

THE  
**SPECTATOR**

**A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF  
NEWS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND SCIENCE.**

**VOLUME TWENTY-SECOND**

1849

**LONDON:**

PUBLISHED BY JOSEPH CLAYTON, AT 9, WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND

THE  
**Spectator**

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1849

# Debates and Proceeding in Parliament

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

THE Queen opened the session of Parliament at Westminster on Thursday, with the usual splendour of procession and state ceremony. A few hours of the morning were propitiously contrasted to the generally dull day, and served to tempt an immense concourse of spectators. The House of Lords was very early crowded with Peeresses and ladies who had obtained tickets of admission: in gorgeous and varied costume, they occupied the whole of the benches except the front row, the whole of the side-galleries, and the strangers' gallery. The Corps Diplomatique found seats behind the Bishops' gallery. The Duke of Wellington was of course one of the most punctual in his attendance: "on entering the House he conversed familiarly with a bevy of ladies, who at once surrounded him." The Archbishop of Canterbury followed; soon after, the Duke of Cambridge, announced by a flourish of trumpets, and by his own hearty salutations to all around him; then Lord Denman and the Judges.

Soon after two o'clock, the Queen entered, leaning on Prince Albert's arm; preceded by the Great Officers of State, and followed by six Pages bearing her train.

The House of Commons having been summoned, the Queen delivered the following Speech.

"My Lords and Gentlemen—The period being arrived at which the business of Parliament is usually resumed, I have called you together for the discharge of your important duties.

"It is satisfactory to me to be enabled to state that both in the North and in the South of Europe the contending parties have consented to a suspension of arms for the purpose of negotiating terms of peace.

"The hostilities carried on in the island of Sicily were attended with circumstances so revolting, that the British and French Admirals were impelled by motives of humanity to interpose, and to stop the further effusion of blood. I have availed myself of the interval thus obtained, to propose, in conjunction with France, to the King of Naples, an arrangement calculated to

produce a permanent settlement of affairs in Sicily. The negotiation on these matters is still pending.

“It has been my anxious endeavour, in offering my good offices to the various contending Powers, to prevent the extension of the calamities of war, and to lay the foundations for lasting and honourable peace. It is my constant desire to maintain with all foreign states the most friendly relations.

“As soon as the interests of the public service will permit, I shall direct the papers connected with these transactions to be laid before you.

“A rebellion of a formidable character has broken out in the Punjaub; and the Governor-General of India has been compelled, for the preservation of the peace of the country, to assemble a considerable force, which is now engaged in military operations against the insurgents. But the tranquillity of British India has not been affected by these unprovoked disturbances.

“I again commend to your attention the restrictions imposed on commerce by the Navigation-laws. If you shall find that these laws are in whole or in part unnecessary for the maintenance of our maritime power, while they fetter trade and industry, you will no doubt deem it right to repeal or modify their provisions. “Gentlemen of the House of Commons—I have directed the Estimates for the service of the year to be laid before you: they will be framed with the most anxious attention to a wise economy. The present aspect of affairs has enabled me to make large reductions on the Estimates of last year.

“My Lords and Gentlemen—I observe with satisfaction that this portion of the United Kingdom has remained tranquil amidst the convulsions which have disturbed so many parts of Europe.

“The insurrection in Ireland has not been renewed, but a spirit of disaffection still exists; and I am compelled, to my great regret, to ask for a continuance, for a limited time, of those powers which in the last session you deemed necessary for the preservation of the public tranquillity.

“I have great satisfaction in stating that commerce is reviving from those shocks which at the commencement of last session I had to deplore. The condition of the manufacturing districts is likewise more encouraging than it has been for a considerable period. It is also gratifying to me to observe that the state of the revenue is one of progressive improvement.

“I have to lament, however, that another failure in the potato crop has caused very severe distress in some parts of Ireland. The operation of the laws for the relief of the poor in Ireland will properly be a subject of your inquiry; and any measure by which those laws may be beneficially amended, and the condition of the people may be improved, will receive my cordial assent.

“It is with pride and thankfulness that I advert to the loyal spirit of my people, and that attachment to our institutions which has animated them during a period of commercial difficulty, deficient production of food, and political revolution.

“I look to the protection of Almighty God for favour in our continued progress; and I trust that you will assist me in upholding the fabric of the constitution, founded as it is upon the principles of freedom and of justice.”

The Lords resumed at five o'clock; and the Queen's Speech having again been read, Lord BRUCE moved the Address; an echo of the Speech, re-echoed by his own words. He expressed confidence, however, that Government would not propose any reduction of the military and naval force which was not justified by the state of the United Kingdom and the Continent; [at which the Marquis of LANSDOWNE cried, “Hear, hear!”] and he specially deprecated any reduction in the Artillery—a force which takes the longest time to prepare, and in some degree compensates for want of numbers in other arms. In passing, Lord Bruce paid a handsome tribute of regret to departed statesmen, —Lord George Bentinck, Mr. Charles Buller, Lord Auckland, and Lord Melbourne.

Lord BATEMAN seconded the Address, in a still closer echo.

Lord BROUGHAM plunged at once into the subjects of the Speech.

He thought that Lord Bruce had painted the improved condition of the country in colours too favourable, and that he took too rose-coloured a view of the state of the public finances. The Speech referred in terms of gratulation to the proposed large reduction in the Estimates. An agitation, to use the popular expression, has been commenced in this country, in his opinion under very unhappy auspices, with very questionable motives, and for very unquestionable objects,—namely, pernicious objects,—commencing in the West Riding of Yorkshire; passing over the county palatine of Lancaster; enthroned, as its metropolis of agitation, in the town of Liverpool; with branches, subordinate capitals of agitation, in Manchester and elsewhere; and supported by the Chartist or Radical and pseudo Economical press of the Metropolis. He found a crusade had been commenced against the landed interest; and, although a conscientious friend to free trade, he felt bound to take his stand against that agitation. He went into figures to show that land has no exemption from a due snare of public burdens. In the reign of William and Mary, personal property paid sixteen times as much as it did at present, and there had ever since been a steady and continuous reduction of the charges to which personal property was liable. Some gentlemen, indeed, denied that the land paid the bulk of the poor-rates, because they paid poor-rates upon their factories. What of that?—they paid as landowners. Suppose the rent of a

factory to be 1,000<sup>1</sup>. a year, and the profits made in that factory to be 30,000<sup>1</sup> a year, which sum formed the basis on which the poor-rates were calculated?—most assuredly the 1,000<sup>1</sup> a year. What pretence, then, was there for saying that personal property contributed to the poor-rates as largely as did the landed interest? These manufacturers perhaps did not tell the world that they manufactured other things besides cotton twist; but every one who knew anything of them well knew that they manufactured paupers—where the land produced one pauper, manufacturers created half-a-dozen.

He doubted the good faith of those who insisted on the reduction of the Army and Navy. His noble and illustrious friend the Duke of Wellington always desired to reduce the Army to the smallest possible limits that were necessary for the defence of our honour and our possessions. Now, looking at the state of Europe, Lord Brougham saw no reason whatever for saying that any large reductions in the Army or the Navy could be safely effected. Since the last meeting of Parliament there was every reason to feel that the defences of the country ought to be strengthened. From North to South—from Schleswig-Holstein to the foot of Italy—in Hungary, Croatia, Vienna, Piedmont, Venice, Sicily—there has been nothing to abate the apprehension of war. There has been not exactly a suspension of hostilities, but a suspension of warlike operations. France, no doubt, is crippled in her resources, her Government overwhelmed with embarrassments; but it does not follow that she has no mind for war. France might not on this or that particular day declare war; but still her Government might be driven by popular feeling to do things which might render war inevitable. Such things had been heard of before now as a general declaration of war against all crowned heads, and an assurance of support to all nations who might rise in opposition to their rulers. But with respect to France the question was, would the present Government last—would the existing peace remain unbroken? Within the last three weeks he had heard a member of the late Provisional Government in France say, that so far from there being any stability in the present state of things in France, there was not a Republican to be found in the whole country: therefore no one could attempt to deny the possibility of restoration giving peace to France and to Europe. That doubtless would come sooner or later, but it might be long before it came; and such was the extent of the self-conceit of mankind, such the nature and amount of human frailty, that it became no easy matter to induce a nation to retrace its footsteps, and much time might elapse before such a consummation could be brought about. Let them only look at the late Presidential election, which would perhaps give them some idea of the strength of parties in that country. One-third or one-quarter of those who returned Louis Napoleon voted also in favour of Ledru-Rollin or Raspail. They were supporters of the *Republique Rouge*, the Jacobin

Republic; they were of the same character as the men of 1792, '93, and '94: such politicians cared nothing for the state of the finances; they could resort to assignats; they could use the sponge and wipe off the national debt, and so go to war in the old manner of the earlier Republicans.

Glancing at other foreign topics, Lord Brougham declared that England was especially bound not to forget her ancient alliance with Austria, a state which had a common interest with us, and never came in conflict with us. There was also that other great empire, the impregnable position of which formed a moat valuable counterpoise to the dissemination of Republican doctrines.

He agreed to continue the new law for some time longer in Ireland; but he earnestly wished that in giving laws to Ireland they could give to that country the inestimable benefit of competent lawyers. Let their Lordships only think of putting fifteen men on their trial for an offence against a new act of Parliament without setting forth the statute which they had violated 1 It was said that the Irish Attorney-General was an Equity lawyer; but surely even in the Equity Courts it was necessary to set forth the charges against any person accused. But if the Law-officers of the Crown in Ireland had shown too little learning in one case, they had shown too much in another of these State prosecutions; for on the failure of a demurrer in a recent case tried at Dublin they had prayed for immediate judgment against the prisoner. This was to hang a man because his special-plead-er mistook the law.

He thought her Majesty's Ministers had shown wise discretion in not ringing any Io pecans upon what had happened in the Punjaub; and he could have wished that the General Officer in command of our forces there had evinced the same forbearance. When an officer in high command, copying the example of Lord Nelson, began his despatch with "It has pleased Almighty God to bless her Majesty's arms with victory," it should be a success so great that there could be no doubt about it. Doubtless they were told that good Christians would be thankful for small mercies, and that reverses even ought to be received with thankfulness, as chastenings from the Divine hand. Viewed in this light; the General in command of the British forces in the late engagement might perhaps have commenced his despatch in some such words as these—"It has pleased Almighty God to permit me to be outmanoeuvred by the enemy"; which would have been edifying indeed.

Lord BEAUMONT addressed himself particularly to correct Lord Brougham's allusions to Sicily as resembling Ireland in its political case.

Sicily has been repeatedly an independent kingdom. In 1812, when the King of Naples was a fugitive in Sicily, it was provided by the treaty between that Monarch and the British Government, that should the King of Sicily recover his Neapolitan kingdom, or acquire any other kingdom, the kingdom of Sicily

should be granted to his eldest son. In 1814 we bound ourselves to see these very principles carried out Lord Beaumont deprecated any attempt to force Austria upon Italy.

The Earl of WINCHELSEA, looking at the unprosperous state of the Colonies, at the impending agricultural distress at home, the disaffected state of Ireland, and the convulsions abroad, declared that it would be like national insanity to agree to the redaction of a single man either in the Army or the Navy.

Lord STANLEY rose to move an amendment; prefacing it with a review of the whole Speech, which he condemned as being open to criticism in every one of its paragraphs; although a Government which had been treated with no ordinary forbearance by its political opponents, during its whole tenure of office, ought to have been especially careful to avoid any observation that could provoke cavil—from all statement as to the condition of the country which could bear upon the face of it the character of exaggeration, not to say of misrepresentation.

For the first time since he had the honour of a seat in Parliament, it had not been in the power of her Majesty's Ministers to introduce that usual and ordinary paragraph, that she "continues to receive from all foreign powers assurances of their friendly relations." Among other subjects of congratulation, however, he was grateful to Ministers for the announcement in which her Majesty declares, not that she receives assurances of friendly relations from all foreign powers, but that it is the constant desire of her Majesty to maintain with all foreign states the most friendly relations; because the declaration removed from his eyes a misapprehension that the constant desire of the advisers of the Crown was *not* to maintain friendly relations with other powers, but by constant uncalled-for and mischievous interference to embroil ourselves in the affairs of every country in Europe. Lord Stanley glanced at the intervention in Spain, and its offensive retort; and asked whether Ministers continued in friendly relations with Naples, Austria, and Rome? Had they not fostered disaffection in those states, and now vainly sought to quell the spirit they had raised? "If I am not mistaken, in the course of the last session, when I ventured to express, with every respect for the motives and amiable disposition and kind feelings of the Sovereign Pontiff, my doubt whether he would be able to check the revolutionary spirit, to which, no doubt with very different and very praiseworthy feelings, he had given encouragement, I was assured, with regard to Naples, Rome, and Florence, that the intervention and advice of the noble Earl the Lord Privy Seal had been of infinite importance and use in encouraging liberal institutions, and that the Sovereign Pontiff would be able to stem any excess of public feeling if he lent himself to the advice of the noble Earl. What has



been the result of the encouragement he has given to liberal institutions fostered and supported by the Prince and the people and by the special mission of a Cabinet Minister? The consequence has been, that the head of the Roman Catholic Church, the undoubted Sovereign of the Roman territories, has been wholly unable to stem the torrent of which he broke down the dam in the xxxxxxxxxx at your advice and by your support, and at this moment he is an exile xxxxxxxxxx; and those dominions are under the control and management.

It any xxxxxxxxxx prevail, of no regular or systematic government, but of a club or association—call it as you will—the open and avowed advocates of foul and atrocious murder.” Lord Stanley repeated the objections so often urged last session as having prevented the King of Naples from quelling the rebellion and so ending disputes. He demanded more information respecting the threatened negotiations. He denied the suspension of hostilities in Lombardy.

“That this country is not engaged in hostilities with most of her allies, is attributable not to your discretion but to their wise moderation and forbearance. There is one Government—if, indeed, it can be called a Government—the Government of a great and powerful country, powerful even under all the difficulties with which it is struggling—with which, I believe, we are upon friendly terms. I will take this opportunity of repeating what I have often said—and I am sure that the sentiment will obtain the concurrence of every man here—that the continuance of a good understanding between this country and France is at all times essential to the maintenance of the peace of Europe. How is it that we have maintained friendly relations with France? Because our Government has cautiously and prudently abstained from all interference in the domestic affairs of that country—because you allowed the French to settle their own government without obtruding on them your interference, advice, and negotiations. But, though you have friendly relations with France at this moment, who can predict that for a fortnight, a week, or a day, we may be able to maintain amicable relations with them?”

He criticized the allusion to the Punjaub, which was couched in terms that excluded it from the Queen’s dominions in British India: how then is the formidable war there called a “rebellion.”

The outbreak in Ireland was suppressed by the strong arm of military force, and the storm is ready to burst forth again the moment that force is reduced. “In the face of all this, Ministers have had the confidence to place in the mouth of their Sovereign the astounding declaration that the aspect of affairs is such as to enable them to effect large reductions in the Estimates. (*Loud cries of “Hear!”*) I venture to state, openly and fearlessly, that it is not the

aspect of *affaire* abroad or in Ireland, but the aspect of affairs in another place, which has induced the Government to make reductions. I believe that they have no alternative but to do as they are ordered. (*Cheers.*) I believe it is possible to effect some reductions in the civil departments of the Army, Ordnance, and Navy. I also think that large reductions may be made by checking the abuses which exist in the administration and management of the dockyards. But the greatest security we could obtain for having the work well done in the dockyards, would be the passing of an enactment to deprive all persons employed in those yards from voting for Members of Parliament. (*Cheers.*) I have heard at least twenty naval officers express an opinion, that until persons employed in the dockyards shall be prevented from voting for Members of Parliament, it will be impossible to exercise efficient control over the work performed in those establishments. If reductions can be effected, in God's name let them be made; and, although one may wonder why such a course has been so long delayed, I will applaud the Government which shall economize without prejudice to the permanent interests of the empire. But when the country is in a position which requires that she should have all her resources and powers at hand, I cannot concur with those who, for the sake of economy, would largely diminish the naval and military forces of the country."

The Irish Poor-law is to be the subject of inquiry: if merely to revise the details of a proposition laid before it by Government, the intended Committee would meet with the candid cooperation of all parties. "But if it be the object of the Government to throw the whole question before a Committee in order that they may inquire into that which has already been inquired into *usque ad nauseam*; move particularly when there is a department of the Government actually charged with the superintendence of this law and nothing else, which is able from its position to obtain more accurate information than any Committee can; and when, too we have a Lord-Lieutenant who, I am glad to declare, discharges the duties of his high station in a praiseworthy manner to men of all parties, and willing to receive their suggestions and advice,—then I say that Ministers will shrink from the responsibility which properly belongs to them, and will betray their duty." (*Cheers.*)

He could not join in congratulating her Majesty on the state of the country. True, the panic of 1847 has passed; but Ministers were about to check the very improvement of which they boasted. The increase in the revenue last year accrued from the import-duty on foreign corn. Another significant fact in the revenue-tables is a diminution in the Property-tax to the extent of 100,000*l.*: that sum indicates a loss of British capital thirty-three times greater than itself; it follows that the country has in the last year sustained a loss of capital to the amount of 3,300,000*l.* There is little reason to boast of prosperity in

manufactures. It appears from a document issued on the authority of the Board of Trade, that in 1818 the exports of the six principal articles of British industry—namely, cotton, woollen, linen, silk, hardware, and earthenware—exhibit a diminution as compared with 1847 of no less than 4,000,000*l.* sterling, and as compared with 1846, of 5,000,200*l.* <sup>41</sup> We are accustomed to test the condition of the middle and lower classes by the amount of deposits in the savings-banks: I have conversed with several noble lords connected with different parts of the country, and they one and all declare that the withdrawal of deposits from the savings-banks during the past year has greatly exceeded that of the preceding year: in Manchester alone the excess of withdrawals has amounted to 40,000*l.* or 50,000*l.*” Ministers themselves could not deny that the agricultural and West India interests are labouring under deep depression; yet they pass by those interests. He had predicted that the imports of foreign corn would bring down British corn to 45*s.*: the price at this moment is 45*s.* and a fraction: if those prices continue, it is impossible that agriculture can be continued with profit to the farmer; and the loss must eventually fall on the labourer. Were Ministers aware, that in spite of those low prices, that were to bring universal plenty and contentment, there is, especially in the Southern counties, a larger amount of vagrancy, a greater prevalence of mendicancy, a larger number of able-bodied agricultural labourers thrown on the poor-rates, and whether the poor-rates, pressing exclusively on the land, are not becoming a more intolerable burden, than for many years? If such be the case, it is not honest to sink the fact.

Lord Stanley moved to insert at the conclusion of that paragraph which says that “the state of the revenue is one of progressive improvement,” the following words—

“We regret, however, to be compelled humbly to represent to your Majesty, that neither your Majesty’s relations with foreign powers, nor the state of the revenue, nor the condition of the commercial and manufacturing Interests, are such as to entitle us to address you in the language of congratulation; and that a large portion of the agricultural and colonial interests of the empire are labouring under a state of progressive depression, calculated to excite serious apprehension and anxiety.”

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE defended the conduct of the Government; beginning with its foreign policy.

If Lord Stanley had waited for the papers to be produced, he would have found that every one of the assertions hazarded in his speech was falsified. He too should be ready on a proper occasion to pay his tribute of admiration to men who had been successfully struggling with difficulties and had restored the glories of the Austrian army in her own dominions. In the negotiations

between the Emperor and his subjects they had not interfered: to the negotiations which they had undertaken they had been invited by the contending parties. Those negotiations, they hoped, would result in the restoration of that power, to which this country was united by the ties of an alliance which he for one should never wish to see disturbed. Lord Lansdowne repeated statements similar to those made last session, showing that Lord Palmerston had not interfered between Austria and Sardinia, or Naples and Sicily, without express invitation from both sides in either dispute.

He cited an old despatch by Lord Castlereagh, declaring that a change in the system of Sicily inimical to the freedom and happiness of the inhabitants "must be resisted"; and he explained, that in the latter stages of the Sicilian contest, the British and French Admirals had interfered to stop the most wanton and barbarous atrocities. Messina was bombarded after the white flag had been exhibited, and soldiers were landed to destroy the suburbs after the town had surrendered. The Admirals saw not merely soldiers killed, forts destroyed, houses demolished, but they saw the lame, the sick, and the infirm, taken from the hospitals and butchered; women who had taken refuge in churches were in those churches violated and murdered; and people were dragged from cottages on which the white flag was flying, and were killed upon the road near the sea-shore, or were slain in their attempts to escape; and the Admirals were prompted by feelings of humanity to interfere in order to terminate such atrocities. Sir William Barker avowed the responsibility of that intervention; but on behalf of her Majesty's Government Lord Lansdowne desired to share that responsibility.

Respecting Schleswig-Holstein, the negotiations had advanced, not speedily, but satisfactorily. By the assistance of Prussia, and by the partial intervention of Sweden, Russia, and other powers, the conflicting and difficult pretensions in which this collision originated had by degrees to a certain extent been withdrawn or disappeared; and there was every prospect that a satisfactory arrangement would be concluded.

Lord Stanley's memory had deceived him in supposing that the insult to the British representative at Madrid had not been noticed: the Spanish Minister was directed to leave the British Court.

As to the Irish Poor-law, Lord Lansdowne was decidedly of opinion that the law required some revision; and he hoped that the inquiry which it was proposed to institute on the subject would be brought to as speedy a termination as possible. Before the House adjourned, he would lay on the table a despatch from the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

The improved condition of commerce is attested by the increase in the number of cotton-mills, in the employment of hands, and in the demand for manufactures. At a future time Lord Lansdowne would lay before the House details which would show that there has been a solid improvement in the revenue independently of the corn-duties. He believed it would be found that, nutting aside the corn-duties altogether, there had been an increase of 200,000*l.* in the Customs in the course of the last year. He had been informed yesterday that there had been a considerable increase of deposits in the Westminster Provident Institution; he believed the same would be found to be the case with the savings-banks: and he sincerely trusted that the commencing prosperity, of which there were such evident signs, would be of a permanent character.

The Duke of RICHMOND hoped that Ministers would not be cowards enough to consent to reductions in the Army and the Navy on the threats of a despicable body of men. He still trusted protection would one day be the law of the land,

Earl FITZWILLIAM urged Ministers to bring in their Irish measures at once, rather than go through the delay of a Committee.

I he Earl of YARBOROUGH, though he had opposed the repeal of the Corn-laws, opposed also a return to the old system or a triennial agitation: he was sure Ministers contemplated no disrespect to the agricultural interest.

The Duke of ARGYLL defended the settlement of 1846: it had not failed; present prices were owing to the state of transition.

The Duke of WELLINGTON desired to state his reasons for voting against the amendment—

He wished that nothing should be done to throw the least difficulty or impediment in the way of her Majesty's Government in carrying on our foreign relations, or 'that any steps should be taken which could give the least ground for any belief that the responsible advisers of the Crown are not supported by the public opinion of this country. The promise to produce the documents relieved his mind from anxiety, because it afforded the best grounds for postponing these questions.

In passing, he stated that he should have moved for a document containing the declaration made by the King of the Two Sicilies in accepting that united kingdom; but the document was out of print The Duke, however, insisted that it formed as much a part of the treaty of Vienna as anything could be, and that this country is as much bound by the declaration as by any other part of that treaty.

The Lords divided: Content, for the Address as it stood, 52; Non-content, against it, 50; Ministerial majority, 2.

The House then adjourned till Monday.

In the House of Commons, after some preliminary business, the Address was proposed by Lord HARRT VANE, and seconded by Mr. EDUARD BUNBURT.

Mr. DISRAELI rose to move an amendment, the counterpart of Lord Stanley's; his speech traversing the same ground, though with considerable differences in the manner of treatment.

Condemning the unstatesmanlike conduct of Ministers in relegating the duty of amending the Irish Poor-law to the dilatory tribunal of a Parliamentary Committee, Mr. Disraeli turned upon the Irish Members, who had much to answer for. "They have to consider whether the state of Ireland is merely brought about by the present operation of the Poor-laws,—whether it may not have been in a great degree occasioned and aggravated by other measures which they supported, and by the non-adoption of other measures which they opposed; measures to which, by the by, they gave their private encouragement and offered their public opposition. Therefore, when gentlemen representing Ireland come forward and complain of the condition of Ireland, it is well that they should recollect how far they individually may be responsible for the present state of Ireland. I believe I see a gentleman opposite who represents a county in Ireland; —I read a speech of his at a county meeting the other day; I read the reasons he alleged for the present condition of Ireland, and one of the weightiest was the repeal of the Corn-law in the year of our Lord 1840. But when I referred to the list of those who voted for that repeal, I found in it the name of that worthy Knight of the Shire." Irish Members had opposed measures brought forward on that side of the House, and privately encouraged at meetings holden by the same Members. "I confess it is a subject upon which I have no inclination or heart to dwell upon the present occasion. [Here Mr. Disraeli paused a moment, apparently somewhat embarrassed by his feelings.] There was a policy once proposed in this House with respect to Ireland, which by the Irish Members was defeated, but which if it had been pursued would have produced a very different effect from what we now see in that country,—a policy which was obliged to be partially pursued even by the Government who then opposed it. The proposer of that policy is no longer among us. At a time when everything that is occurring vindicates his prescience and demands his energy, we have no longer his sagacity to guide or his courage to sustain us. In the midst of the Parliamentary strife his plume can soar no' more for us to rally round. But he has left us the legacy of heroes—the memory of his great name, and the inspiration of his great example."

Mr. Disraeli contended that the new commercial system has had a fair trial and has failed. He would not weary the House with statistics, but would give conclusions at which he had arrived from official documents, to which they could all appeal. "In the year 1847 the importations from the United States into this country were the greatest in amount upon record: there was an importation of what in the American language is called 'bread-stuffs' to so great an amount that the extra profit of the Americans upon bread-stuffs, as compared with the prices in 1848, amounted to 5,300,000*l* sterling; so that besides the ample and sufficient profit the Americans would have obtained, under any circumstances, by the prices of 1848 for example, the excess of price in 1847, in consequence of the famine of corn in Europe, gave them an extra profit of 5,300,000*l*; while, in consequence of the famine of cotton in the United States, although they sent a much less quantity than in the preceding or subsequent years, the extra profits upon cotton amounted to 3,200,000*l*.; therefore the Americans received from us an extra profit that year of 8,500,000*l*. Now, that was a year extremely favourable to commercial interchange, and therefore your two great evils of corn famine in Europe and cotton famine in America combined together to test the principles of your new commercial system with every possible advantage. The natural question is, what did the Americans take from us in exchange under these circumstances? Now, we have the complete returns upon this point before us; and I find that they took of our cotton manufactures, in round numbers, 60,000,000*l* of yards extra. Instead of 25,000,000*l* which they took from us before the change of the law, they took in 1847, under the remarkable circumstances I have stated, 85,000,000*l* of yards; an amount not equal to that which the whole Levantine market takes at the present moment. The question, therefore, for you to consider, is whether the taking 60,000,000*l* yards more of your manufactures is an equivalent exchange for the immense importations you received from and the immense price you paid to the United States. But it so happens that returns before us prove that even these 60,000,000*l* yards were not an exchange at all in reference to the operation of the new law; because it appears by American returns which I now possess, that American home manufactures were increasing at the rate of 30,000*l* bales per annum. In the year 1847, in consequence of the high price of cotton, and the commercial circumstances that allowed her to import our manufactures much cheaper than she could manufacture them herself, she used largely of our manufactures; and if you had not taken her bread-stuffs she would have imported from you a much larger amount of your goods. This is proved from the circumstance, that in 1848 she has resumed on a greater scale her own manufactures, and the excess of your manufactures imported into the United States has fallen off more than 30,000,000*l* of yards. The two famines of corn and cotton, which you say have prevented your system from having a fair

chance, combined, in fact, to give you a chance with the United States which probably you will never enjoy again." It was said by the journals, daily and weekly, that the convulsed state of the Continent was adverse to the experiment: but by the returns for 1848 it turns out that the manufacturers exported to the Continent more than in any preceding year; so that the third exceptional circumstance was favourable to the success of the system. Again, the famine in Europe kept up the high price of agricultural produce far above the general level. Fifthly, the state of the Continent poured precious metal into this country, and prevented that derangement of their distribution which had been predicted from the new system. Then why has that system failed? why is the commerce of England, notwithstanding these circumstances, in its present prostrate state? The reason is, that those countries whose products you have admitted will not take your products in exchange." He had shown the effect in the United States, in Brazil the British exports have fallen from 26,500,000 in 1835 to 18,500,000*l* in 1845; and he read a letter from Brazil showing that at the present moment the market is glutted. "While this is the state of your trade with your two favourite markets, I do not see that your position in Europe has been bettered. Russia is still hermetically sealed, and Prussia is not yet shaken. You may force markets; you may deluge markets, as I have shown you have succeeded in doing: but the only effect of attempting to struggle against these hostile tariffs is, that you exchange your own labour every year and every month for a less quantity; that you render British labour or British industry less efficient; that you degrade British labour; that you diminish the profits, and therefore must lower the wages paid in this country; and that, as the British philosophers long ago showed you, you must finally produce a state of exchange, with regard to the precious metals, most unfortunate towards this country. Therefore it is that all practical men are now of opinion that you should adopt reciprocity as the just principle of all commercial systems. That is the principle which I have always supported, and not the principle that gentlemen opposite have rather humorously imputed to me."

Touching on foreign politics, Mr. Disraeli asked where was the "suspension of arms"? Was it between his Holiness the Pope and the Prince of Canino? Was the foreign policy of this country to be dictated by a French Admiral? Who is the King of Naples"—is not the King of the Two Sicilies to be noticed?—*what* are the "negotiations" in Sicily? Has her Majesty no allies left, that the usual assurance on that head is omitted in the speech? All that portion of the Speech was vague, unsatisfactory, and obscure. Yet great changes had taken place on the Continent since Parliament was prorogued, and England had taken an active part, "Look at the state of France; look at the state of the whole centre of Europe—the fairest, the most favoured, the most civilized



countries. I find in France a Republic without Republicans, and in Germany an Empire without an Emperor. And this—this is \* progress;’ 1 (*Immense laughter and cheering.*) This is the brilliant achievement of universal suffrage—the high political consummation of the sovereignty of the people 1 Yes, these are the constitutional models, the political exemplars, which are to fashion the future free constitution of England. The scene would be one of unmingled absurdity, were not the circumstances connected with it calculated to create terror. There wanted only one ingredient in the mess to make the incantation perfectly infernal A Republic without Republicans, an Empire without an Emperor, only required mediation without an object on which to mediate, to make the saturnalia of diplomacy the orgies of politics. And we have got it.” (*Loud cheers and laughter.*)

Mr. Disraeli glanced sarcastically at the Schleswig-Holstein question, still unsettled; at that German romance the Assembly in Frankfort; at Austria, who was to have been blotted from the map, but has reerected her empire and her sovereignty in Hungary; at the Sicilian dispute: and all these would have been settled, if Denmark, Austria, and Naples, had been left alone. He should like to see the instructions given to the six successive envoys to La Plata. “I was going to say, these envoys remind me of the dynasties in *Macbeth*,<sup>1</sup> Another, and another still *succeeds*\*; but that, unfortunately, is the very thing which they don’t do.” (*Great laughter.*)

This led him to the important subject of the day. “Sir, immense changes have occurred since I last had the honour of addressing you. Empires have fallen; the Pope no longer reigns in Rome; her Majesty meets Parliament, and tacitly admits that she has no allies. But, amidst all these portentous changes, there is nothing so marvellous as the fact on which I congratulate her Majesty’s Ministers, and that is, their conversion to the principles of financial reform. The age of miracles is *not* past.” (*Laughter.*) He invited Ministers to explain this part of the address, so briefly and pithily put before the gentlemen of that House.

“I have directed the Estimates for the service of the year to be laid before you: they will be framed with the most anxious attention to a wise economy. The present aspect of affairs has enabled me to make large reductions upon the Estimates of last year.”

“Well, but the Estimates of last year were also made with every possible attention to a ‘wise economy.’ (*Laughter and cheers.*) But it is rather strange to me to be told that the present aspect of affairs has enabled the Government to make large reductions. The question naturally arises—What aspect of affairs? what has compelled them to this course? Is it what I read here—the spirit of disaffection exists in Ireland still—is that the aspect of affairs? Is it

what I read here—that a rebellion of a formidable character exists in the Punjaub—is that the aspect of affairs? (*Loud cheers.*) Is it the fact, that at this moment two millions of armed and disciplined men are moving over the face of Europe in hostile array—is that the aspect of affairs which enables her Majesty's Government to make large reductions in the Estimates of last year? When we met last year, her Majesty *had* allies, not of a doubtful character, but some of whom had been honoured guests in her own palace. Affairs on the Continent were so tranquil, that it was with some difficulty the Foreign Secretary was able to furnish his quota to the Royal Speech. There was indeed a treaty respecting the slave-trade with a South American Republic, of which not six gentlemen in the House had ever before heard That was the tranquil state of last year. The revenue of last year was not more eminently prosperous than it has been this prolific season. Trade was scarcely so brisk then as it is at present: but, over and above all other circumstances, India was settled, and as we were then informed, settled for ever; and yet Ministers then came forward, not with a reduction, but with a proposition to increase the expenditure — with a scheme not for the relief of our burdens, but with a proposal for increased taxation. How are we to reconcile this? Then there was an increase in our forces, and the Militia were to be called out. What has happened since to place us upon safer ground? I do not know that anything has occurred in Europe in which we can find that present aspect of affairs that has impelled her Majesty's Ministers into the path of financial reform; and one of my objects in rising is, if possible, to extract that instructive information from her Majesty's Government. That there should be a necessity for retrenchment, is not in the least surprising to gentlemen on our side of the House. You have been tampering with the resources of the country for many years. (*Cheers.*) It is not a year ago since one whose loss we all deplore told you, that with the changes you. have made a reduction of 25 per cent on all salaries would hardly be considered as satisfactory to the country. And independently of that, retrenchment is sure to be supported by the Tory party, because no necessary retrenchments have ever been proposed which have not received their support—faithful in that to their old traditional policy, for they were the first opposers of extravagance. But no gentleman on this side of the House will agree to a retrenchment which is not a real and a just retrenchment, adopted under a view of all the exigencies of the case, and not impelled by some mysterious influence not patent to the world. Least of all should I approve of gentlemen laying party hands upon that which is the palladium of our country—the fleet of England, which influences foreign cabinets more than any minister; or of the British regiments, which have now become as famous as the Roman legions. (*Loud cheers.*) Yet large reductions are announced in both, and that in consequence of “the present aspect of affairs.”

It surely cannot be that her Majesty's Ministers have become converts to the perpetual peace theory." (*Immense laughter.*)

Had the "budgets" recently circulated, through the country inspired any portion of this paragraph of the Speech? "One celebrated budget was proposed, some little time ago; and no sooner had this flagrant luminary overtopped the natural horizon, than in a more Northern atmosphere a parhelion appeared, which, showed its disc in somewhat mitigated splendour, and which almost raised an equal portent in the economical atmosphere." (*Cheering and laughter.*) He had no objection to these proposals for reduction; but he said to those honourable gentlemen, deduct your ten or your five millions from that immense treasure—that more than Californian gold—the hundred millions sterling annually, or the two millions a week, that was to be realized from the repeal of the Corn-laws, (*Cheers.*)

Reductions made in a rash and unauthorized manner are always followed increased expenditure. In 1835, we had a weak Government: reductions were made to satisfy a popular Cry; foreign governments, having observed that we were weakening ourselves, developed their own powers: and the expenditure was increased again. So in 1830, retrenchments by a weak Government changed the whole policy of Europe; and a hostile alliance between France and Russia against English objects was only thwarted by the French Revolution. But if the expenditure is to be regulated by the exigencies of the case, what difference is there between this year and last year? Last year we had a profound peace, with a failing revenue, drooping commerce, tranquillity in India. Now we have war, convulsion on the Continent, a reviving revenue, an active trade, and India in mutiny. He endeavoured to ascertain the truth logically by exhausting the suppositions. Did Ministers agree with the oracles of Manchester—first, that the French nation will never go to war again, in consequent of the tenure of landed property in France,—the same tenure having existed under the Consulate and the Empire? secondly, is it their opinion, that the state of Europe is a state of revolution and not of war,—Robespierre having been a professor of peace in a way that would have qualified him to be a member of the Free-trade League? thirdly, do they think that there is no fear of war because "constitutional governments" are established in Europe, and constitutional governments never go to war,—though he should like to know what constitutional governments *are* established? fourthly, that no nation will now attempt fresh conquests, because they never repay the cost of annexation,—though the conquest of Malta or Gibraltar has not precisely been a source of weakness to us, nor that of Silesia to Prussia, of Servia to Austria, of Bessarabia to Russia. Do they agree with the new doctrine of "race," its differences and inferiorities; opposed as those are to the new doctrine of "fraternity and equality"? Do they

agree that “England must be content with a less demonstration of brute force”? What is brute force? A highly-disciplined army led by an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Wellesley, is as much an exhibition of moral as of brute force. “But if, on the contrary, I find a man, with just as much facility of speech as enables him to command the attention of a multitude, haranguing great bodies of his countrymen, making inflammatory appeals to them, and stirring them up against the institutions of their country—that is what I call a demonstration of brute force—(*Cheers and laughter*)—a demonstration which I think this country would be very well content to do without, and which, if there be any sense or spirit left with men of might and leading in this country, they will endeavour to put down as an intolerable and ignominious tyranny. (*Great cheering from the Opposition benches.*) I have often observed, Sir, that the hangers-on of the new system quote with much satisfaction the words of the great Swede, <sup>1</sup> with how little wisdom the world is governed and my little experience of human life, especially within the last few years, has led me to adopt an opinion which, if not identically the same, is at least somewhat analogous. Were I blessed with offspring, I would address my son in this style—‘My son—(*Great laughter at the solemnity of the style in which Mr. Disraeli pronounced the words*)—‘ My son, you see with how much ignorance yon can agitate a nation? (*Laughter and cheering.*) Yes, but the Queen’s Ministers are truckling to those men. (“*Hear, hear!*”) That is the position of affairs. Her Majesty’s Ministers have yielded to public opinion. Public opinion on the Continent has turned out to be the voice of secret societies; Public opinion in England is the voice and clamour of organized clubs. (*Cheers.*) *er* Majesty’s Ministers have yielded to public opinion, as a tradesman who has been baffled in an overcharge yields to public opinion when he takes a lesser sum: and so the public expenditure is to be reduced in accordance with the public opinion, because there is an unholy pressure from a minority among them; and that minority has a confidence of success, because they have already beaten two Prime Ministers. “Opinion is stronger than truth,” according to Sophocles. Sir, I prefer truth, particularly in her Majesty’s Administration; and therefore I shall move an amendment.” \*\*\*

“We stand here not only to uphold the Throne, but the Empire, and to vindicate the industrial privileges of the working classes, and the reconstruction of the Colonial system. We stand here to uphold the Church, not only assailed now by appropriation-clauses but by vizared foes, and to maintain the majesty of Parliament against the Jacobin manoeuvres of Lancashire. This, Sir, is a stake, this is a cause not likely to be lost. At any rate all efforts should be made; and, for my part, I should submit to have my tongue palsied rather than counsel the people *ot* England that they should lower their tone: I would rather quit this House at once, than tell the people of

England that they overrate their position: I leave that delicate intimation to the fervent patriotism of the gentlemen of the new school. For my part, I denounce their politics, I defy their predictions; and I do so because I have faith in the people of England, in their genius, and in their destinies.”

Sir. GRATTAN moved an amendment on the paragraph relative to Ireland; proposing to substitute the following after the word “that”—.... “the disturbances in Ireland have not been renewed; but a feeling of discontent, augmented by the distresses of the people, still exists, which it will be our duty to watch, and as speedily as possible to remedy.”

In supporting this amendment, he declared that the mock insurrection was a got-up affair to put down Repeal; that there was no disaffection in Ireland; that in many districts Government relief was altogether insufficient; and that the Poor-law was destroying the virtues of the male and female population.

Mr. JOHN O’CONNELL imputed the idleness in Ireland to the sense of insecurity in the fruits of labour. He was determined to offer every obstacle to the continuance of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act.

Mr. FAGAN defended the Poor-law; but advocated candid and impartial inquiry. He complained that, though agitation had ceased, amelioration had not been substituted for coercion.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL began by expressing his sympathy with Mr. Disraeli’s regret for the loss of Lord George Bentinck, and himself paid a tribute to the memory of Mr. Charles Buller.

In defending the Ministerial policy in Ireland. Lord John asked the House to suspend its judgment until it should have Lord Clarendon’s statement before it. As to the objections urged against the Poor-law inquiry, he observed that Ministers had been accused of legislating in ignorance of Ireland; and that out of nine Members who met Mr. Grattan to consult on the Poor-law five held different opinions. Several measures of amelioration introduced last session on the franchise, the law of landlord and tenant, &c., would again be submitted to the House.

Mr. Disraeli’s statistics were unintelligible: he showed that there had been a great importation of food,—a supply which, in the deficiency of food, was desired by Protectionists as well as Free-traders. “That American growers and merchants should gain five millions of profit in the transaction, provided we had the benefit of the food for the consumption of the country, is not a subject of lamentation with me. I think it is only the natural result of commerce, and one which we are not by any means to deplore.”

Lord John had been in favour of a fixed duty on corn; “but the House not having chosen to adopt that mode—having chosen to set corn entirely free—I

hope that no attempt—above all, I hope that no successful attempt—will be made at renewing any duty upon that main article of sustenance.”

Lord John gave explanations respecting foreign transactions similar to those offered by Lord Lansdowne; with the further explanation, that the House was not now called upon to congratulate her Majesty, but simply to thank her Majesty for supplying the information; and the perfectly erroneous suppositions of Mr. Disraeli showed how hazardous it was to form an opinion before the necessary documents had been laid before the House. In this explanation Lord John Russel bore testimony to the sincerity and pacific policy of French statesmen. “Although at the commencement of the revolution there were words used in a circular of M. Lamartine which certainly appeared to many individuals dangerous to the peace of Europe, and which were made a great deal of use of—phrases and jargon about assisting a struggling nationality, which might lead to great dangers—yet, I must say, with regard to M. Lamartine, with regard to General Cavaignac, and with regard to the present French Government, and all the Governments we have had to deal with in France, they have listened fairly and frankly to all the representations we have had to make to them. They have stated what they believe to be the interest and the policy of France; and we have no reason whatever to complain, but, on the contrary, reason to rejoice that We have had to deal with men of high honour and pacific views.” (*Loud cheers.*)

With respect to the expenses of military establishments, Mr. Disraeli seemed to be hardly better informed than he was upon our foreign relations. “He seemed to suppose that we had yielded to representations which had appeared in public, addressed to the Financial Association of Liverpool, by the honourable Member for the West Riding of Yorkshire. Now, Sir, my opinion is entirely against the opinions contained in that representation.

I think, whatever deduction or augmentation you might make, to take the year 1835 or any other fixed year for many years past, and to say that you will square your estimates and fix your establishments according to the expenditure of that year, would be, with great deference to the honourable gentleman, an extremely irrational course of proceeding. (*Cheers from both sides of the House*): In the first place, it is obvious that your requirements may be very different; in the next place, any one who will look at the Finance Accounts, or the votes of the year will see that there have been some four or five millions added to our expenditure on grounds which have nothing to do with any increase of our armies. And therefore, in fact, if you take off ten millions, instead of having the same establishment, we shall have some five millions less than in 1835. Again, I am not sure that even in 1835 the establishment was fixed precisely according to the exigencies of the country. I need not touch that point, because I decline to debate the subject -altogether;

but it must be assumed by the honourable gentleman, that in 1835 there was proposed the precise estimate which ought to have been made: and then our possessions, for which we have to furnish troops, are very much increased since 1865. In one colony alone, which we have acquired since 1835, I think there were last year 1,800 men of the infantry of the Line. Of course, if you were to take the rule of 1835, you must have certain garrisons diminished below what they were in that year, in order to supply the garrisons of the new colonies you have acquired I am sure any gentleman engaged in commerce, manufactures, or fanning, would never think of adopting such a principle for the conduct of his own business. But, Sir, while I disagree with the opinions of the honourable gentleman,—and though I think there are flaws in his letter upon the subject which rather throw discredit upon his common sense, for he says that ten millions was a good sum in former years, and is sufficient for the purposes of the present; and when he speaks thus, I think it is clear that he has framed his statement, not according to what the exigencies of the public services require, but in a way which he thinks public meetings will be likely to agree with and to applaud, when they will not listen to a detailed statement by which a smaller sum might be saved, but which would be really founded upon a practical and business-like estimate of our present necessities;—at the same time, when we had to consider the question of our establishments, I think it was obvious that we could not persevere in the course we felt ourselves bound to take last year. There was then a sudden and formidable convulsion in various parts of Europe, and no one could say what might be its issue. We did not think we should be justified, under those circumstances, in proposing to diminish our expenditure. We asked for the same number of men for the Navy and Army for which we had asked at the commencement of the session, although we had not the ways and means sufficient for that establishment. The House supported us in that course; they declared, by large majorities, that it was not expedient to reduce our military establishment. But, Sir, when we had again to consider that subject—when we had again to consider the question of the Estimates exceeding the amount of our revenue, it was our duty, I think, to come to one of two conclusions,—either to reduce those Estimates, and to bring them within the amount of revenue, or, on the other hand, to attempt to raise the revenue to the level of our expenditure. It was not fitting to go on every other year increasing the public debt of the country without a prospect of the expenditure being equalized with the revenue. Now, Sir, the first course was evidently the best, supposing it to be a justifiable and practicable course. Upon that subject we had to consider, first whether there were not many reforms which might be made, many retrenchments which might be effected, without impairing the numbers and efficiency of our military establishments. The Committees which sat last year upon our Naval and Military Expenditure and for the appointment of which (not my own

original proposition, I must confess) the House is indebted to the honourable Member for Montrose—showed Uiat, as regarded the Navy at least, useful retrenchment might be made without impairing the efficiency of the service. There then was one source of economy; but that was not enough to bring our expenditure within the limits I have stated. We had then further to consider whether our effective force could be reduced. Now, in considering that subject, we had to remember, that since we had been in office we had added 3,000 men to the number voted for the Navy—we had added 5,000 men to the number voted for the Artillery. We came therefore to the conclusion, that, in the present state of Europe, we might safely make some reduction which would afford a considerable amount of saving without impairing the force below that which is necessary for the efficiency of the public service— which was necessary for the defence of our numerous colonies and possessions. Whether we have done wisely in that respect—whether the reductions that we propose come within the principle I have stated—whether we have carried them too far, or have not gone far enough—will be proper questions for this House to consider when the Estimates shall come before it, and when those of our colleagues who are charged with the various departments shall state their views of the exigencies of the service, and the sums we propose to be taken. But this I will say, that we have fixed them upon the scale of what we think will be wanted for the present year, and what we think can be spared for the force of the present year: we have not selected them with reference to any particular past year, or said that our expenditure must be squared according to the estimates of that one year.”

“The disposition of recent Governments in France to curtail enlistments and not to increase their forces, is one reason why I think it will be safe to propose no greater estimates than those we propose for the present year. And I do trust, in spite of the denunciations contained in this proposed amendment, that the various nations of Europe, however they may settle their internal affairs, will, by the progress of negotiation and in process of time, come to the conclusion that war must be injurious to them all, and that there is no cause sufficient why one State should be the aggressor against another. (*Cheers.*) If such sentiments should prevail —if each power is left to make its own arrangements with respect to its own internal constitution—then I should say that the reductions of the present year might be followed out in future years. It would be exceedingly unwise and imprudent to make any great and sudden reduction at once; but gradual reductions —reductions made with a view to what is called in the Speech a wise economy, will be a policy which, I trust, this country may be able to pursue, which would be for her own interest and for that of every country in Europe. Now, Sir, I do not contend that there is no cause for anxiety in the present state of the world. “I am far from



thinking that those revolutions which took place last year have run their course, and that each state is now in the enjoyment of assured security and tranquillity. I rejoice as much as any man that the ancient empire of Austria, an old ally of this country, should have been recovering her splendour, and should have shown her strength in so conspicuous a manner: but many questions with respect to the Austrian empire, of great difficulty—questions with respect to the internal constitution of Prussia—questions with regard to the formation of what the honourable gentleman called an empire without an emperor—are still unsettled, and we are not sure what may be the ultimate event. In fact, there has been, within the last year, first, an excessive apprehension, caused by the events which had taken place; then there has been rising up here and there some wild theory, pretending to found the happiness of a state and of mankind upon visionary maxims and unsound speculations, which can never secure the welfare of any state or country. We have, indeed, seen that those hopes were unwise, and that the issue did not answer the expectations which had been formed in the case of many countries of Europe. No one could say that events might not, at some unforeseen moment, take a course unpropitious for the maintenance of European peace. But still I do think that the time which has elapsed since the first outbreak of these revolutions has tended to make men consider more soberly what is the value of real freedom, and what is the value of peace in the world, to be set against political change, and how much may be sacrificed, and ought to be sacrificed.

“In the mean time, Sir, I do appeal against this proposed disarmament, not by any carping at the particular terms which may be used, nor by going into a minute defence of every act of the Government, but as feeling generally what has been happening around us, and what is our present state. We have gone through a commercial convulsion, arising chiefly from a wild spirit of speculation. Is our trade at the present moment shaken to the dust, or is it true that it is reviving? Is it true or not that it is assuming a healthy tone, and may we not hope that it will take its usual course to a state of restored prosperity? We have put down what, in spite of the honourable Member for Meath, I must call an insurrection in Ireland: tranquillity. Into been restored. Has this object been effected by any sanguinary measures? has it been restored by arming one class of the population against another/and by fixing upon Ireland a permanent state of civil war, which would be incalculably worse than a transitory insurrection? I reply boldly that it has not. I reply, that my noble friend at the head of the Government of Ireland should vigour and energy; he showed also that which is still more rare than vigour and energy—he showed singular judgment, tempera, forbear and he showed himself averse from the first to anything like setting class against class, or the

infliction of sanguinary punishments. Well, Sir, I say again, this country has been menaced by those who, as in other countries, would, for the sake of plunder, have disturbed the whole order of society. I ask, have not they been defeated in their machinations? have not they been defeated by the usual exercise of law, as regular, and at the same time as firm and merciful in its proceedings, as was consistent with the constitution of this country? (*Cheers.*) I ask, has this country been involved in foreign hostilities—has there ever been any danger of it? Has not peace in Europe been preserved by this country; and as regards other powers, have we not shown our disposition at least to guarantee terms which would be honourable to the contending parties, rather than to mix in the fray and excite those various powers to conflict and war. (*Cheers.*) If I can say that these things are true,—if I am not to be contradicted as to the facts, admitting as I do that with respect to the greater portion of them the highest praise is to be given to the energies, the prudence, and the wisdom of this mighty people,—yet I do say, if such be the results, that the Government which has been at the head of affairs at least deserves this, not to be condemned on the first night of a session.”

Mr. EDMUND BURKE ROCHE disapproved of any proposals to limit the area of poor-law taxation in Ireland, or to make a more stringent law of settlement. The true cheap government for Ireland would be, to do her justice, and develop her industrial resources.

Mr. HUME would at that hour only notice some omissions in the Speech.

Government had promised him that during the recess they would consider measures for equalizing and lightening the burdens of taxation: yet the subject was not even mooted in the Speech or the Address. Was there to be any investigation into the taxation of the country? In reference to Mr. Disraeli's protest against concessions on the point of popular representation, he asked if Ministers meant to take their stand on the present representation, and refuse all concessions? He wished also to know what are the views of the Government on the subject of our Colonies; the late management of some of which had been most disgraceful. Not one of the acts which had driven the Americans to rebellion had been characterized by half the atrocity and tyranny of the arbitrary proceedings which had taken place in British Guiana and Ceylon. (*“Hear, hear!”*) He considered that the noble Earl at the head of the Colonies had forfeited every claim to support, and that her Majesty's Government should at once remove him. (*Cheers.*)

The House divided on Mr. Grattan's amendment; and it was negatived by 200 to 12. The debate on Mr. Disraeli's amendment was adjourned.

NEW WRITS were ordered, on Thursday, for Portsmouth, (in the room of Sir Francis Baring); Kingston-upon-Hull, (Mr. Matthew Talbot Baines, appointed to office); Leominster, (Mr. Henry Barkly, appointed Governor of Guiana); Bolton, (Dr. John Bowring, appointed Consul at Canton); South Devon, (Lord Courtenay, appointed to office).

NOTICES OF MOTION were given in great plenty on Thursday: we have only space, however, to note the more important.

Sir GEORGE GRET—Bill for the continuance of the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Acts in Ireland for a limited time. *Tuesday*, 6th February.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—Vote for Irish Distress. *Wednesday*, 7th February.

Sir WILLIAM SOMERVILLE—Bill to amend the laws which regulate the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters In Ireland. *Friday*, 9th February.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—Select Committee ou Army and Ordnance. *Friday*, 9th February.

Mr. LABOUCHERE—Committee of the whole House on the Navigation-laws. *Monday*. 12th February.

Mr. BAILLIE—Select Committee on Grievances complained of In Crown Colonies of Ceylon, British Guiana, and Mauritius, and report on measures for better administration and government of those dependencies. *Tuesday*, 13th February.

Mr. FEARGUS O'CONNOR—Select Committee on the Legislative Union between England and Ireland. *Thursday*, 15th February.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL—Committee of the whole House, with a call of Members, on the Condition of Ireland, unless Ministers first announce large measures of relief. *Thursday*, 15th February.