Feb. 14, on Mr. Hume's Motion respecting the Abolition of Military and Naval Sinecures.

England.	Hodges, T. L.	Ricardo, D.	Beauclerk, major
Tooke, W.	Lester, B. L.	Ingilby, sir W.	Wood, alderman
Hawes, B.	Berkeley, hon. G.	Tancred, H. W.	Wilks, J.
Phillpotts, J.	Fancourt, major	Godson, R.	Strutt, E.
Vincent, sir F.	Evans, W.	Guest, J. J.	Romilly, W.
Key, sir J.	Gaskell, D.	Bulwer, E. L.	Roebuck, J. A.
Fryer, R.	Tennyson, rt. hon.	Bulwer, H. L.	Humphery, J.
Gisborne, T.	Hall, B.	Cobbett, W.	Hill, M. D.
Thicknesse, R.	Goring, C. D.	Grote, G.	Hutt, W.
Palmer, gen.	Plumptree, J. P.	Warburton, H.	Molesworth, sir W.
Pryme, G.	Dawson, E.	Davies, colonel	Lennox, lord W.
Clay, W.	Phillips, C. M.	Buller, C.	Attwood, T.
Martin, J.	King, E. B.	Harvey, D. W.	Marsland, T.

Bowes, J.
Potter, R.
Philips, M.
Brotherton, W. J.
Bolling, W.
Astley, Sir J.
Simeon, sir R.
Buckingham, J. S.
Briggs, R.
Bayntun, S. A.
Parrot, J.
Aglionby, H. A.
Wigney, I. N.
Curteis, H. B.
Turner, W.
Fielden, W.
Gully, J.
Townley, R. G.
Dykes, F. L. B.
Shawe, R. N.
Jarvis, J.
Divett, E.
Willoughby, sir H.
Romilly, E.
Evans, W.
Ewart, W.
Ord, W. H.
Hawkins, K. H.
Trelawney, W.L.S.
Spry, S. T.
Hodgson, J.
Fellowes, N.
Fielden, J.
Fellowes, H A.W.
Vernon, G. H.
Walker, R.
Etwall, R.
Cayley, E.
Langdale, C.
Brodie, W. B.
Buller, E.
Mosley, sir O.
Fenton, J.
Harland, W. C.
Williams, colonel
Ellis, W.
Herries, J. C.

Scotland.

Dalmeny, lord
Gillon, W. D.
Kinloch, G.
Oswald, J.
Oswald, R.
Pringle, R.
Wallace, R.
Wemyss. J.

Ireland.

O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, C.
O'Connell, J.
O'Connell, M.
O'Connell, M.
Ruthven, E. S.
Ruthven, E.
Fitzsimon, C.
Fitzsimon, N.
Grattan, J.
Grattan, H.
Roche, D.
Roche, W.
Finn, W. F.
Butler, colonel
Sullivan, R.
Shiel, R. L.
O'Connor, F.
Barry, G. S.
Dant, J. O'Neale
Nagle, Sir R.
O'Brien, C.
Baldwin, Dr.
M'Lachlan, L.
Lynch, A. H.
Roe, J.
French, F.
Lalor, R.
Rorke, J. H.
Bellew, R. M.
Fitzgeral, T.
O'Ferrall, R. M.
Vigors, N.
Wallace, T.

3.—BISHOPS IN THE EAST INDIES.

Majority of 86 (Tellers included) who, on the 19th of July, in the Committee on the East India Bill, voted for two additional Bishops for India.

England.

Adams, E. H.
Althorp, lord
Baring, F.
Barnard, E. G.
Buxton, T. F.
Bouverie, capt.
Cavendish, lord
Collier, J.
Crawley, S.
Divett, E.
Ebrington, visc.
Estcourt, T. G. B.
Fancourt, major
Feilden, W.
Finch, G.
Forster, C. S.
Goring, H. D.
Graham, sir J.
Grant, right hon. R.
Grey, colonel
Grey, sir G.
Grosvenor, lord R.
Hughes, H.
Howard, hon. F. G.
Halcomb, J.
Ingham, R.
Inglis, sir R.
Jermyn, earl
Kerry, earl of
Lamont, captain
Leech, J.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lyall, G.
Macaulay, T. B.
Morpeth, viscount
Mosley, sir O.
Mostyn, hon. E. M. L.
Palmer, R.
Parker, J.
Parker, sir H.
Pendarves, E. W.
Peter, W.
Petre, Hon. E.
Phillpotts, J.
Plumptre, J. P.
Pryme, G.
Ridley, sir M. W.
Rooper, J. B.
Russell, lord J.
Scrope, P.
Scott, sir E. D.
Shepherd, T.
Stanley, E.
Strickland, G.
Tancred, H.
Todd, R.
Tracy, C. H.
Troubridge, sir E.
Wilbraham, G.
Williamson, sir H.
Winnington, sir T.
Wood, C.
Ward, H. G.
Wynn, right hon. C.

Scotland.

Bruce, C. L.
Bannerman, A.
Dalmeny, lord
Ewing, J.
Ferguson, captain
Fergusson, R. C.
Grant, right hon. C.
Johnston, A.
Mackenzie, J. A.
Macleod, R.
Maxwell, sir J.
Maxwell, J.
Sharpe, general

Ireland.

Coote, sir C.
Hill, lord M.
Jephson, C. D. O.
Lefroy, Dr.
Macnamara, —

4.—WEST INDIA SLAVE QUESTION.

Minority of 94 (tellers included) who on the 31st of July voted for Mr. Buxton's motion, "That one-half of the £20,000,000 should be reserved till the apprenticeship shall have expired."

For the motion	94	In the house.
Against it	149	239.
Majority against it	51	

England.	Fenton, J.	Palmer, R.	Wilks, J.
Aglionby, H. A.	Forrester, G. C. W.	Pease, J.	Williams, colonel
Attwood, T.	Gaskell, D.	Penleaze, T. F.	Winnington, sir T.
Bewes, T.	Grote, G.	Philips, M.	Winnington, capt.
Berkeley, hon. C. F.	Handley, major	Petre, hon. E.	*Scotland.*
Bish, T.	Handley, H.	Potter, R.	Agnew, sir A.
Blake, sir F.	Handley, W. F.	Poulter, J.	Johnston, A.
Bouverie, captain	Harland, W. C.	Pryse, P.	*Ireland.*
Briggs, R.	Hawkins, J. H.	Romilly, J.	Blake, M.
Briscoe, J. I.	Howard, hn. G. F.	Romilly, E.	Evans, G.
Brocklehurst, J.	Howick, lord	Sanford, E. L.	Finn, W. F.
Brotherton, J.	Hudson, T.	Scrope, P.	Mullins, F. W.
Brougham, J.	Hutt, W.	Strutt, E.	O'Connell, D.
Bulwer, E. L.	Ingilby, sir W.	Tayleur, W.	O'Connell, M.
Cayley, sir G.	Jerningham, H. V. S.	Thicknesse, R.	O' Connell, J.
Cayley, E. S.	Lambton, H.	Tooke, W.	O'Dwyer, A. C.
Chandos, marq. of	Lamont, captain	Torrens, colonel	O'Reilly, W.
Clay, W.	Langdale, hon. C.	Trelawny, W.	Ruthven, E. S.
Curteis, H. B.	Lushington, Dr.	Turner, W.	Ruthven, E.
Curties, captain	Marjoribanks, S.	Tynte, C. J. K.	Sullivan, R.
Dashwood, G. H.	Marsland, T.	Vernon, G. J.	Vigors, N. A.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Martin, J.	Wason, R.	Grattan, J.
Evans, W.	Methuen, P.	Whalley, sir S.	Teller.
Ewart, W.	Morrison, J.	Wigney, J. N.	Buxton, T. F.
Faithfull, G.	Ord, W. H.		

PAIRED OFF.

FOR.	AGAINST.
Parrott, J.	Russell, lord J.
Seale, W.	Codrington, sir E.

Minority of 52 (teller included) who voted against filling up the blank in the 25th clause with the sum of £20,000,000.

Against	52	In the house
For	133	185.
Majority . .	81	

England.	Ewart, W.	Hutt, W.	Philips, M.
Aglionby, H. A.	Faithfull, G.	Ingilby, sir W.	Potter, R.
Bish, T.	Fenton, J.	Knatchbull, E.	Roebuck, A.
Blamire, W.	Gaskell, J.	Langton, G.	Romi ly, J.
Bruce, lord E.	Handley, major	Marshall, J.	Stewart, –
Briggs, M.	Handley H.	Marsland, T.	Strutt, E.
Chandos, lord	Hall, B.	Methuen, P.	Thicknesse, R.
Cobbett, W.	Harland, W. C.	Norris, lord	Todd, J. R.
Cornish, J.	Hawkins, J. H.	Parrott, J.	Torrens, colonel
Dillwyn, L. W.	Hudson, T.	Pease, J.	Turner, W.

Trelawny, W. L. S.	Wilmot, sir E.	O'Connell, M.	Sullivan, R.
Tynte, C. J. K.	Wigney, J. N.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Teller.
Wason, R.	*Ireland.*	Ruthven, E. S.	Briscoe, J. I.
Whalley, sir S.	O'Connell, D.	Ruthven, E.	

PAIRED OFF.

AGAINST.	FOR.
Walker, R.	Whitbread, W. H.
O'Connell, J,	Watson, hon R.
Mills, J.	Villiers, lord
Evans, colonel	Howard, H. P.
Seale, colonel	Codrington, sir E.

5.—AGRICULTURE.

Minority of 90 who voted, April 26th, in favour of lord Chandos's resolution, "That in any reduction of taxation which may be considered expedient, it is necessary that the interests of the agricultural portion of the community should be duly considered."

Aglionby, H. A.	Fancourt, major	Lygon, hon. col.	Smith, T. A.
Arbuthnot, hon. H.	Ferguson, capt. G.	Manners, lord R.	Somerset, lord G.
Attwood, M.	Ferguson, A. C.	Martin, T. B.	Stanley, E.
Balfour, J.	Fielden, J.	Maxwell, sir J.	Stuart, captain
Baring, A.	Finn, W. F.	Maxwell, T. W.	Tennyson, C.
Barnard, E. G.	Fitzsimon, C.	Nicholl, J.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Bethell, R.	Folkes, sir W. M.	O'Connell, D.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Bell, M.	Fox, S. L.	O'Connell, M.	Tyrell, sir J. T.
Blackstone, W. S.	French, F.	Ossulston, lord	Verner, W.
Blamire, W.	Gordon, capt. W.	Oswald, R. A.	Vincent, sir F.
Bruce, lord E.	Greville, sir J.	Palmer, R.	Walsh, sir J. B.
Burrell, sir C.	Handley, H.	Parker, sir H.	Ward, H. G.
Chaplin, T.	Hanmer, sir J.	Parker, T.	Wason, R.
Cline, hon. R.	Heathcote, G. I.	Patten, W.	Wemyss, captain J.
Cobbett, W.	Herbert, hon. S.	Pease, J.	Williams, W. A.
Crawley, S.	Hodges, T. L.	Perceval, colonel	Windham, W. H.
Curties, H. B.	Ingilby, sir W. A.	Plumptre, J. P.	Yorke, capt. C. P.
Curties, capt. E. B.	Inglis, sir R.	Rickford, W.	Tellers.
Denison, J. E.	Kerrison, sir E.	Ruthven, E. S.	Chandos, marq. of,
Dilwyn, L. W.	King, E. B.	Ruthven, E.	Fremantle, sir T.
Dugdale, W. S.	Knatchbull, sir E.	Sanderson, R.	——
Duncombe, W.	Leech, J.	Sheppard, T.	Hall, B.
Egerton, T.	Lennard, T. B.	Simeon, sir R.	Bankes, W.
Estcourt, T. B.	Lincoln, earl of	Sinclair, G.	

LISTS OF MAJORITIES AND MINORITIES, (Session 1834,)

1.—CORN LAWS.

Division of the 7th and 8th of March, on Mr. Hume's motion, "That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider the Corn Laws, (9 Geo. IV. c. 60,) and substituting, instead of the present graduated Scale of Duties, a fixed and moderate Duty on the Import at all times of Foreign Corn into the United Kingdom, and for granting a fixed and equivalent Bounty on the Export of Corn from the United Kingdom."

For the motion	157
Against it	314
Majority against the Motion	—157
Total in the House	471
Absent, Paired, &c.	186
Speaker	1
Total	—658

MAJORITY.

England.
Althorp, lord
Anson, hon. G.
Astley, sir J. D.
Astley, sir J.
Atherley, A.
Attwood, M.
Bankes, W. J.
Baring, A.
Baring, H. B.
Bell, M.
Benett, J.
Bentinck, lord G. F.
Berkeley, hon. C. F.
Barnard, E. G.
Bethell, E. R.
Bewes, T.
Biddulph, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Blackstone, W. S.
Blake, sir F.
Blandford, marquis
Boss, J. G.
Bowes, J.
Brocklehurst, J.
Brodie, B.
Bruce, lord E.
Brudenell, lord
Bulteel, J. C.
Burrell, sir C.
Burton, H.
Byng, G.
Byng, sir J.
Calcraft, J.
Calvert, N.
Carter, J. B.
Cartwright, W. R.
Cavendish, hon. C.
Cavendish, lord
Cavendish, Col.
Cayley, sir G.
Cayley, E. S.
Chandos, marquis
Chaplin, colonel T.
Chapman, A.
Chetwynd, capt W F
Childers, J. W.
Clayton, col. W. R.
Clive, E. B.
Clive, hon. R. H.
Cockerell, sir C.
Collier, J.
Cookes, T. H.
Cooper, hon. A. H. A.
Cotes, J.
Crawley, S.
Cripps, J.
Crompton, J.

Curteis, H. B.
Curteis, captain
Dare, R. W. H.
Denison, W. J.
Denison, J. E.
Dillwyn, L. W.
Donkin, sir R. S.
Duncombe, hon. W.
Dundas, captain
Dundas, sir R. L.
Eastnor, viscount
Egerton, W. T.
Edwards, J.
Estcourt, T. G. B.
Fancourt, major
Finch, G.
Fitzgibbon, R.
Fitzroy, lord C.
Fitzroy, lord J.
Foley, E. T.
Foley, J. N.
Folkes, sir W.
Forester, G. C. W.
Fox, S. L.
Frankland, sir B.
Fremantle, sir T.
Gaskell, J.
Gladstone, W.
Glynne, sir S.
Gordon, R.
Goring, H. D.
Goulburn, rt hon H.
Graham, sir J. R. G.
Grant, right hon. R.
Greene, T. G.
Grey, hon. colonel
Grimston, viscount
Gronow. capt, R.H.
Grosvenor, lord R.
Guise, sir B. W.
Halcomb, J.
Halford, H.
Halse, J.
Handley, W. F.
Handley, B.
Handley, H.
Hanmer, sir J.
Hanmer, colonel H.
Harcourt, G.
Hardinge, sir H.
Harland, W.
Heathcoat, J. J.
Heathcote, G. J.
Heneage, G. F.
Henniker, lord
Herbert, hon. S.
Heron, sir R.
Herries, rt hon. J.

Hill, sir R.
Hodges, T.
Hornby, E. G.
Hoskins, K.
Hotham, lord
Houldsworth, T.
Howard, P. H.
Hope, H. T.
Hudson, T.
Hurst, R. T.
Irton, S.
Ingilby, sir W. A.
Inglis, sir R.
Jephson, J. F.
Jermyn, earl
Jerningham, H. V.
Johnstone, sir J. V.
Jolliffe, H.
Keppel, major
Kerrison, sir E.
Kerry, earl of
Knatchbull, sir E.
Lambton, hon. E.
Langdale, hon. C.
Leech, J.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lemon, sir C.
Lennard, T. B.
Lennard, sir T. B.
Lennox, lord W.
Lennox, lord G.
Lennox, lord A.
Lewis, hon. T. F.
Lincoln, earl of
Locke, W.
Lumley, viscount
Lygon, hon. colonel
Lyall, G.
Madocks, J.
Mangles, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marryat, J.
Maxfield, captain
Miles, W.
Mildmay, P.
Mills, J.
Moreton, hon. A. H.
Moreton, hon. H. G.
Mostyn, hon. E. M.
Neale, admiral
Neeld, J.
Newark. viscount
Nicholl, J.
North, F.
Norreys, lord
Ossulston, lord
Paget, F.
Palmer, C. F.

Palmer, R.
Palmerston, visct.
Parker, sir H.
Pease, J.
Pechell, sir S. J. B.
Peel, rt hon. sir R.
Peel, colonel J.
Pelham, C. A. G.
Pendarves, E W.
Penruddocke, J. H.
Pepys, C.
Philips, sir G.
Pinney, W.
Pigot, R.
Ponsonby, hon. W.
Price, sir R.
Pryme, G.
Pryse, P.
Ramsden, J. C.
Reid, sir J. R.
Richards, J.
Rickford, W.
Rider, T.
Ridley, sir M. W.
Robarts, A. W.
Rooper, J. B.
Ross, C.
Rotch, B.
Rumbold, C. E.
Russell, Lord J.
Russell, C.
Russell, W. C.
Sanderson, R.
Sandon, viscount
Sanford, E. A.
Scarlett, sir J.
Scott, sir E. D.
Scott, J. W.
Sebright, sir J.
Shawe, R. N.
Simeon, sir R. G.
Skipwith, sir G.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J.
Smith, hon. S.
Somerfet, lord G.
Spry, S. T.
Stanley, rt hon. E.
Staunton. sir G. T.
Staveley, J. K.
Stewart, J.
Stormont, viscount
Stuart, lord Dudley
Steuart, W.
Surrey, earl of
Talbot, C.
Talmash, A. G.
Tayleur, W.

Thomson, P. B.
Throckmorton, R. G.
Tower, C. T.
Townshend, lord C.
Townley, R. G.
Tracy, C. H.
Trelawney, W.
Trevor, hon. R.
Troubridge, sir E. T.
Tullamore, lord
Tynte, C.
Tyrell, sir J.
Tyrell, C.
Verney, sir H.
Vernon, G.
Villiers, viscount
Vivian, J.
Vyvyan, sir R.
Wilbraham, G.
Williams, W.
Williams, R.
Williams, T.
Willoughby, sir H.
Windham, W.
Winnington, H. J.
Wood, colonel T.
Wall, C.
Ward, H.
Warre, J,
Watkins, L.
Watson, hon. R.
Weyland, major R.
Whitbread, W.
Wrottesley, sir J.
Wynn, right hon. C.
Yorke, captain C.

Scotland.

Adam, admiral
Agnew, sir A.
Arbuthnot, hon. H.
Bruce, C.
Callender, J. H.
Elliot, hon. capt. G.
Ferguson, capt. G.
Fergusson, R. C.
Gordon, hon. capt.
Grant, right hon. C.
Hallyburton, hon. D.
Hay, colonel A. L.
Jeffrey, rt hon. F.
Johnstone, J. J. H.
Macleod, R.
Rae, sir W.
Ross, H.
Stewart, sir M. S.
Traill, G.
Wemyss, captain J.

Ireland.

Barry, G. S.
Belfast, earl of
Blaney, hon. capt.
Bobbin, L.
Browne, D.
Blake, M. J.
Castlereagh, visct.
Christmas, J. N.
Conolly, col. E. M.
Coote, sir C. H.
Corry, hon. H. L.
Copeland, W. C.
Daly, J.
Fitzgerald, T.
Gladstone, T.
Hayes, sir E.
Howard, R.
Jones, capt. T.
Knox, hon. col. J. J.
Lambert, H.
Meynell, capt. H.
O'Callaghan, hn. C.
O'Connor, F.
O'Ferrall, R. M.
Roche, W.
Roe, J.
Shaw, F.
Sheil, E. L.
Stewart, sir H.
Sullivan, R.
Talbot, J.
Tennent, J. E.
Walker, C. A.
Wallace, T.

Tellers.

Darlington, Earl of
Rice, hon. T. S.

MINORITY.

England.

Aglionby, H. A.
Attwood, T.
Baillie, J. E.
Baines, E.
Barnett, C. J.
Bernal, R.
Bish, T.
Blunt, sir C. R.
Bolling, W.
Briggs, R.
Brotherton, J.
Brougham, W.
Buckingham, J. S.
Buller, E.
Buller, J. W.
Bulwer, H. L.
Bouverie, D. P.
Buxton, T. F.
Chichester, J. B.
Clay, W.
Crawford, W.
Dashwood, G. H.
Davenport, J.
Davies, Colonel
Dawson, E.
Divett, E.
Dundas, J. C.
Dundas, T.
Dykes, F. L. B.
Ellice, Rt. Hon. E.
Ellis, W.
Etwall, R.
Evans, W.
Evans, Colonel
Ewart, W.
Faithfull, G.
Fenton, J.
Fielding, J.
Fielden, W.
Fleetwood, H.
Fort, J.
Fox, Colonel
Fryer, R.
Gaskell, D.
Gisborne, T.
Grey, sir G.
Grote, G.
Guest, J. J.
Gully, J.
Hall, B.
Hardy, J.
Harvey, D. W.
Hawes, B.
Hawkins, J. H.
Hodgson, J.
Howard, captain
Howick, lord
Hughes, H.
Humphery, J.
Hutt, W.
Hyett, W. H.
Ingham, R.
James, W.
Jervis, J.
Kemp, T. R.
Kennedy, J.
Lambton, H.
Langton, colonel G.
Langston, J. H.
Labouchere, J. C.
Lester, B. L.
Lister, E. C.
Littleton, rt. hon. E.
Loyd, J. H.
Lushington, Dr.
Marshall, J.
Marsland, T.
Martin, J.
Molyneux, lord
Molesworth, sir W.
Morpeth, viscount
Morrison, J.
Ord, W. H.
Palmer, general
Parker, J.
Parrott, J.
Philips, M.
Phillpotts, J.
Penleaze, J. S.
Rippon, C.
Robinson, G. R.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rolfe, R. M.
Romilly, J.
Romilly, E.
Ryle, J.
Russell, lord
Scholefield, J.
Sheppard, T.
Smith, V.
Stanley, H. T.
Stanley, E. J.
Scrope, P.
Seymour, lord
Stewart, P. M.
Strickland, sir G.
Strutt, E.
Tancred, H. W.
Tennyson, C.
Thicknesse, R.
Thompson, Alderman
Thomson, P.
Todd, R.
Tooke, W.
Turner, W.
Vernon, G. J.
Walker, R.
Walter, J.
Warburton, H.
Waterpark, lord
Whalley, sir S.
Wedgwood, J.
Whitmore, W. W.
Wigney, I. N.
Wilks, J.
Williams, colonel
Wood, C.
Wood, alderman
Wood, G. W.
Young, G. T

Scotland.
Abercromby, J.
Bannerman, A.
Dalmeny, lord
Dunlop, captain
Ewing, J.
Gillon, W. D.
Loch, J.
Murray, J. A.
Ormelie, lord
Oswald, R. A.
Oswald, J.
Parnell, sir H.
Sharpe, general
Stuart, R.
Wallace, R.

Ireland.
Evans, G.
Lalor, P.
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, M.
O'Connell, M.
O'Connell, J.
O'Dwyer, A. C.
O'Reilly, W.
Ruthven, E. S.
Ruthven, E.
Vigors, N.

Tellers.
Hume, J.
Torrens, colonel

ABSENT.

Adams, E. H.
Andover, viscount
Anson, sir G.
Apsley, lord
Ashley, lord
Bainbridge, E. T.
Baring, F. T.
Baring, F.
Baring, W. B.
Beaumont, T. W.
Berkeley, G. C. F.
Blackburne, J.
Blamire, W.
Briscoe, J. I.
Bulkeley, sir R.
Buller, C.
Bulwer, E. L.
Burdett, sir F.
Calley, T.
Chaytor, W. R. C.
Chaytor, sir W.
Clive, viscount
Cobbett, W.
Codrington, E.
Dick, Q.
Duffield, T.
Dugdale, W. S.
Duncannon, viscount
Durham, sir P. C.
Ebrington, visc.
Fazakerley, J. N.
Fellowes, H. A. W.
Fellowes, N.
Ferguson, general
Forster, C. S.
Fordwich, viscount
Glynne, sir S. R.
Godson, R.
Heathcote, sir G.
Hill, M. D.
Horne, sir W.
Hawkes, T.
Jervis, J.
Johnstone, Sir F.
King, E.
Lamont, captain
Lee, J,
Lopes, sir R.
Lowther, viscount
Lowther, colonel
Maberly, colonel
Mandeville, viscount
Manners, lord R.
Methuen, P.
Miller, W. H.
Milton, viscount
Mosley, sir O.
Noel, sir G.
Owen, H. O.
Owen, Sir J.
Paget, sir C.
Patten, J. W.
Peter, W.
Petre, E.
Phillips, sir R.
Phillipps, C. M.
Plumptre, J. P.
Pollock, F.
Poulter, J.
Powell, col. W. E.
Poyntz, W. S.
Price, R.
Ramsbottom, J.
Russell, lord C. J. F.
Seale, colonel
Slaney, R. A.
Smith, T. A.
Spankie, Mr. serjeant
Spencer, hon. capt. F.
Stanley, E.
Stonor, T.
Talbot, W. H. F.
Tapps, G. W.
Taylor, M. A.
Tynte, C. K. K.
Vaughan, sir R.
Vincent, sir F.
Vivian, sir H.
Winnington, H. J.
Williamson, sir H.
Wilmot, sir J. E.
Winnington, sir T.
Walsh, sir J. B.
Welby, G. E.
Whitmore, T. C.
Wynn, sir W. W.
Yelverton, W. H.

Scotland.
Balfour, J.
Campbell, sir H.
Dalrymple, sir J. H.
Ferguson, H.
Fleming, C.
Grant, col. F. W.
Hay, sir J.
Hope, sir A.
Johnston, A.
Mackenzie, J. A. S.
Maxwell, J.
Oliphant, L.
Pringle, R.
Sinclair, E.
Stewart, G.

Ireland.
Acheson, viscount
Archdall, gen. M.
Baldwin, Dr. H.
Barron, W.
Bateson, sir R.
Bellew, R. M.
Bernard, W. S.
Blackney, W.
Butler, P.
Browne, J. D.
Callaghan, D.
Carew, R. S.
Chapman, M. L.
Clements, viscount
Cole, lord
Cole, A.
Cooper, E.
Chichester, lord A.
Don, O'Conor
Ferguson, sir R. A.
Finn, W.
Fitzsimon, C.
Fitzsimon, N.
French, F.
Forbes, lord viscount
Galway, J. M.
Grattan, J.
Grattan, H.
Hill, lord A.
Hill, lord M.
Jacob, E.
Jephson, C. D. O.
Keane, sir R.
Lefroy, Dr. T.
Lefroy, A.
Lynch, H.
Macnamara, major
Macnamara, F.
Martin, J.
Martin, J.
Maxwell, H.
Maxwell J.
Mullins, F. W.
Nagle, sir R.
O'Brien, C.
O'Connell, C.
O'Grady, col. S.
O'Neill, hon. gen.
Oxmantown, lord
Perceval, colonel
Perin, L.
Roche, D.
Ronayne, D.
Stawell, colonel
Talbot, J. H.
Verner, colonel
White, S.
Young, J.

PAIRED OFF.

FOR.		AGAINST.	
Duncannon, lord	Beaumont, M.	Ebrington, visc.	Wason, R.
Potter	Maxwell, J.	Poulter	Grant
Burdett, sir F.	Oliphant	Vincent, F.	Bulwer, E. L.
Buller, C.	Johnston	Macnamara	Sinclair
		Horne, sir W.	

2.—PENSION LIST.

Minority of 184 (tellers included), who voted for Mr. D. W. Harvey's motion, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the consideration of each grant in the Pension List, and report the same to the house. *Feb.* 18.

England.	Grote, G.	Richards, J.	*Scotland.*
Aglionby, H. A.	Guest, J.	Rickford, W.	Dunlop, captain
Attwood, T.	Gully, J.	Rider, T.	Ewing, J.
Baillie, J.	Hall, B.	Rippon, C.	Gillon, W. D.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Handley, B.	Robinson, G. R.	Johnston, A.
Barnard, E. G.	Handley, H.	Roebuck, J. A.	Oliphant, L.
Beauclerk, major	Hardy, J.	Romilly, E.	Ormelie, earl
Benett, J.	Hawes, B.	Sanford, E.	Oswald, J.
Bewes, T.	Heathcoat, J.	Scholefield, J.	Pringle, R.
Bish, T.	Hill, M. D.	Scott, J.	Sharpe, general
Blackburne, J.	Hodges, T. L.	Scrope, C.	Sinclair, G.
Blake, sir F.	Hughes, H.	Seale, colonel	Wallace, R.
Blunt, sir C.	Hudson, T.	Shawe, R. N.	*Ireland.*
Boss, J.	Humphery, J.	Sheppard, T.	Barron, W.
Bowes, J.	Hurst, R. H.	Simeon, sir R. G.	Bellew, R.
Briggs, R.	Hutt, W.	Spry, S. T.	Blake, M.
Briscoe, J. I.	Ingham, R.	Stanley, E. J.	Butler, hon. colonel
Brocklehurst, J.	Jervis, J.	Staveley, J. K.	Chapman, M. L.
Brotherton, J.	Kemp, T.	Strickland, G.	Evans, G.
Buckingham, J. S.	Kennedy, J.	Strutt, E.	Finn, W. F.
Buller, C.	King, E.	Talmash, A. G.	Fitzgerald, T.
Cayley, E. S.	Langdale, hon. C.	Tancred, H. W.	Fitzsimon, C.
Chaytor, sir W.	Langton, colonel	Thicknesse, R.	Grattan, H.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Leech, J.	Tennyson, rt. hon. C.	Lambert, H.
Clay, W.	Lefevre, C. S.	Todd, R.	Lynch, A. H.
Codrington, sir E.	Lennox, lord W.	Tooke, W.	Macnamara, F.
Collier, J.	Lennox, lord G.	Torrens, colonel	O'Connell, D.
Cromptom, J. S.	Lennox, lord A.	Townshend, lord C. J.	O'Connell, M.
Curteis, H. B.	Lester, B. L.	Trelawney, W. L. S.	O'Connell, J.
Curteis, captain	Lister, E.	Turner, W.	O'Conor Don
Davies, colonel	Lloyd, J.	Vincent, sir V.	O'Connor, F.
Dawson, E.	Locke, W.	Walter, J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.
Dillwyn, L.	Marshall, J.	Warburton, H.	Roche, D.
Divett, E.	Martin, J.	Wason, M.	Roe, J.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Methuen, P.	Watkins, L.	Ruthven, E. J.
Evans, colonel	Molesworth, sir W.	Watson, hon. R.	Ruthven, E.
Ewart, W.	Moreton, hon. H. G.	Whalley, sir S.	Sheil, R. L.
Faithfull, G.	Palmer, general	Whitmore, W. W.	Sullivan, R.
Fancourt, major	Palmer, C. F.	Wigney, J. R.	Talbot, J. H.
Fenton, J.	Parker, J.	Wilbraham, G.	Vigors, N. A.
Feilden, W.	Parrott, J.	Wilks, J.	Walker, C. A.
Fielden, J.	Pease, J.	Williams, W.	Tellers.
Fleetwood, P.	Petre, hon. E.	Williams, colonel	Harvey, D. W.
Fort, J.	Philips, M.	Windham, W.	Hume, J.
Fryer, R.	Plumptre, J. P.	Winnington, H.	Paired off in favour.
Gaskell, D.	Potter, R.	Wood, alderman	Tynte, C.
Godson, R.	Ramsbottom, J.	Young, G. F.	Romilly, J.
Goring, H.			

MAJORITY (190).

England.	Attwood, M.	Barnett, C. J.	Bernal, R.
Althorp, viscount	Baring, F.	Bell, M.	Blackstone, W. S.
Anson, hon. G.	Baring, H.	Bentinck, lord G.	Bolling, W.

Bouverie, hon. D. P.
Brougham, W.
Bruce, lord E.
Buller, J. W.
Buller, E.
Bulteel, J.
Burdett, sir F.
Buxton, T. F.
Byng, G.
Byng, sir J.
Carter, J. B.
Cartwright, W.
Cavendish, hon. C.
Cavendish, lord
Cavendish, hon. H. F.
Childers, J. W.
Clive, E. B.
Clive, hon. R. H
Crawley, S.
Cripps, J.
Darlington, earl of
Davenport, J.
Denison, J. E.
Dunkin, sir R.
Duffield, T.
Dundas, hon. sir R.
Ebrington, lord
Egerton, W.
Ellice, E.
Evans, W.
Finch, G.
Fitzroy, lord C.
Foley, J. H. H.
Forester, hon. G. C. W
Forster, C.
Fox, colonel
Gisborne, T.
Gladstone, W. E.
Gordon, R.
Graham, sir J.
Grant, right hon. R.
Grey, colonel
Grey, sir G.
Gronow, captain
Halford, H.
Hanmer, sir J.
Harcourt, G.
Hardinge, sir H.
Harland, W. C.
Herbert, hon. S.
Heron, sir R.
Herries, right hon. J.
Hodgson, J.
Howick, lord
Hope, H.
Inglis, sir R.
Irton, S.
Johnstone, sir J.
Keppel, major G.
Kerrison, sir E.
Knatchbull, sir E.
Labouchere, H.
Lambton, H.
Lemon, sir C.
Lincoln, earl of
Littleton, E.
Lumley, viscount
Lushington, doctor
Lygon, colonel
Mangles, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marsland, T.
Maxfield, captain
Mildmay, P. St. J.
Milton, viscount
Molyneux, lord
Morpeth, lord
Mostyn, hon. E. M. L.
Nicholl, J.
Norreys, lord
North, F.
Ord, W. H.
Ossulston, lord
Penleaze, J.
Paget, F.
Palmer, R.
Palmerston, lord
Pechell, sir S.
Peel, right hon. sir R.
Peel, colonel
Pendarves, E. W.
Peter, W.
Phillpotts, J.
Pigot, R.
Pinney, W.
Ponsonby, hon. W.
Pryme, G.
Reid, sir J.
Rice, hon. T. S.
Ridley, sir M.
Robarts, A. W.
Rolfe, R.
Rooper, J. B.
Ross, C.
Russell, rt. hon. lord J.
Russell, lord C.
Russell, W.
Russell, C.
Ryle, J.
Sanderson, R.
Sandon, lord
Scarlett, sir J.
Scott, sir E.
Smith, J.
Smith, R.
Somerset, lord G.
Spankie, serjeant
Stanley, right hon. E.
Stanley, hon. T.
Staunton, sir G. H.
Stewart, P.
Stuart, lord D.
Tayleur, W.
Thompson, P. B.
Thomson, rt. hon. C. P.
Throckmorton, R G.
Tower, C. T.
Townley, R. G.
Tracy, C. H.
Trevor, hon. G. R.
Verney, sir H.
Vernon, hon. G. S.
Vyvyan, sir R.
Willoughby, sir H.
Winnington, sir T.
Wood, G.
Walker, R.
Ward, H.
Warre, J.
Waterpark, lord
Wedgwood, J.
Weyland, major R.
Whitbread, W.
Wrottesley, sir J.

Scotland.

Adam, admiral
Agnew, sir A.
Arbuthnot, general
Bruce, C.
Dalmeny, lord
Elliott, hon. captain
Ferguson, captain
Fleming, admiral
Grant, right hon. C.
Halliburton, D. G.
Hay, colonel
Jeffrey, right hon. F.
Johnstone, J.
Loch, J.
M'Kenzie, J. A. S.
M'Leod, R.
Murray, J. A.

Ireland.

Browne, J. D.
Browne, D.
Castlereagh, viscount
Christmas, J.
Corry, hon. H.
Fitzgibbon, hon. R.
Gladstone, T.
Hayes, sir E.
Hill, lord M.
Jones, captain
Knox, hon. colonel J.
Shaw, F.
Talbot, J.
Verner, colonel
Wallace, T.
Young, J.

ABSENT.

England.

Adams, E. H.
Andover, viscount
Anson, sir G.
Apsley, lord
Ashley, lord
Astley, sir J. D.
Astley, sir J.
Atherley, A.
Bankes, W. J.
Baring, A.
Baring, W. B.
Beaumont, T. W.
Berkeley, G. C. F.
Berkeley, C. F.
Bethell, E.
Biddulph, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Blamire, W.
Blandford, marquis
Brodie, B.
Brudenell, lord
Bulkeley, sir R. W.
Bulwer, E. L.
Bulwer, H. L.
Burrell, sir C.
Burton, H.
Calcraft, J.
Calley, T.
Calvert, N.
Campbell, sir J.
Cayley, sir G.
Chandos, marquis
Chaplin, col. T.
Chapman, A.
Chaytor, W. R. C.
Chetwynd, capt. W. F.
Clayton, col. W. R.
Clive, viscount
Cobbett, W.
Cockerell, sir C.
Cookes, T. H.
Cooper, A. H. A.
Cotes, J.
Dare, R. W. H.
Dashwood, G. H.
Denison, W. J.
Dick, Q.

Dugdale, W. S.
Duncombe, W.
Dundas, J. W.
Dundas, J. C.
Eastnor, viscount
Edwards, J.
Ellis, W.
Estcourt, T. G. B.
Etwall, R.
Fazakerley, I. N.
Fellowes, H. A. W.
Fellowes, N.
Ferguson, gen. sir R.
Fitzroy, lord J.
Foley, E. T.
Folkes, sir W.
Fordwich, viscount
Fox, S. L.
Frankland, sir R.
Fremantle, sir T.
Gaskell, J. M.
Glynne, sir S. R.
Goulburn, H.
Greene, T. G.
Grimston, viscount
Grosvenor, lord R.
Grosvenor, earl of
Guise, sir B. W.
Halse, J.
Handley, B.
Hanmer, col. H.
Hawkins, J. H.
Heathcote, sir G.
Heathcote, G. J.
Heneage, G. F.
Heniker, lord E.
Hill, sir R.
Hornby, E. G.
Horne, sir W.
Hoskin, K.
Hotham, lord
Houldsworth, T.
Howard, P. H.
Howard, E. G.
Hyett, W. H.
Ingilby, sir W. A.
James, W.
Jermyn, earl
Jerningham, H.
Johnstone, sir G. F.
Jolliffe, H.
Lamont, capt. N.
Langston, J. H.
Lee, J. L. H.
Lennard, T. B.
Lennard, sir T.
Lewis, T. F.
Lopes, sir R.
Lowther, viscount
Lowther, col. H.
Lyall, G.
Maberley, col.
Madocks, J.
Mandeville, viscount
Manners, lord R.
Marryat, J.
Miller, W. H.
Mills, J.
Moreton, H.
Neale, adm. sir H. B.
Neeld, J.
Newark, viscount
Noel, sir G.
Owen, H. O.
Owen, sir J.
Paget, sir C.
Parker, sir H.
Patten, J. W.
Pelham, C. A. G.
Penruddocke, J. H.
Pepys, C.
Phillips, sir R.
Philips, sir G.
Phillipps, C. M.
Pollock, F.
Poulter, J.
Powell, col. W. E.
Poyntz, W. S.
Price, R.
Price, sir R.
Pryse, P.
Ramsden, J. C.
Rotch, B.
Rumbold, C. E.
Russell, lord
Sebright, sir J.
Slaney, R. A.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, R. S.
Smith, T.
Spencer, capt. F.
Stanley, E.
Stewart, J.
Stonor, T.
Stormont, viscount
Surrey, earl of
Talbot, C. R. M.
Talbot, W. H. F.
Tapps, G. W.
Taylor, M. A.
Troubridge, sir E. T.
Tullamore, lord
Tynte, C. K. K.
Tynte, C. J. K.
Tyrell, sir J. T.
Tyrell, C.
Vaughan, sir R.
Vernon, G. H.
Villiers, viscount
Vivian, sir H.
Vivian, J. H.
Wall, C. B.
Walsh, sir J. B.
Welby, G. E.
Whitmore, T. C.
Williams, R.
Williams, T. P.
Williamson, sir H.
Wilmot, sir J. E.
Wood, col. T.
Wyndham, W.
Wynn, sir W. W.
Wynn, C. W.
Yelverton, W. H.
Yorke, capt. C. P.

Scotland.

Abercromby, J.
Balfour, J.
Bannerman, A.
Callender, J. H.
Colquhoun, J. C.
Dalrymple, sir J. H.
Ferguson, R.
Fergusson, R. C.
Gordon, capt. W.
Grant, col. F. W.
Hay, sir J.
Hope, sir A.
Maxwell, sir J.
Maxwell, J.
Parnell, sir H.
Rae, sir W.
Ross, H.
Stewart, E.
Stewart, sir M. S.
Traill, G.
Wemyss, capt. J.

Ireland.

Acheson, viscount
Archdall, general
Baldwin, Dr. H.
Barry, G. S.
Bateson, sir R.
Belfast, earl of
Bernard, W. S.
Blackney, W.
Blaney, capt. C.
Callaghan, D.
Carew, R. S.
Chichester, lord A.
Clements, viscount
Cole, lord
Cole, A.
Conolly, col. E. M.
Cooper, E. J.
Coote, sir C. H.
Copeland, W. C.
Daly, J.
Dobbin, L.
Ferguson, sir R. A.
Fitzsimon, N.
French, F.
Forbes, viscount
Galwey, J. M.
Grattan, J. A.
Hill, lord A.
Howard, R.
Jephson, C. D.
Keane, sir R.
Lalor, P.
Lefroy, Dr. T.
Lefroy, A.
Macnamara, major W.
Martin, J.
Martin, J.
Maxwell, J.
Meynell, capt. H.
Mullins, F. W.
Nagle, sir R.
O'Brien, C.
O'Callaghan, C.
O'Connell, M.
O'Connell, C.
O'Ferrall, R.
O'Grady, col. S.
O'Neill, gen. J.
O'Reilly, W.
Oxmantown, lord
Perceval, col.
Perrin, L.
Roche, W.
Ronayne, D.
Stawell, col.
Stewart, sir H.
Tennent, J. E.
White, S.

In the minority in favour of Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey's motion respecting the pension list, Mr. Morrison (Ipswich) paired off for the motion with Mr. Maxwell. The mover and seconder of the address, therefore, both voted against ministers on this occasion.

3.—REPEAL OF SEPTENNIAL ACT.

MINORITY

Of 187 (tellers included) who voted for Mr. Tennyson's motion for leave to bring in a Bill to shorten the Duration of Parliaments.

Ayes	185
Noes	235
Majority	50

Abercromby, J.
Adams, E. H.
Adam, admiral
Aglionby, H. A.
Attwood, T.
Baillie, J. E.
Baldwin, Dr.
Baines, E.
Barnett, C. J.
Barron, H.
Barron, G.
Barry, G.
Barnard, E. G.
Bannerman, A.
Beauclerk, major
Bellew, R. M.
Bewes, T.
Bish, T.
Blackburne, J.
Blake, T.
Blunt, sir C.
Briscoe, J. I.
Briggs, R.
Bowes, J.
Brocklehurst, J.
Bouverie, D.
Browne, D.
Brotherton, J.
Butler, colonel
Bulwer, E. L.
Buckingham, J. S.
Cayley, sir G.
Chaytor, sir W.
Clay, W.
Collier, C.
Dashwood, G. M.
Denison, W. J.
Divett, E.
Dobbin, L.
Dundas, captain
Dunlop, captain
Dykes, F. L. B.
Ellis, W.
Etwall, R.
Evans, colonel
Evans, George
Ewart, W.
Ewing, J.
Faithfull, G.
Fielden, J.
Fellowes, H. A. W.
Fenton, J.
Fergusson, R. C.
Ferguson, sir R.
Finn, W. F.
Fitzsimon, N.
Fleetwood, H.
Fryer, R.
Gillon, W. D.
Gaskell, D.
Grote, G.
Guest, J. J.
Gully, J.
Hall, B.
Hay, colonel, L.
Hill, M. D.
Handley, B.
Handley, H.
Hawes, B.
Hawkins, J. H.
Harvey, D. W.
Hodgson, J.
Hodges, T. L.
Hornby, E. G.
Hughes, H.
Hurst, R. H.
Humphery, J.
Hutt, W.
Ingham, R.
Ingilby, sir W.
James, W.
Jervis, J.
Kennedy, J.
King, E. B.
Lalor, P.
Lambert, H.
Lambton, H.
Leech, J.
Lefevre, S.
Lister, E. C.
Locke, W.
Lloyd, J. H.
Lushington, Dr.
Madocks, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marshall, J.
Marsland, T.
Maxwell, J.
Methuen, P.
Molesworth, sir W.
Morrison, J.
Mullins, F. W.
Nagle, sir R.
O'Brien, C.
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, C.
O'Connell, M.
O'Connell, M.
O'Conor, Don
Oliphant, L.
Oswald, R, A.
Oswald, J.
Palmer, C. F.
Palmer, general
Parker, J.
Parker, sir H.
Parnell, sir H.
Parrott, J.
Pendarves, E. W.
Penleaze, J. S.
Philips, M.
Plumptre, J. P.
Potter, R.
Pryme, George
Pryse, Pryse
Richards, J.
Rider, T.
Rippon, C.
Robinson, G. R.
Roche, D.
Roche, W.
Roebuck. J. A.
Romilly, E.
Romilly, J.
Ross, H.
Rotch, B.
Russell, lord
Russell, lord C.
Ruthven, E.
Ruthven, E. S.
Sanford, F. A.
Sandford, sir D. K.
Simeon, sir R.
Sinclair, G.
Sheil, R. L.
Seale, colonel
Scrope, P.
Shawe, R. N.
Sharpe, general
Scholefield, J.
Staunton, sir G.
Staveley, T. K.
Stewart, sir M.
Stewart, lord J.
Stanley, H. T.
Stanley, E. J.
Strickland, sir G.
Strutt, E.
Sullivan, R.
Tancred, H. W.
Talbot, J. H.
Thicknesse, R.
Todd, R.
Tooke, W.
Torrens, colonel
Trelawney, sir W.
Turner, W.
Tynte, C. J. K.
Vernon, G.
Vigors, N. A.
Vincent, sir F.
Walker, C. A.
Wallace, R.
Walter, J.
Ward, H. G.
Warburton, H.
Wason, R.
Whalley, sir S.
Wigney, J. N.
Wilks, J.
Wilbraham, G.
Wood, alderman

Tellers.
Codrington, sir E.
Tennyson, C.

PAIRED OFF.

FOR.		AGAINST.	
Bainbridge, E. T.	O'Ferrall, M.	Feilden, W.	Rice, T. S.
Beaumont, T. W.	Poulter, J.	North, F.	Shaw, F.
Chapman, M.	Williams, colonel	Pease, J.	Sanderson, R.
Dawson, E.	Walker, R.		
Fort, J.			

SHUT OUT.

Callaghan, D. Sandon, lord

4.—DISSENTERS' ADMISSION INTO THE UNIVERSITIES.

Majority on the Bill "to remove certain disabilities which prevent some classes of His Majesty's subjects from resorting to the universities of England and proceeding to degrees therein."—*July 29.*

Adam, admiral	Dundas, J. W.	Lushington, Dr.	Ruthven, E.
Aglionby, H. A.	Ebrington, lord	Lynch, A.	Scholefield, J.
Althorp, lord	Elliot, capt.	Macleod, R.	Scrope, P.
Attwood, T.	Etwall, R.	Macnamara, major	Seale, col.
Bainbridge, E.	Evans, G.	Mackenzie, J. A. S.	Shawe, R. N.
Baines, E.	Ewart, W.	Maitland, T.	Stanley, H. T.
Baring, F. T.	Ewing, J.	Marjoribanks, S.	Stanley, E. J.
Barnett, C. J.	Fenton, J	Methuen, P.	Stawell, col.
Barron, W.	Ferguson, sir R.	Morpeth, lord	Stewart, P.
Beauclerk, major	Feilden, W.	Moreton, A.	Steuart, R.
Berkeley, C.	Fellowes, W.	Mostyn, E. L.	Sullivan, R.
Bernal, R.	Fleming, admiral	Mullins, R.	Talbot, J.
Bewes, J.	Fox, lieut. col.	Murray, J. A.	Tancred, H. W.
Biddulph, R.	French, F.	O'Connell, D.	Tennyson, C.
Blamire, W.	Gaskell, D.	O'Connell, M.	Thicknesse, R.
Blake, M. J.	Gillon, W. D.	O'Connell, J.	Thomson, C. P.
Briggs. R.	Grey, col.	O'Dwyer, A, C.	Troubridge, sir E.
Brocklehurst, J.	Grey, sir G.	Oliphant, L.	Torrens, col.
Brotherton, J.	Gordon, R.	O'Reilly, W.	Tooke, W.
Brougham, W.	Gronow, R. H.	Oswald, J.	Todd, R.
Buckingham, J. S.	Hall, B.	Palmerston, lord	Tower, C.
Bulteel, J. C.	Handley, B.	Pease, J.	Turner, W.
Burton, H.	Harland, W. C.	Pelham, C. A.	Waddy, C.
Byng, G.	Hawes, B.	Pepys, C. C.	Walker, C. S.
Calvert, N.	Hay, L.	Peter, W.	Wallace, R.
Campbell, sir J.	Hawkins, J.	Philips, M.	Warburton, H.
Carter, J. B.	Hill, lord M.	Phillipps, C. M.	Wason, R.
Chapman, M. L.	Howard, R.	Pinney, W.	Waterpark, lord
Chichester, J. P. B.	Howard, P.	Potter, R.	Wedgwood, J.
Childers, J. W.	Hudson, T.	Poulter, J.	Whalley, sir S.
Clay, W.	Hurst, R. H.	Price, sir R.	Wigney, J. N.
Clements, lord	Hutt, W.	Pringle, R.	Wilks, J.
Clive, E. B.	Kennedy, J.	Pryme, G.	Williams, W. A.
Codrington, sir E.	Labouchere, H.	Pryse, P.	Williams, G.
Cookes, T. H.	Lambton, H.	Rice, T. S.	Winnington, H.
Crompton, S.	Langdale, C.	Richards, J.	Wood, C.
Dalmeny, lord	Langston, J. H.	Rider, T.	Yelverton, W.
Davies, col. C.	Lennard, sir T. B.	Rolfe, R. M.	Young, G. F.
Denison, W.	Lennard, T. B.	Rooper, J. B.	Tellers.
Dillwyn, L.	Littleton, E. J.	Russell, lord J.	Wood, G. W.
Divett, E.	Lumley, lord	Ruthven, E. S.	Smith, R. V.
Duncombe, T.			

Minority of 77 (tellers included) who voted against the third reading of the Universities' Bill, Monday, July 28.

Archdall, M.	Dugdale, W. S.	Irton, S.	Norreys, lord
Arbuthnot, H.	Duncombe, W.	Jones, capt.	Peel, sir R.
Attwood, M.	Estcourt, T. G. B.	Jermyn, earl	Penruddocke, J. H.
Bankes, W. J.	Finch, G.	Kerrison, sir E.	Perceval, colonel
Baring, A.	Gladstone, T.	Knatchbull, sir E.	Phillipps, C. M.
Baring, H. B.	Gladstone, W. E.	Langston, J. H.	Reid, sir J. R.
Blackstone, W. S.	Gordon, capt.	Lefroy, T.	Ross, C.
Bolling, W.	Goulburn, H.	Lefroy, A.	Sandon, lord
Bruce, lord E.	Greene, T.	Lemon, sir C.	Sanderson, R.
Brudenell, lord	Grimston, lord	Lincoln, earl of	Scarlett, sir J.
Buller, J. W.	Harcourt, G. V.	Lowther, lord	Shaw, F.
Campbell, sir H. H.	Hanmer, col.	Lowther, col.	Sheppard, T.
Chandos, marquis	Hayes, sir E.	Lyall, G.	Sinclair, G.
Colborne, N. W. R.	Henniker, lord	Manners, lord R.	Somerset, lord G.
Cole, A. H.	Herbert, S.	Marryat, J.	Stormont, lord
Corry, H. T. L.	Herries, J. C.	Maitland, T.	Trevor, R.
Daly, J.	Hotham, lord	Meynell, capt.	Villiers, lord
Dare, R. W. H.	Hughes, W. H.	Neale, sir H.	Wall, C. B.
Darlington, earl of	Inglis, sir R.	Nicholl, J.	Young, J.

5.—MALT DUTY.

Minority of 172 (tellers included), who voted in favour of Sir W. Ingilby's motion for a Committee to inquire what reduction could be effected in the Malt-Tax.

England.	Crawley, S.	Gully, J.	Parker, sir H.
Adams, E. H.	Curteis, H. B.	Halcomb, J.	Parrott, J.
Aglionby, H. A.	Dare, R. H.	Halford, H.	Pigot, R.
Arbuthnot, hon. A.	Darlington, earl of	Hall, B.	Pelham, hon. C.
Attwood, M.	Dashwood, G.	Handley, H.	Poulter, J.
Attwood, T.	Davies, colonel	Hanmer, sir J.	Richards, J.
Baillie, J.	Dillwyn, L.	Hanmer, colonel H.	Rippon, C.
Bainbridge, E.	Duffield, T.	Harvey, D. W.	Robinson, G. R.
Bankes, W. J.	Dugdale, D. S.	Hardy, J.	Rooper, J. B.
Baring, A.	Dundas, captain	Herbert, hon S.	Russell, W.
Baring, H.	Dawson, E.	Hope, H. T.	Seale, colonel
Barnard, E. G.	Duncombe, hon. H.	Henniker, lord	Simeon, sir R.
Beauclerk, major	Durham, sir P.	Irton, S.	Spry, S.
Bell, M.	Egerton, W.	Jervis, J.	Stanley, E.
Benett, J.	Etwall, R.	Jolliffe, H.	Stewart, J.
Blackstone, W.	Faithfull, G,	Kennedy, J.	Sandford, E.
Briggs, R.	Fancourt, major	Keppel, hon. G.	Sanderson, R.
Bruce, lord E.	Fellowes, hon. N.	Kerrison, sir E.	Shawe, R.
Brudenell, lord	Fellowes, H. A. W.	Leech, J.	Tancred, H. W.
Buckingham, J. S.	Fielden, J.	Lennox, lord W.	Townshend, lord C.
Burrell, sir C.	Finch, G.	Lincoln, earl of	Taylor, M. A.
Burton, H.	Foley, hon. E.	Lister, E.	Tennyson, rt. hon. C.
Buxton, T. F.	Folkes, sir W.	Lowther, hon. H. C.	Tower, J.
Berkeley, Hon. G.	Forester, hon. C. W.	Lygon, hon. H.	Trevor, hon. G. R.
Cartwright, W.	Fremantle, sir T.	Martin, J.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Cayley, E. S.	Fryer, R.	Meynell, captain	Tyrell, Sir J.
Chandos, marquis	Gaskell, J. M.	Miles, W.	Tyrell, C.
Chaplin, colonel	Gaskell, D.	Milton, lord	Tynte, C. J. K.
Clive, hon. R.	Grimston, viscount	Norreys, lord	Tollemache, A. G.
Clayton, sir W.	Goring, H.	Palmer, R.	Vernon, G.
Cotes, J.	Guise, sir W.	Palmer, general	Walter, J.

Weyland, major	Cole, viscount	O'Connor, F.	Gordon, hon. W.
Williams, colonel	Conolly, colonel	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Grant, hon. colonel
Williams, R.	Daly, J.	Roe, J.	Maxwell, J.
Wilmot, sir E.	Finn, W. F.	Roche, D.	Sinclair, G.
Wood, colonel	Fitzsimon, C.	Roche, W.	
Windham, W. H.	Fitzgerald, T.	Ruthven, E. S.	Paired off.
Welby, G.	Hayes, sir E.	Ruthven, E.	Bowes, J.
Watkins, J.	Jacob, E.	Sheil, R. L.	Denison, W. J.
Wilks, J.	Lalor, P.	Sullivan, R.	Fleetwood, captain
Ireland.	Maxwell, J.	Vigors, N. A.	Ossulston, lord
Blaney, hon. C.	O'Connell, D.	Wallace, T.	Tynte, C.
Barry, G. S.	O'Connell, M.	*Scotland.*	
Butler, hon. colonel	O'Connell, J.	Bruce, C.	Tellers.
Blake, M.	O'Connell, M.	Gillon, W.	Hume, J.
			Ingilby, sir W.

Minority of 61 (tellers included), who voted in favour of Mr. Cobbett's motion, "That it is expedient that from and after the 5th of October next, all duties on Malt shall cease and determine."

Against the motion.....	142
For the motion.....	59
Majority.....	83

201 in the house.

England.	Foley, E.	Trelawney, W. L. S.	*Ireland.*
Adams, E. H.	Folkes, sir W.	Trevor, hon. R.	Jacob, E.
Aglionby, H. A.	Gaskell, D.	Tyrell, sir J.	O'Connell, M.
Astley, sir J.	Hume, J.	Tyrell, C.	O'Connell, M. J.
Attwood, T.	Ingilby, sir W.	Vincent, sir F.	O'Connell, J.
Barnard, J. G.	James, W.	Walter, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Bell, M.	Keppel. major	Wason, R.	Ruthven, E.
Bowes, J.	Leech, J.	Watkins, L.	Sheil, R. L.
Buckingham, J. S.	Lennard, sir T.	Wigney, I. N.	
Burton, H.	Lister, E. C.	Wilks, J.	Tellers.
Chandos, marquis of	Mills, W.	Winnington, H.	Cobbett, W.
Chaplin, colonel	Parrott, J.		Curteis, H. B.
Clayton, col. W. R.	Pigot, N.	*Scotland.*	Paired for the motion.
Crawley, S.	Plumptre, J. N.	Ferguson, captain	Goring, H. D.
Curteis, captain	Rickford, W.	Maxwell, sir J.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Faithful, G.	Robinson, G. R.	Oswald, R. A.	
Fancourt, major	Shawe, R. N.	Sinclair, G.	Shut out.
Fielden, J.	Simeon, sir R.	Wallace, R.	Kennedy, J.

6.—BISHOPS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Minority of 60 (tellers included) who voted in favour of Mr. Rippon's motion for "Relieving the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church from their legislative and judicial duties in the House of Lords:"—

Against the motion	127
For the motion.....	60
Majority against.....	67

187 in the House.

England.	Baines, E.	Buller, C.	Faithful, G.
Adams, E. H.	Bewes, T.	Chaytor, sir W.	Ferguson, sir R.
Aglionby, H. A.	Blake, sir F.	Codrington, sir E.	Fielden, J.
Attwood, T.	Buckingham, J. S.	Ewart, W.	Grote, G.

Guest, J. J.	Richards, J.	Hay, colonel L.	O'Connell, M.
Harland, C. H.	Rider, T.	Oliphant, L.	O'Dwyer, A. C.
Harvey, D. W.	Roebuck, J. A.	Oswald, R. A.	Ruthven, E. S.
Humphery, J.	Romilly, J.	Oswald, J.	Ruthven, E.
Ingilby, sir W.	Russell, lord	Pringle, R.	Sheil, R. L.
James, W.	Sebright, sir J.	Stewart, R.	Vigors, N. A.
Kennedy, J.	Staveley, J. K.	Wallace, R.	Walker, C. A.
Leech, J.	Warburton, H.	Wemyss, captain	Tellers.
Lister, E. C.	Whalley, sir S.	*Ireland.*	Hume, J.
Parrott, J.	Wilks, J.	Blake, M. S.	Rippon, C.
Pease, J.	Wood, alderman	Evans, G.	Shut out.
Philips, M.	*Scotland.*	Jacob, E.	Molesworth, sir W.
Potter, R.	Gillon, W. D.	O'Connell, D.	

PAIRED OFF FOR THE MOTION.

Bainbridge, E. T.	Hall, B.	Lynch, A. H.	O'Connell, M.
Bowes, J.	Fleming, Admiral	Marjoribanks, S.	Palmer, general

7.—POOR LAWS.

Minority of 52 (tellers included) who voted against the third reading of the Poor Laws' Amendment Bill.

Attwood, M.	Fielden, J.	Lowther, colonel	Stanley, E.
Attwood, T.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, D.	Thicknesse, R.
Bainbridge, E.	Fryer, R.	O'Connell, M.	Tower, C.
Baines, E.	Guise, sir W.	O'Connell, M.	Vigors, N. A.
Baring, H.	Gully, J.	O'Connell, J.	Vyvyan, sir R.
Blackstone, W.	Halcomb, J.	Parker, sir H.	Walter, J.
Brotherton, J.	Halse, J.	Potter, R.	Williams, colonel
Burrell, sir C.	Hardy, J.	Rider, T.	Willoughby, sir H.
Cobbett, W.	Hughes, W. H.	Robinson, G. R.	Wilks, J.
Duffield, T.	Humphrey, J.	Ruthven, E.	Young, G. F.
Duncombe, W.	Kennedy, J.	Scholefield, J.	Tellers.
Egerton, W. T.	Leech, J.	Somerset, lord G.	Benett, J.
Faithful, G.	Lister, E. C.	Spry, S. T.	Hodges, T. L.

PAIRED OFF.

Tennyson, right honourable C.

VII.—PLACEMEN AND PENSIONERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RETURN of Members holding Offices, or having Pensions, Grants, or Emoluments in the first Session of the Reformed Parliament.—*Parl. Paper, No.* 671, *Sess.* 1833.

1.—Thirty-six Members holding Offices under the Crown at the pleasure of the Crown, or otherwise.

Althorp, viscount, Northampton, county, chancellor of the exchequer	£5000
Baring, Francis, Portsmouth, commissioner of treasury . .	1200
Belfast, earl of, Antrim, county, vice-chamberlain, 1830 .	924
Carew, R. S. Wexford, county, lord lieutenant.	

Clive, viscount, Ludlow, lord lieutenant.
Campbell, sir John, Dudley, solicitor-general . No salary: fees uncertain
Duncannon, viscount, Nottingham, city, first commissioner of woods and forests, 1831 . . . . . £2000
Ebrington, viscount, Devonshire, North, vice-lieutenant for Dover, 1830 . . . . . nil.
Colonel East Devon militia. nil.
Elliot, captain hon. George, Roxburghshire, naval aid-de-camp to the king 182
Secretary to the Admiralty 2000
Governor of mint in Scotland 300
Captain, navy, half-pay, not received during the secretaryship to the Admiralty.
Fox, Charles Richard, Tavistock, surveyor-general to ordnance, 1832 1200
Captain, guards, 1829 . . . . . 450 to 470
Graham, sir J. R. G. Cumberland, East, first lord of admiralty, 1830 4500
Grant, Charles, Inverness, county, president board of control . 3500
Grant, Robert, Finsbury, judge advocate-general and commissioner India board, 1830 2000
Gordon, Robert, Cricklade, commissioner India board, 1832 . 1200
Grosvenor, lord Robert, Chester, comptroller of the household, 1830 904
Hobhouse, sir John Cam, Westminster, secretary-at-war . 2480
Horne, sir William, Mary-le-bone, attorney-general . . no return
Jeffery, Francis, Edinburgh, lord advocate of Scotland, 1830 . 2500
Kennedy, Thomas F. Ayr, &c. commissioner of treasury, 1832 . 1200
Lamb, George, Dungarvon, under secretary home department . 1502
Labouchere, Henry, Taunton, lord of admiralty, 1832 . . 1000
Maberley, William Leader, Chatham, clerk of ordnance, 1832 . 1200
Lieut.-colonel, half-pay; not received during appointment.
Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Leeds, secretary to India board . 1500
Mackenzie, James A. Stewart, Ross and Cromarty, commissioner India board 1200
Oxmantown, lord, King's County, lord lieutenant.
Paget, sir Charles, Carnarvon, groom of bedchamber . . 500
Rear admiral 458
Palmerston, viscount, Hampshire, South, secretary foreign affairs, 1830 5000
Lieut.-colonel Hants militia, 1809; no pay during office.
Peel, sir Robert, Tamworth, privy councellor.
Pechell, sir Samuel J. Windsor, lord of admiralty . . 1000
Captain R.N. half-pay 228: 2: 6
Phillips, sir Richard, Haverfordwest, lord lieutenant.
Russell, lord John, Devonshire, South, paymaster of forces, 1830 2000
Stanley, Edward G. S. Lancashire, North, chief secretary of Ireland, 1830 5500
Keeper of the privy seal, 1830 . . . . nil.
Smith, R. Vernon, Northampton, commissioner of treasury . 1200
Thomson, Charles Poulett, Manchester, vice president of board of trade 2000
Treasurer of the navy, 1830 . . . . nil.
Tennyson, Charles, Lambeth, privy councellor, 1832.
O'Neil, John B. R. Antrim, county, constable of Dublin Castle . 439
Major-general in the army 419

2.—Four Members holding Offices in the appointment of Public Offices, &c.

Wood, Charles, Halifax, joint secretary to the treasury, 1832 . 2500
Rice, Thomas S. Cambridge, joint secretary to the treasury, 1830 . 2500

Hill, Matthew D. Hull, law courts commissioner . . £1000
Howick, viscount, Northumberland, North, under-secretary to the colonies 1500

3. Ten Members holding Offices or Pensions for life, under grants from the Crown.
Hardy, John, Bradford, chief steward of the honor of Pomfret . 19
Gross fees of stewardship, £978; net fees, £707: the difference paid to deputy.
Pepys, Charles C. Malton, king's counsel . . . nil.
Pollock, Frederick, Huntingdon, king's counsel, 1830 . nil.
Perrin, Louis, Monaghan, county, king's serjeant . . . nil.
Rolfe, Robert Monsey, Penryn, &c. king's counsel, 1832 . nil.
Spankie, Robert, Finsbury, king's serjeant, 1832 . . . nil.
Scarlett, sir James, Norwich, king's counsel, 1816 . . nil.*
Wallace, Thomas, Carlow, county, king's serjeant . . nil.
Wynn, sir W. W. Denbigh, county, steward of Broomfield and Gale; by patent 20
Colonel of Denbighshire militia, 1814, 15*s.* per day.
Wynn, Charles W. W. Montgomery, county, steward of Denbigh, by patent, 1796 30

4. One Member holding Offices under grants from the Crown or other public officers.
Brougham, James, Kendal, registrar of affidavits, 1832 . 1700
Clerk of letters patent, 1832† . . . 750

5. Four Members holding Offices for life, under appointments from the chiefs in the Courts of Justice.
Brougham, William, Southwark, master in chancery, 1831 . 4186
Spry, Samuel Thomas, Bodmin, secretary to board of gentlemen pensioners, by purchase of the patent 365
Stuart, William, Bedford, county, registrar (by deputy) of the prerogative court in Ireland, 1832 1500
Captain Bedfordshire militia.
Fitzgibbon, hon. Rich. Limerick, usher and registrar (by deputy) of affidavits in the court of chancery, Ireland, 1797 . . 3215

6. Four Members holding Pensions or Sinecures, or Offices chiefly executed by deputy under grants from the Crown by act of parliament.
Abercromby, James, Edinburgh, lord chief baron, 1832 . . 2000
Goulburn, Henry, Cambridge university, pension for life under act 57 Geo. III. c. 65 2000
Merries, John Charles, Harwich, retired allowance as commissary in chief 1350

---

* The patent contains a grant of the ancient salary, the gross amount of which is £40 a-year; the net amount £28. This was regularly paid till the year 1830 inclusive, since which the treasury have refused to comply with His Majesty's grant.
There was also an allowance of stationery and four bags annually, which was compounded for £10, the payment of which has also been refused.
The king's counsel cannot undertake the defence of any person accused and prosecuted criminally in the name of the king, without his majesty's licence, under his sign manual, for which a fee is paid to the crown of £10. The number of these licences since the time of my appointment in 1816 has been 167, amounting to £1670, which the crown has received, or to an average of £98: 10 per annum.
† The member is dead, and the offices expired Aug. 20, 1833.

Murray, John Arch. Leith, recorder of the great roll, or clerk of the pipe in the exchequer court, Scotland, 1795 . . £414

7. One Member holding the Reversion of Offices under the Crown after one or more lives, stating the office, and net proceeds at present of such office.

Sutton, Charles Manners, Cambridge university.

Contingent pension under 2 and 3 Will. IV. cap. 109, "An annuity of £4000 a-year to be paid to the right hon. Charles Manners Sutton during his life; after his decease £3000 to his heir male."

Sect. 7. "One-half of the annuity to be suspended during any period in which the right hon. Charles Manners Sutton may hereafter hold any place under his majesty, of equal or greater profit than the annuity."

Sec. 8. Proviso, "In case the heir male shall succeed to the registrar of the prerogative court of the archbishop of Canterbury, then the annuity of £3000 to cease; but if the profits of the office shall not produce the annual sum of £3000, then there shall be paid such a sum annually as will make up a clear annual income of £3000."

8. Sixty-four Officers on the Full and Half pay of the Army.

Archdall, Mervyn, Fermanagh, general, lieut.-general not having a regiment	no return
Lieutenant-governor, Isle of Wight	no return
Pension for the loss of right arm on service	£400
Ferguson, sir Ronald C. Nottingham, general, 1790, about	600
And from £400 to £500 emoluments as colonel of the 79th highlanders	450
Hope, sir Alexander, Linlithgowshire, general, 1786, pay as colonel and non-effective allowance	613
Saving on clothing uncertain, in the year 1832 it was	475
Pension for wounds	400
Lieut.-governor Chelsea Hospital, full pay	390
The lieut.-governor furnishes his apartments, and receives an allowance on that account	50
He receives a diet account of 3s. for such days as he is present in the hospital	uncertain
Byng, sir John, Poole, lieut.-general, 1793, colonel of the 29th regiment	613
Emoluments from clothing	uncertain
Appointed governor of Londonderry and Culmore in July 1832; no pay attached, having been discontinued since my appointment.	
An income about £300 from the lands of Culmore, granted by charter, and about £170 British, paid by the Irish society, by same charter is attached to this government, but I have not yet received any part of it.	300 170
Dalrymple, sir John H. Edinburghshire, lieut.-general, 1821	614
Donkin, sir Rufane S. Berwick, lieut.-general, pay as colonel	593
Non-effective allowance	20
Colonel of the 80th regiment	590
Lygon, Henry B. Worcestershire, lieut.-general, 1802, full pay £1 : 9 per diem.	
Sharpe, Mathew, Dumfries, &c. lieut.-general, 1791, £1:5s. per diem	
Vivian, sir Richard Hussey, bart., Truro, lieut.-general, 1793, pay as colonel 12th royal lancers	893
As lieut.-general in Ireland	1,388
Profits from clothing of regiment	206
As master of the royal hospital held with the command in Ireland	356

Table allowance £1,476
Allowance for forage 1832 183
Pension for wound 350
Salary as one of his Majesty's grooms of the bedchamber 356

Arbuthnot, hon. Hugh, Kincardineshire, major-general, 1796, 17s. per diem.

Dundas, hon. Robert L., Richmond, major-general, 1830, full pay 16s. per diem.

Greville, sir Charles J., Warwick, major-general, 1796, pay and allowance as colonel of the 98th regiment . . 613

Hardinge, sir H., Launceston, major-general, 1801, 17s. per diem.
Pension for loss of limb 300

Kerrison, sir Edward, bart., Eye, major-general, 1796, as colonel 19th light dragoons 891
Non-effective allowance 20
Emoluments from clothing . . . . uncertain

Manners, lord Robert, Liecestershire, major-general, £1 : 3 per diem.

Anson, hon. George, Yarmouth, lieut.-colonel . . . no return

Anson, sir George, Litchfield, lieut.-colonel, 1814, half pay . 200

Brudenell, lord, Northamptonshire, lieut.-colonel . . . no return

Cavendish, hon. Henry F. C., Derby, equerry extraordinary to his Majesty, 1831 . . . . nil

Chaplin, Thomas, Stamford, lieut.-colonel, 1811, full pay, about . 400
Pension for wounds 50

Clayton, William Robert, Marlow, lieut.-colonel, 1804, half pay . 209

Darlington, earl of, Shropshire, lieut.-colonel, 1824, half pay . 200

Davies, Thomas Henry, Worcester, lieut.-colonel, 1815, half pay . 200

Fitzroy, lord Charles, Bury St. Edmunds, lieut.-colouel, 1807, half pay 200

Grey, hon. Charles, Wycombe, lieut.-colonel, 1820, half pay . . 200

Hay, Andrew Leith, Elgin, &c. lieut.-colonel, half pay . . 200

Hill, lord Arthur, Down County, lieut.-colonel, 1833, full pay . 400

Hotham, lord, Leominster, lieut.-colonel, 1825, half pay . . 200

Peel, Jonathan, Huntingdon, lieut.-colonel, 1815, half pay . 200

O'Grady, Standish, Limerick, County, lieut.-colonel, 1811, half pay 200

Stawell, Sampson, Kinsale, lieut.-colonel, 1801 . . . 419

Torrens, Robert, Bolton, lieut.-colonel, 1796, Royal Marines, 16s. per diem.

Baring, Henry Bingham, Marlborough, major . . . no return

Beauclerk, Aubrey William, Surrey, major, 1818, half pay . . 155

Bentinck, lord George, King's Lynn, major, 1818, half pay . . 200

Keppel, hon. George, Norfolk, major, 1815, half pay . . 173

Berkeley, hon. Craven F. Cheltenham, captain, 1823 . . 315

Bernard, W. Smyth, Bandonbridge, captain, half pay . . . 127

Chichester, lord Arthuir Belfast, captain, 1827, half pay . . 209

Chetwynd, William, F. Stafford, captain, 1826, half pay . . 215

Conolly, Edward M., Donegal, captain artillery, full pay . . 200

Cooper, hon. Anthony Henry Ashley, Dorchester, captain, 1825, full pay 200

Curteis, Edward Barrett, Rye, captain, 1822, full pay . . 200

Fenton, Lewis, Huddersfield, captain, 1804, half pay . . . 127

Fitzroy, lord James, Thetford, captain, 1822, half pay . . 136

Forester, hon. G. Cecil W., Wenlock, captain, full pay . . 349

Lennox, lord Arthur, Chichester, captain, 1823, half pay . . 127

Paget, Frederick, Beaumaris, captain, 1829, full pay . . 200

Pringle, Robert, Selkirkshire, captain, 1819, half pay . . 127

Russell, lord Charles J. F., Bedfordshire, captain, 1823 . . 200

Stuart, Charles, Bute, captain, 1832, full pay . . . 127

Watson, hon. Richard, Canterbury, captain, 1817, half pay £136.
Berkeley, hon. G. C. G. F., Gloucestershire, lieutenant, 1816, half pay . . . . . 54.
Fordwich, lord, Canterbury, lieutenant, 1827, half pay, about . 42
Halford, Henry, Leicestershire, lieutenant, 1818 . . . 73
Maclachlan, Lachlan, Galway, lieutenant, 1796, half pay . . 42
M'Namara, Francis, Ennis, lieutenant, full pay . . . 118
O'Callaghan, hon. Cornelius, Tipperary, lieutenant, 1826, full pay 164
Ross, Horatio, Inverbervie, &c. lieutenant, half pay . . 54
Stanley, hon. Henry T., Preston, lieutenant, 1830, full pay . 118
Brigstock, William P., Somersetshire, cornet, 1816, half pay . 60
Powell, W. Edward, Cardiganshire, cornet . . . 33
Rider, Thomas, Kent, cornet, 1816, half pay . . . 61
Grattan, James, Wicklow, lieutenant, half pay . . . 42

9. Nineteen members on the Full and Half pay of the Navy.

Neale, sir H. B. bart., Lymington, admiral, 1832, half pay, £2. 2s. per diem.
Codrington, sir Edward, Devonport, vice-admiral, 1794, half pay, £1. 12s. 6d. per diem.
Fleming, hon. C. E., Stirlingshire, vice-admiral, 1821, half pay, £1. 12s. 6d. per diem.
Adam, Charles, Clackmannan, rear-admiral, 1825, half pay, £1. 5s. per diem.
Dundas, James W. D., Greenwich, post-captain, 1807, half pay, 12s. 6d. per diem.
Ingestre, viscount, Hertford, post-captain, 1827, half pay, £228. 2s. 6d.
Lieut.-colonel Staffordshire militia.
Troubridge, sir E. T., bart., Sandwich, naval aid-de-camp to the king, 1831, nil.
Captain, 1807, half pay, 12s. 6d. per diem.
Berkeley, Maurice F. F., Gloucester, captain, 1814, half pay, £191. 12s. 6d.
Ferguson, George, Banffshire, captain, 1805, half pay, £192 per annum.
Gordon, hon. William, Aberdeenshire, captain, 1797, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem.
Jones, Theobald, Londonderry county, captain, 1828, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem
Meynell, Henry, Lisburn, captain, 1809, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem.
Spencer, hon. Frederick, Midhurst, captain, 1822, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem.
Wemyss, James, Fife, captain, 1814, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem.
Yorke, Charles P., Cambridgeshire, captain, half pay, 10s. 6d. per diem.
Boss, John G. Northallerton, commander, 1811, half pay, £184 per annum.
Mandeville, viscount, Huntingdonshire, commander, 1822, half pay, £184 per annum.
Chichester, John P. B., Barnstaple, lieutenant, 1816, half pay, £95 per annum.
Dobbs, Conway Richard, Carrickfergus, lieutenant, 1821, half pay, £95 per annum.

10. Forty-five members in the Militia and Yeomanry.

Coote, sir Charles H., bart., Queen's County, colonel, Queen's County
Grant, hon. Francis William, Elginshire, colonel, Inverness-shire.
Lord lieutenant of Inverness-shire.
Langton, William Gore, Somersetshire, colonel, Oxford.
Lowther, hon. Henry Cecil, Westmorland, colonel, Cumberland.
Waterpark, lord, Derbyshire, colonel, Derby.
Lieut.-colonel, Staffordshire.
Wood, Thomas, Breconshire, colonel, East Middlesex.
Aid-de-camp to the king.
Brodie, William B., Salisbury, lieut.-colonel, corps of volunteer yeomanry.
Chaytor, sir William R. C., bart., Sunderland, lieut.-colonel commandant, North Riding, Yorkshire.

Eastnor, viscount, Reigate, lieut.-colonel, Herefordshire.
Lowther, lord, Westmorland, lieut.-colonel, Westmorland.
Owen, Hugh Owen, Pembroke, lieut.-colonel, Royal Pembrokeshire.
Penruddocke, John H., Wilton, lieut.-colonel commandant, Wiltshire.
Price, Richard, New Radnor, lieut.-colonel commandant, Radnorshire.
Seale, John Henry, Dartmouth, lieut.-colonel, South Devon.
Stormont, viscount, Norwich, lieut.-colonel, Stirlingshire.
Trevor, hon. George Rice, Carmarthenshire, lieut.-colonel commandant, royal Carmarthen fusileers.
Wrottesley, sir John, bart., Staffordshire, lieut.-colonel commandant, West Staffordshire.
Callander, James H., Argyleshire, major, Stirlingshire.
Duncombe, hon. William, Yorkshire, major, Third West York.
Hodges, Thomas Law, Kent, major, Kent.
Moreton, hon. Henry F. G., Gloucestershire, major, North Gloucestershire.
Tullamore, lord, Penryn, major, King's County.
Tynte, Charles Kemeys, Bridgewater, major, West Somerset yeomanry cavalry.
Maxwell, Henry, Cavan, captain commandant, Fortland yeomanry corps.
Acheson, viscount, Armagh County, captain, Armagh.
Biddulph, Robert, Hereford, captain, Denbighshire.
Cole, hon. Arthur Henry, Enniskillen, captain, Fermanagh.
Cole, viscount, Fermanagh, captain, Glenorth.
Clements, viscount, Leitrim County, captain, Prince of Wales, Donegal.
Cooper, Edward Joshua, Sligo County, captain, Sligo.
Crompton, Joshua Samuel, Ripon, captain, Second West Yorkshire.
Fellowes, hon. Newton, Devonshire, captain, East Devon.
Gore, Montague, Devizes, captain, Wilts.
Grosvenor, earl, Cheshire, captain, Royal Flintshire.
Hurst, Robert H., Horsham, captain.
Lennox, lord William Pitt, King's Lynn, captain, Royal Sussex.
Roe, James, Cashel, captain, Tipperary.
Stewart, Edward, Wigton, &c. captain, Kirkcudbright and Wigtonshire.
Stanley, Edward John, Cheshire, captain, Cheshire.
Welby, Glynne Earle, Grantham, captain, Royal South Lincoln.
Williams, Thomas Peers, Marlow, captain, Royal Anglesea infantry.
Verner, William, Armagh, captain, Ardnes corps of infantry.
Bruce, lord Ernest, Marlborough, cornet, Royal Wiltshire yeomanry.
Bulkeley, sir R. B. W., bart., Anglesea, lieutenant, Royal Anglesea.
Hornby, Edward George, Warrington, Second Royal Lancashire.

IX.—FUTURE POLICY OF THE TORIES.

THE following extracts from the speeches of the principal Tories, delivered during the two last sessions of parliament, will serve to illustrate their foreign and domestic policy—its agreement with the policy of the late Ministers, and the measures supported by the Reform Parliament. We shall begin with extracts from the speeches of the

DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Independence of Belgium.—"As to the negociations, he had no difficulty in saying that, from the moment the present government took charge of them, they might be said to have *abandoned the cause of the King of the Netherlands:* and that was an act peculiarly reprehensible in a British minister at any time, and especially in times like the present; but it was the business of a British minister to pay every attentive care to the interests of the Dutch nation. In the progress

of negociations like those, IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO IMAGINE A GREATER BLUNDER THAN THE RECOGNITION OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF BELGIUM. As soon as the case of Holland was abandoned by the British ministers, the British ministers were abandoned by three other powers; and in proof of it he might mention, that the plenipotentiaries of the three other powers were not authorized to give their approbation to the treaty of January, 1832. He would confirm that statement by what passed at the time of the ratification; for he had in his pocket a memorandum upon the subject, which would clearly prove that England and France were the powers which pushed the measure forward, while Russia, Prussia, and Austria, did not join in the attempt."—*Feb* 5, 1833.

Toleration of Missionaries.—"With respect to the resolutions which related to the moral improvement of the negro, he had an amendment to propose—namely, to omit the words "*A liberal and comprehensive system of education.*" No man could be more desirous than he was, that when the negro became free he should receive every moral improvement which could be communicated to him; but those who were aware that the words in question were introduced into the resolutions on the proposition of an honourable member of the other House, were aware that they pointed to the toleration and *encouragement of missionaries;* and there could be no doubt, if they were adopted, society in the West Indies would continue to be, as it had been, greatly disturbed."—*June* 25, 1833.

East India Company's Trade.—"From what he had then, and from what he had since seen, he must say that he thought the government of the East India Company was the best and most *purely administered* that he had ever witnessed. It was not now a question whether a chartered government was the best for carrying on the double operations of trade and goverment, or for carrying on only one of these things. He had seen the company in the days of their glory, and when it was at the head of a population of one hundred millions; and notwithstanding it had been engaged almost continually in wars, its debt was only forty millions sterling. It was, therefore, untrue to tell the people of this country that such a government was *unfit* for the purposes of government and trade, when hitherto it had united both."—*July* 5, 1833.

Reform Bill.—"I should wish to ask the noble lord (Earl Grey) how any ministry will hereafter be able to conduct the king's government with *a parliament such as will be returned by this Bill?*"

Irish Church Temporalities' Bill.—"The great object on all these occasions was to support the *Protestant* religion in Ireland. Now, if the present measure were passed, they would be contented to pass from that principle entirely. How was it consistent for Parliament with the Act of Union, which declared the two churches to be united, fresh in remembrance—to pass such a measure as this? Besides, his majesty positively swore to support the Church of England in all its rights, privileges, and immunities. He did not quote the precise words, but the meaning of the oath evidently was that his majesty was thereby bound to maintain the Protestant Church in its full powers."—*July* 11*th*, 1833.

Debate on the Address.—"He had opposed the measure regarding the West India colonies from the commencement, for he thought he foresaw great injury from it to the interests of the country, and he should be happy to find he had been misinformed and deceived on this subject." * * "A change takes place in the government of Spain, in consequence of the will of the late king; till then the undisputed successor, Don Carlos, retires into Portugal, and thus the war is encouraged and kept up. *This state of things would not continue if we were on terms of amity with Don Miguel.*" * * "A measure was brought forward last session—the municipal commission; he was bound to say that it was well worthy of their lordships' consideration, to pause and reflect ere they proceeded upon reports (i. e. those of the commissioners), when strong doubts were entertained of the legality of the commission under whose authority they were formed. But setting this consideration aside, he would make one observation which he was desirous *emphatically* to utter. He doubted, much doubted, whether it would be expedient to establish a new municipal constitution on the ten pound franchise. *He considered such to be impracticable:* and he even thought

that ministers themselves could not have that confidence in the ten pound householders as to delegate to them so great and so important a trust."—*Feb.* 4, 1834.

Cambridge Petition.—"Who and what were the Dissenters? Many of them differed but little except in one or two points of doctrine from the established church; others of them did not agree with the church of England in any one point; others denied the Trinity; and *others were* ATHEISTS: and would it, he asked, be desirable to place *such* persons in a situation to inflict injury upon the established church? * * He could not consider it to be the business of either house of parliament to interfere with the rules and regulations of other bodies, and those such corporate bodies as our universities."—*March* 21, 1834.

Admission of Dissenters into the Universities.—"When Dissenters would have gotten degrees they would in time become governors; they would hold the education of the people in their hands, and would instantly supersede the constitution which at present governed the universities. He would not then enter into the consequences which would inevitably result if such a measure were adopted, *which God forbid.* The consequences would be most disastrous. The connexion between church and state would be destroyed—the religion of the country would be menaced, nay, THE VERY EXISTENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ITSELF."—*April* 20, 1834

The Irish Church Commission.—"Was the Church Temporalities Bill, he asked, intended to be a final one? EVERY THING WAS DONE by that measure which could possibly be effective to reduce the property of the church *to the very lowest rate.*"—*June* 6, 1834.

Principle of Free Trade.—"They had heard a great deal of free trade in other countries, but in his opinion there was no such thing as a free trade at all. He therefore would be favourable to such an increase of duty on foreign silks as to give a change to the home market."—*June* 17, 1834.

The Irish Coercion Bill.—"It had been stated as a reason for abandoning the former bill, that though it might pass that house it would not pass in another place. In this opinion he could not agree, as he was satisfied that no government possessed the confidence of that other house in a *greater degree* than did the late administration (that of Earl Grey), and he was equally satisfied that notwithstanding the late resignations, the present government (that of Lord Melbourne), *possessed at this moment the same confidence there as when it was assisted by the talents and character of the noble earl on the opposite side.*"—*July* 29, 1834.

SIR ROBERT PEEL.

Malt Tax.—"With respect to the total repeal of the Malt Tax, he still adhered to the opinion he had stated in the last session—the House could not consent to such an excessive reduction of taxation, as would be implied in the repeal of the Malt Tax."—*Feb.* 27, 1834.

Pension List.—"You are now going to dry up the sources of that power of bestowing rewards for service, which was once considered essential to the well-being of the state. *I challenge you to produce the instances in which there has been a corrupt appropriation of the pension fund.* I admit that pensions have been granted as acts of royal favour, without reference to public service."—*May* 5, 1834.

LORD ABERDEEN.

Legitimacy.—"Nine-tenths of the people of Portugal were favourable to Don Miguel."

Belgian Revolution.—"The king (the Dutch king) has conducted himself above all praise, and if it please, I trust his merits will meet with due success. In truth, the cause of Holland in so just a cause, so *good a cause*, that it must prosper; and when I say the cause of Holland, I entreat your lordships to believe that I mean the cause of England also, for I consider them inseparable and identical."

X.—WHIG CLAIMS TO NATIONAL CONFIDENCE.

As we do not reckon to be bound to 'men or measures,' but try to find out and hold fast by that which is good in either, we give insertion without hesitation to the following. It is a summary of the real or supposed benefits conferred by the Reform Ministry and Reform Parliament. It is what Mrs. Austin would call a 'one-sided statement;' but as the Whigs are in trouble, and likely soon to be put on trial before the whole country, it would be unjust to suppress any evidence that could be adduced in their favour. Among their good deeds are reckoned these:—

Taken off taxes to the annual amount	£5,235,000
Lessened the annual expenses of the government	3,471,000
Lessened the number of official persons, 1858—salaries thereby saved	259,230
Abolished upwards of 2000 places—salaries saved	362,250
Reduced the salaries of the ministers, chief-justices, attorney, and solicitors general, and all salaries above £1000 per annum	199,429
Reduced salaries and allowances of ambassadors, consuls, &c.	50,525
Reduced the expenditure of the navy.	1,220,000
Two boards of stamps and taxes thrown into one, with various other economical regulations.	
House-tax	repealed.
Duty on printed cottons	repealed.
Duty on candles	repealed.
Duty on starch, stone-bottles, and sweets	repealed.
Duty on soap	reduced one-half.
Duty on slates and coal	repealed.
Duty on tiles	repealed.
Duty on hemp	reduced.
Duty on drugs	reduced.
Duty on currants and fruit	reduced.
Duty on cotton wool	reduced.
Stamps on marine insurance	reduced.
Stamps on fire assurance—farming stock	repealed.
Duty on advertisements	reduced.
Stamps on small receipts	repealed.
Land tax on personal estates	repealed.
Duty on pamphlets and almanacks	repealed.
Duty on commercial travellers	repealed.
Duty on clerks and book-keepers	repealed.
Duty on horses of clergymen and dissenting ministers—if salary under £120	repealed.
Duty on tax carts	repealed.
Duty on overseers, warehousemen, and shopmen	reduced.

The Irish church placed on a more satisfactory footing by the abolition of several useless bishopricks, and adding to the salaries of the inferior clergy.

Irish church-cess abolished.

Bill for the abolition of Irish tithe carried through the Commons but rejected by the Lords.

The Bank charter renewed on a more liberal system, a monthly report of its accounts to be made public; and to pay £120,000 a-year to the public for its pri-

vileges. Also quarterly returns from private bankers of their notes in circulation required.

The East India monopoly destroyed; all India and China thrown open to British enterprise and employment of British capital. The charter granted designated by Mr. O'Connell, 'the great charter' of the Indian people.

Negro slavery abolished.

Great and salutary changes effected in the law, particularly in the Court of Chancery, in which alone the public will save £96,000 per annum.

Established the Court of Bankruptcy, by which a vast saving of time and expense has been effected to creditors.

Established the Central Criminal Court, the jurisdiction of which extends over a population of 1,700,000, and which by monthly sessions affords facilities for the speedy trial of offenders.

Established a 'Judicial Committee' of the Privy Council for the prompt decision of appeals and admiralty causes.

Abolished the punishment of death for housebreaking, forgery, and returning from transportation.

Almost gave political existence to Scotland by new representative, corporate, and police institutions.

Laid the foundation of a new and, it is hoped, an amended system of Poor Laws, and appointed a commission of inquiry into the practicability of introducing Poor Laws into Ireland.

Commissions of inquiry appointed to inquire into the state of corporations in England and Ireland, and into the state of the churches of the two kingdoms preparatory to effective reforms.

Preserved the peace of Europe without compromising the honour or interests of the empire.

Lastly, commerce and manufactures were never more flourishing than under the late Ministry, and by negociations with France and other means attempts were being made still further to extend them.

XI.—MILITIA, YEOMANRY AND VOLUNTEERS.

Abstract of Accounts of the sums actually expended in each year, for the Militia and for the Yeomanry and Volunteer Corps of the United Kingdom, from the 1st January, 1816, to 1st January, 1834.

	Militia.	Yeomanry.
1816	£306,306	£112,598
1817	381,668	138,813
1818	365,510	118,736
1819	375,545	123,729
1820	418,537	185,479
1821	420,377	207,568
1822	340,617	184,317
1823	332,093	142,944
1824	326,901	144,514
1825	418,194	129,281
1826	359,613	162,480
1827	333,127	151,027
1828	335,516	58,715
1829	308,421	63,027
1830	243,629	70,345
1831	372,331	184,883
1832	226,840	96,482
1833	222,173	92,406
Totals . . .	£6,084,406	£2,367,348

XII.—PROPORTION OF CHURCHMEN AND DISSENTERS.

(From the *Congregational Magazine*, Dec. 1, 1834.)

A comparative view of the Hearers, Communicants, and Scholars, belonging to Churchmen, Dissenters, and Wesleyan Methodists, in 203 towns and villages of England; compiled from local returns transmitted to the Congregational Union.

	Places of Worship.	Hearers.	Communicants.	Scholars.
Dissenters	634	231701	47276	75767
Methodists	214	74897	22377	38706
Total Nonconformists	848	306598	69653	114473
Episcopalians	330	166099	9625	47247
Excess of Nonconformists ..	518	140499	60028	67226

XIII.—OBITUARY AND CORRECTIONS.

Since the publication of the last edition of *The Black Book* in 1832, the following deaths have occurred in the List of Placemen, Pensioners, and Sinecurists.

Arbuthnot, Harriet, pension on civil list . . .	£938
Bathurst, earl, teller of the exchequer . . .	2700
Birnie, sir R., chief magistrate, Bow-street . . .	1200
Bingham, major gen. sir G. R. commander, Ireland . .	1210
Blackwood, vice-admiral sir G. R, commander of the Nore, &c. .	3255
Brent, T. secretary to board of green cloth, &c. . .	1466
Clinton and Say, lord, lord of the bedchamber . . .	500
Conygham, marquis, steward of the household . .	636
Donoughmore, gen., earl of; as colonel, searcher, pensioner, &c.	5044
Fitzgerald, lord, late minister at Lisbon . . .	1700
Fitzgerald, lord Robert, pension on civil list . . .	800
Gloucester, duke of, parliamentary allowance out of the consolidated fund, exclusive of his military appointments and the allowance of the duchess . . .	14000
Grant, sir Wm., late master of the rolls	3750
Grenville, lord, auditor of the exchequer . . .	4000
Greville, Charles, comptroller in excise, &c. . .	1522
Leake, R. M., master of the report-office in Chancery, *(office abolished)*	4589
Macdonald, sir James, commissioner of India board, &c. .	1200
Mackintosh, sir James, commissioner of ditto, and pensioner of the East India Company	2400
Macleod, lieut. gen. sir John, colonel, commandant, horse-artillery and master-gunner, St. James'-park . . .	2782
Manchester, duchess dowager of, as late collector of customs .	2928
Mulgrave, countess of, pensioner on civil list . . .	800
Mulgrave, lord, general, col. of 31st foot, gov. of Scarborough, &c.	made no return.
Newcastle, Ann, duchess dowager of; resigned her pension of £800 a year on the civil list before her death	

Pell, sir A., puisne-judge, Bankrupts'-court	£2000
Penn, John, hereditary pension on consolidated fund	3000
Seymour, captain sir M., naval commissioner, Portsmouth	1100
Scott, W. H. I., son of lord Eldon; sinecures, offices, and reversion	14789
Spottiswoode—king's printer	made no return.
Tarleton, gen. sir B., as colonel, governor, and pensioner	2190
Villiers, G. W. F., commissioner of customs	1200
Wyndham, hon. P. C., West India offices and sinecures	5526
Yorke, C. P., teller of the exchequer	2700

N.B.—The hon. Charles Bathurst and James Moore, Esq., have resigned their pensions on the civil list.

Church of Ireland.—The reforms introduced and projected in the Irish church since the publication of the last edition of *the Black Book,* have been noticed at page 6 of this Appendix.

Court of Chancery.—By 2 and 3 Will. IV., c. 3, the offices of clerk or keeper of the hanaper, the patentee of the subpœna office, the registrar of affidavits, the clerk of the crown in chancery, the clerk of the patents, the clerk of the custodies of lunatics and idiots, the prothonotary of the court of chancery, the chaff wax, the sealer, the clerk of the presentations, the clerk of inrollments in bankruptcy, (subsequently reappointed,) the clerk of dispensations and faculties, and the patentee for the execution of the laws and statutes concerning bankruptcy were to cease and determine from August 20th, 1833.

By the same Act, and in lieu of the loss of patronage thereby occasioned, the retiring pension of the Lord Chancellor is augmented to £5000 per annum. For other reforms in the offices of the Court of Chancery, see 3 and 4 Will. IV. cap. 84 and cap. 94.

House of Commons.—By 4 and 5 Will. IV. cap. 70, the salary of the present speaker is continued at £6000, but on the appointment of a new speaker, salary reduced to £5000. Future secretary of the speaker to receive £500. Clerk of the House of Commons to receive £2000; clerk assistant £1500; second clerk assistant £1000; sergeant-at-arms £1500; deputy sergeant-at-arms £800. The sinecure offices of committee clerk and engrossing clerk are abolished.

THE END.

PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES.

In reply to inquiries connected with a General Election, the Author of the Black Book begs publicly to announce that he is ready to offer himself *(free of expense)* a Candidate for the representation of any City or Borough in Parliament, in opposition to a Tory or Conservative Whig; but he will not, when union is so essential, divide the reform interest,—that is, he will not weaken the popular cause by being brought forward as a *third* man, in any case, where it may endanger the return of a brother Radical, or even a Liberal Reformer. By a Liberal Reformer is meant a Reformer who has generally supported the late Ministers, and who is in favour of the Ballot, Short Parliaments, Household Suffrage, and a thorough reform of the Church and Corporations.

CHEAP WEEKLY POLITICAL PUBLICATION.

On Saturday, in the first Week of the meeting of Parliament, No. I. of a Weekly Review and Register of Politics, Literature, and Statistics,

ENTITLED

THE GOOD SENSE.

By the Author of "The Black Book," "The History of the Middle and Working Classes," &c.

The design of this new periodical work is not only to furnish a cheap weekly Review and Register of Politics, Literature, and Statistical Information, but to establish those principles of political and social ameliorarion which the Editor has inculcated in his former publications.

MARCHANT, PRINTER, INGRAM-COURT, FENCHURCH-STREET.