

# CONSTITUTIONAL REFLECTIONS

ON THE

## PRESENT ASPECTS

OF

## PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

BY

AUGUSTUS SMITH, ESQ.,

LATE M.P. FOR TRURO.

---

LONDON:

EDWARD STANFORD, 6, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

1866.

---

*Price One Shilling and Sixpence.*



## CONSTITUTIONAL REFLECTIONS.

---

THREE successive Parliaments have occupied themselves in a vain endeavour to settle and reconstruct their own body, and three successive Governments have introduced three several measures to the House of Commons for their consideration, digestion, and acceptance. All these three well-intentioned attempts have, however, come to nought; the causes of which are variously explained according to the views, interests, and principles of different parties. One point however is clear, that neither of these measures were really acceptable to the country, and that it was therefore the Country, of which Parliament is but the mirror, which refused that decided assent, without which no great measure of change in the Constitution—passed in confidence as to the grounds on which such may be called for, and as to results, if passed—can be expected or ought to receive legislative sanction.

The fact is the nation has by no means arrived at any definite conclusions, as to what it wants as respects what is called Parliamentary Reform, and is still more uncertain as to the mode in which any objects, in themselves desirable on that head, should be brought about. The several measures, introduced

of late years, were much too crude—both as to principles and construction—to satisfy the intelligence and convictions of the country, or they had not fallen through as they did. The country, though willing enough to improve and repair and amend the Constitution, has not only no desire, but will not tolerate even the risk of bringing such about by organic changes of a doubtful tendency. The people of this country,—taking the term people in a very wide sense,—are not yet satisfied that the Constitution of the United States is better than that of the parent land of that energetic Republic. The one as to practical experience is not yet, as everybody knows, a century old, while the other may fairly reckon a matured existence of six centuries, and during the last two of these centuries a practical working of its system affording the best proof of its fundamental excellence. Any reflective mind cannot moreover forget that the circumstances of a growing nation,—receiving vast annual additions by emigration, with a territory of unlimited expanse,—compared with the confined and sea-bound country of an ancient people, that from the earliest period of their existence, have overspread and replenished its narrow boundaries, are so entirely unlike, that however admirable the form of Government might be for the one in its early simple relations, it would by no means fit with equal benefit the fixed and complicated interests of the other.

Whatever may have been the causes of failure, the agitation however of this question of Reform has been the bane of three successive Parliaments, diverting their attention from their proper duties—(very much to the satisfaction of the official class—) but very much to the dissatisfaction of the public as damaging to their interests, and to the character moreover of Parliament itself. This latter consideration may not be ungrateful to the advocates of despotism, of Princes and Democrats, who have an innate and universal aversion to the successful, intelligent, and rational freedom of our Parliamentary Government, and who would willingly see it put on trial by any change, which might chance to weaken its authority or jeopardy its existence.

Before then any further attempt is made to introduce another Reform Bill, it were well the principles on which such ought to be founded, should be somewhat more attentively studied than has been the fashion of late, and which if possible should be fully ascertained, so that the Country, Parliament, and the Government may be in accord upon these, before the work of reconstruction is attempted.

The principles of the great Reform Bill were so clear, and the objects so plain, that no mistake could exist in the minds of our political parties as to what results were intended, however much they might differ as to the wisdom of these and of the measure itself.

The first and main object of this great Consti-

tutional Act was the doing away with what were termed Rotten Boroughs—rotten as being subject to individual nomination, or in the hands of small bodies, utterly insignificant as to any interest they possessed in the country. This may be described as the machinery or material body of the measure. The second and next object was to secure the electoral power being exercised by the whole real intelligence, independence, and property of the country. This was the soul or political vitality intended. This second object was certainly in a great measure effected, though the first was in many instances but imperfectly carried out, and various measures have consequently been from time to time proposed with a view to amend what was deficient in this respect, but unfortunately with a tendency at the same time rather to deteriorate than to improve the other. All these Reform measures, particularly the last three attempts, thus deranged without settling and completing the work of the great Reform Bill, and consequently the natural instinct of the country rejected their adoption. All the nomination Boroughs, by the two first of these late measures more especially, remained to all intents and purposes as much of that character as ever by any redistribution of seats proposed, while the Franchise alterations would have produced an electoral body, less intelligent, less independent, less definite as to interests, and less substantial as to property, than what had been contributed by the law passed under Earl Grey's government.

These measures gave rise to a suspicion that there was something like a compact between our great territorial and our great factory lords, by which such places as Launceston, Calne, Tavistock, Eye, Arundel, Thirsk, Morpeth, &c., &c., were spared, while many minor independent Boroughs were curtailed as to their share in the representation for the benefit of larger and hitherto unrepresented towns. The latter magnates to be sure were wise in their generation in assenting to such an arrangement, as it so far gave them additional power to annihilate these pet pocket boroughs at some future period through the large increase of those connected with the great factory interest, the centres no doubt of great masses of population, but still in their interests very similar and identical.

No political term has perhaps been more abused and divested of its real meaning than that of Reform. This of late has been used as if it referred solely to Parliament. Now when the standard of Reform was first raised, it was rather in reference to the various administrative departments of Government, and the various civil, municipal, corporate, and judicial institutions in the land, and the laws and powers by which they were worked, that the cry of Reform arose, and it was because at length a conviction took possession of men's minds that these could not be effected without a reconstruction of the machinery itself, that Reform of Parliament became the great and paramount political question

of the day. Parliamentary Reform was called for as a means to an end, not as the end itself. As a machinery for working great practical changes of administrative amelioration in all the varied branches of the executive, whether vested in what is chiefly regarded as the government of the country, or such as was carried out under various local institutions by the people themselves. But there is something quite senseless, not to say childish, in constantly taking to pieces and reconstructing this machinery, instead of using it for the purposes for which it has been created. Any branch of industry, such as a mine for instance, in which the means of working was made of more concern than the staple to be worked, would very soon come to grief, and be *knacked*, as it is expressed in Cornwall, to the loss of the adventurers. To revise and make perfect machinery from time to time is one thing, so long as its fundamental principles, laws, and purposes, are ever kept in view, but under pretence of such revision constantly to stop its action for the introduction of organic changes of mere theoretical pretension, simply amounts to the creating of a perennial existence of revolution, which the good sense of Englishmen abhors as much as nature does a vacuum, and will not willingly accept unless it is very clearly made manifest what are the purposes intended, and as clearly the means by which the same are to be accomplished.

Hypocrisy has unfortunately more or less beset

the whole of this question in all its relations. Whether we examine the aims intended, the purposes of parties—the objects of individuals—the interests of classes—the means proposed and the results expected—we find declarations, speeches and votes, the language of the hustings, the platform, or the benches, all more or less tinctured with forced, shy, trimming, disingenuous expressions, reminding one too much of the adage that words were intended to disguise the thoughts. It is full time then that the foundations of the question should be more severely investigated than has hitherto been practised, and that before an operation is performed its necessity to save the body should be first proved, as well as its certainty as a remedy: and if the amputation of a limb is really essential there is no occasion to run any risk by undue haste, and to treat the nation in the same way as was found necessary in the case of King Charles, and select the head as that limb, however effectual the removal of that might doubtless prove for all imaginable ailments.

The old and fundamental principle of the Constitution was *the representation of interests*, but our modern statesmen tell us that the franchise is not a right conferred as a privilege with reference to general or special interests, but a personal and individual fundamental right, that “Every man who is not  
“presumably incapacitated by some consideration of  
“personal unfitness, or of political danger is *morally*  
“entitled to come within the pale of the Constitu-

“tion.” This new doctrine to be sure is somewhat hazy in its terms, and qualified by such a cloud of possible exceptions, that when the facts come to be determined on which they rest, it may be very problematical what residuum of political right would ultimately be left to which every man is *morally* entitled—and it is certainly a novel doctrine that the exercise of the electoral franchise is necessary to secure the being within the pale of the Constitution.\*

\* The real meaning of being within the pale of the Constitution may be collected from a work “Seasonable reflections on dissolving Corporations,” which appears among the Somers’ Tracts by Sir Robert Atkins, a learned lawyer and great assertor of liberty. Speaking of the Constitution of England, which he reckons the happiest in the world, he says, “As the subjects of the King are born to lands and other things, so are they born to inherit and enjoy the laws of this realm, that so every man may have an equal benefit by law : it is therefore common right, and is a greater inheritance to every man, than that which descends to him as heir from his parents, because thereby his goods, lands, wife, children, his body, life, honour and estimation are protected from injury and wrong.” It was a subsequent passage in this tract, which explains the views of Lord Somers, quoted by Mr. Bright as an authority in favour at least of Household if not of Manhood Suffrage.

Speaking of the surrenders of the Charters and Corporations Sir Robert writes : “Such surrender is, first, against the law of nature, &c. ; second, against the law of God, &c. ; third, against the law of the land, in that it destroys *the natural right of every free-born subject of England to make free election of members to serve in Parliament.* . . . Even in the hottest and maddest of times . . . they never were so extravagant as to suppose they had such a power to destroy the

That the whole of the community, with the exception of those who are voters, are to be considered as outside the pale of the Constitution is miserable nonsense to be enunciated by an English statesman, and it might just as well be said such persons were not Britons or subjects of Queen Victoria. This new doctrine savours much of the American Declaration, which grandiloquently announces to be self-evident as truths—

“ That all men are created equal, and that all are  
 “ endowed with certain inalienable rights, viz. Life,  
 “ Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

How far the American Constitution practically worked out equality proclaimed by this declaration, the social and political position of five millions of persons, with a darker shade of skin than is thought proper, has curiously illustrated. The English Constitution however has never claimed any such philosophical principles for its basis, or proclaimed any

“ being of Corporations . . . Such judgment would unhinge  
 “ the whole frame of our admirable Government, make it an  
 “ *imperium plane despoticum*. And so we should either have no  
 “ Parliament at all, that is to say, so chosen by the people as  
 “ they ought, and of old times have been *accustomed*. . . .”

The terms here used are evidently no authority for universal manhood, or even household suffrage,—questions never mooted in those days,—but only to the right of every *free-born*—(a term here used clearly as marking a difference to those who were not so born)—to exercise his right as an elector according to the terms of the charter of his Borough as of old times had been *accustomed*.

fundamental rights as belonging to individuals, but practically treated all such rights as privileges conferred on individuals on account of general or special interests. Proof of the existence of these, and the fitness of parties to be entrusted therewith, have always been required as necessary. The first and governing principle as to representation the Constitution has always regarded as *one of interests*, not one of numbers, much less of classes, as antagonistic to each other, on which Mr. Bright solely relies in his advocacy of what he calls Parliamentary Reform.

The nebulous axiom above referred to, enunciated now for the first time by any British statesmen, requires to be resolved for examination into some fixed propositions. Mr. Gladstone, in his summary of these, asks "What are the qualities which fit a man for the Franchise?" To which he answers, "Self-command—self-control—respect for order—patience under suffering—confidence in the law—regard for superiors"—but makes no mention of intelligence, or knowledge, or independence of means, which have hitherto been considered as the qualifications more essential, if not absolutely indispensable, before any claim for admission to the franchise could be allowed, and more likely to test whether a man was "presumably incapacitated by personal unfitness," as well as the question of political danger, than all the self-excellencies as to mind, demeanour and conduct, which are so gratuitously and presumably taken for

granted. These specifications as to the requisite qualifications for the franchise are somewhat singular, as not very capable of proof, which the more tangible merits of intelligence, and knowledge, and independence so readily afford.

On the points of intelligence and knowledge Mr. Bright has frequently admitted that they do not already exist to the extent they ought, while his description of the working classes is not very hopeful that such qualities would amount to much, even when the State has provided for them that system of education which he maintains they have a right to receive at its hands free of all cost to themselves. Their state as to intelligence he thus describes in one of his speeches in the House of Commons, where his statements are somewhat nearer the truth than often is characteristic of those made on the provincial platform. "The working classes are not like members of this House, and some million people in the country, who have a little time to spare morning and evening, and a good many who have time during the day. They work from six in the morning till six in the evening, and sometimes later. They have not the time,—except when they are out of work and when they are in great distress,—they have not the time to make great political demonstrations."

Now, if they have no time for political demonstrations, occupied as that time is, and thus very truly described, it must be evident their opportunities for

acquiring political knowledge, or knowledge of any kind, must necessarily be of a very scanty description, and not a day passes without melancholy proofs of this, as experienced by every one in the daily routine of life, and as chronicled in the columns of the daily press, in spite of the apocryphal virtues so glaringly given them, without a particle of shade, by Mr. Gladstone's oratorical brush. These to be sure are curiously illustrated by their strikes and combinations in respect of wages;—the tyranny with which they enforce their opinions and schemes on others, and the terrorism of a most fiendish spirit, employed to control all who do not at once willingly join their array;—by the ignorance displayed as to all the real economical laws which regulate both wages and the employment of capital;—by the zeal with which large sections advocate extreme legislative measures, such, for instance, as the Permissive Bill; or rush into such religious extravagances as Mormonism; and other fanatical delusions; or by the narrow views, which almost universally prevail among them, favouring the doctrines of protection in trade in antagonism to those of free-trade; equality in the rate of wages without reference to skill: limiting the time for any man's industry; restricting the implements and tools to be used, and the mode of using them. If anything more was wanting on authority as to the state of knowledge to be found among the working classes, that of Mr. Goschen, when presiding lately at a meeting of the Halifax Mechanics' In-

stitute,—while it very rationally accounts for,—fully admits the unsatisfactory results of such institutions, and that though their animal spirits may not have deteriorated, mental work is not as fashionable as it was a very few years back among the mechanic class. As late as 1864 it further appears one-fourth of those who signed the Marriage Register were marksmen.

Now, if such are the claims for admission of the working classes to the franchise on the score of intelligence and knowledge, those founded on their stake in the country through property, and on that independence usually considered to arise therefrom, will still less bear the test of examination. Various calculations have recently appeared, and excited some interest and discussion, as to the income of the working classes, and have been given to the public apparently on the presumption that such an amount of income ought to entitle the recipients to the franchise privilege. This was put by Mr. Gladstone at £250,000,000, while Mr. Bass declared it more likely to be £350,000,000. Dr. Leoni Levi, however, on a closer examination of the subject, (and the data on which his calculations are based are very fully and clearly given)—enlarges this amount to £418,300,000, described further as being shared by 10,697,000 persons, of whom 5,523,000 are reckoned to be between the ages of 20 and 60, giving a general average to each person of 22s 6d in England,

20s 6d in Scotland, and 14s 6d in Ireland. This income it must be hereby remarked is untaxed, and if any abstract principle is admitted to be proclaimed by the Constitution, it is that of "*no taxation without representation.*" The converse ought therefore equally to hold good, that no untaxed income has a claim on the representation, or if preferred it must be equally granted, that all incomes, on account of which the franchise is conferred, ought to be brought within the sphere of taxation. The taxed income of the country be it observed is returned at £326,700,000 which is calculated to be less than one-third of the whole income of the kingdom, which ought to be brought under that charge.

The amount of this income charged under Schedule D on persons in trades, professions or general occupations, is £110,100,000, and the number of persons paying the same amounts to 350,000, giving an average income to each of about £314. The total number of persons paying income tax altogether under the several schedules being deducted from the total number of electors, 1,056,664, it appears there are a very large body of persons in the enjoyment of the electoral franchise already, who are not contributors to this tax. If to these unincome-taxed electors we add some three or four million of persons, through household suffrage, or even one million of persons through a reduction of the rate of house franchise, the swamping so entirely the present

body of direct tax-paying electors could only be tolerated and justified by making the payment of income tax as the least condition which ought to accompany the privilege. In the clamour for privilege equality however raised by Messrs. Bright, Foster, and Beales, or even Mr. Mill, not one word is ever said about tax equality, or is the measure ever recommended as one that would greatly assist the national exchequer.

But after all, if the income of the working classes reaches the vast sum of £418,000,000, it may be asked from whence is it derived, or can it be fairly likened as interest like other incomes arising for the most part by the employment of capital already accumulated? Wages arise almost entirely from labour alone, being more or less according to the skill with which that labour is exercised, and, unlike the profits of trade, professions, &c., require no outlay of capital on the part of the owner. This at once stirs up the great question which causes so much discussion and so many difficulties in these days, of the relative values of labour and capital, which it is the fashion of certain political agitators to represent as antagonistic, just as they insist the interests of different classes are also at variance. Capital, like the talent laid up in the napkin, may often maintain a dormant existence without labour; but labour without the agency of capital perishes. Capital may then be said to be the mother of labour. None are therefore so much interested

in the creation and accumulation of capital as the owners of labour. The larger the one the greater will be the demand for the latter, and consequently, the higher by competition will be the wages of labour. The fatter the goose the more plentiful and richer will be the supply of golden eggs to be divided as food among the multitude; whereas the operation of strikes and combinations is to lessen the power of laying eggs at all, in the greed that demands a larger share than the layer can afford.

But these working classes, who pay no tax on this large income now attributed to them,\* are equally freed from various other taxes, and what they do pay is contributed *indirectly*, so as not to come home to them in that wholesome form, which ought to be felt by every one who is admitted to the electoral privilege, if the chief object and purpose of the parliamentary machinery is duly kept in view. Out of the odd £70,000,000 annually raised by taxation it is difficult to assign at the outside more than £20,000,000 as indirectly falling on the the working classes, and this share comes under the two heads of Customs and Excise. With the other branches of taxation they have little or no concern. Besides, many articles included in the Customs and Excise, such as wine, excise licenses and others, the revenue

\* How far Mr. Leoni Levi's recent calculations are to be depended on seems to require more accurate proof than the public are yet in possession of, as not longer ago than 1860 he set them at but £144,000,000. See a very able letter on the subject by Mr. Baxter, in the *Times* in October last.

derived from the assessed and land taxes and stamps fall exclusively on those classes, who are above the working classes, as does the greater portion of the Post Office revenue. This last, however, contributes little or rather less than nothing to the expenditure and maintenance of the State, if the cost of the Packet service is taken into account; while the modern system under which that department is administered, particularly in these days of emigration, savings banks and annuities, confers on the working classes the greatest possible boons, and is worked under the two latter heads exclusively for their advantage. Be it remembered, this system originated with a Government in which they are said to have little or no share, and which for their welfare and interest is described to have no sympathy.

But if the working classes feel so little the pressure of taxation, they are much interested as recipients in a very large proportion of the expenditure. If the upper and middle classes in the higher offices of the State, and the various civil and military administrative departments, are ever striving to appropriate to themselves the plums of pay, profits and pensions, which place in this country so liberally provides; the working classes divide—(which according to the new doctrine would be characterised as their income)—the larger sums which figure in the various estimates for the national expenditure. Pay for soldiers and sailors, provisions and clothing for

the same, wages of shipwrights and mechanics, the labour cost for buildings, docks, and fortifications, the pay of customs and excise officers, letter-carriers and policemen, are distributed as crumbs innumerable in which the beneficial interest is eagerly sought after by the working classes, and of which the tangible tokens penetrate their pockets by direct money payments, weekly and monthly, with often a very light return in the shape of work. So largely are these classes now interested in the expenditure of the country, any influence they might exercise in Parliament through a more extended participation in the elective franchise, would be little likely to operate as an economical check on the modern tendency to extravagance of our administrative officials. As it is now, Members are more frequently in the habit of getting up in the House to complain of the low rate at which certain parties are paid, than of their receiving a too liberal allowance. The Members for the Dockyard Boroughs are quite incorrigible on this head, especially if of a professional caste themselves. The indifference of the working classes to economy is well exemplified by the working of a low municipal franchise in many corporate towns. The owners of little or nothing are apt to be careless and generous when dealing with the means of others.

But if the working classes are thus directly interested in the ordinary expenditure of the taxes to which they contribute so little, it should further be

borne in mind that certain portions of the expenditure of the country is incurred in great measure on account of their very existence. The million expended on education is expressly laid out for their benefit, to which sum more than equal is raised by subscription from those classes with whom they are so constantly taught their interests are altogether antagonistic. It must further be remembered that among the working classes are unfortunately to be found those sections of society, who are alike dangerous to themselves and all the other various grades of the community, and against whom every state must necessarily provide protection. Our vast judicial, magisterial, police, prison, and convict establishments would be very slender and inexpensive but for the existence of those weak portions of mankind, which are found with but few exceptions among the classes who look for their subsistence to the wages of daily labour. It is not only the large outlays which are thus occasioned from the imperial revenues, but the larger portion of the local taxation of the country is rendered necessary to meet the same evils for the protection of society at large. The eight millions annually raised as poor rates are a charge on the capital of the country for the benefit of those whose only property is their labour. There are also innumerable institutions chiefly supported by the voluntary subscriptions of other classes, to which, though almost exclusively for their benefit, artisans, mechanics and labourers contribute little or

nothing, nor could they be expected to do so from their means, except to a very limited amount. Hospitals, asylums, public parks, and various literary, educational and charitable institutions lift their heads through the land, and if they speak well for the liberality, more commonly arise from a really kind feeling on the part of those blest with the harvest of capital to provide for the wants to which labour must inevitably be exposed under the vicissitudes and conditions of its existence.

In a full and thorough investigation of this subject, facts such as these cannot be ignored, and are certainly not mentioned in an offensive spirit towards the working classes; but it would be dishonest to shirk the truth, however ungrateful it may be to some. The hypocrisy which deals in nothing but laudations of the working classes, and prompts gentlemen, striking their hands upon their breast, to talk so much fustian about the honest heart covered by the fustian jacket, is a disgrace to our would-be political Gamaliels, and symptomatic of a moral cowardice which does not speak very well for the honesty, intelligence, and independence of some of our high-flying senators. It may be considered very prudent, if prudence has any fellowship with cringing meanness. There is reason to believe, however, the working classes are intelligent and shrewd enough to see through and appreciate at their true worth the panegyrics of these frothy flatterers. They are generally too sensible of, and

willing enough to acknowledge, the unfavourable features which too often belong to and disfigure so many individuals among their class, and perhaps equally ready to excuse and extenuate them as evils of necessity belonging to the circumstances of their existence. Having ever taken a lively interest in their welfare, and endeavoured—though perhaps somewhat in a limited sphere—to do what I could for their general improvement, and social comfort and advancement—I should be heartily ashamed of myself did I ascribe to them, as a body, virtues and excellences, which are but imperfectly developed and practised among them. I should feel I was not that real friend which I claim to be to them, by word and deed, did I set up to be their chronic flatterer ; to be to them a mere prophet of smooth things, and speak only to make things pleasant. Looking to the circumstances in which the larger portion of the working classes are born, bred, and reared from their earliest days ; the continuous struggle for sheer existence to which their exertions must be ever directed, and their whole life absorbed ; the temptations to which they are constantly exposed ; the facilities to vice with which their mode of living necessarily familiarises them ; the ignorance, as exhibited by their prevalent prejudices and superstitions which, except as to their particular calling, pervades their class on all general subjects, and the limited opportunities as to means, and still more as

to time, which are at their command to lessen its disadvantages,—one may well wonder, bearing all these considerations in mind, that the working classes, as a body, are not worse than they are, and that so many excellencies, sound qualities of head and heart, so much practical intelligence and often knowledge, such patience and charity, such sobriety and honesty, should distinguish so large a portion of the individuals which constitute the masses who, numerically, are the bulk of the nation. But we must deal with them as we find them, and while appreciating their merits not be unmindful of those failings which appertain to them as a body, and against which it is but common prudence to guard as well for their own welfare as the general interests of society.

Legislation, as exercised by the predominant and selfish classes who now control it, is again very often directed towards the care of the excluded classes in matters about which they are themselves often indifferent, and would rather not receive the protection afforded. Thus almost an army of inspectors are provided to watch over factories, mills, mines, and various sanitary works.

If there has been any partiality in our Legislative course, it has always been to favour the working classes, and frequently on the professed principle that population was the main strength of the nation, which was a received political axiom till experience

proved that population, like everything else which is forced and favoured in its growth by protection, becomes an evil and a burthen. Their interests then have been rather studied than neglected by the Legislature as at present constituted, and there is no reason for the change clamoured for by Messrs. Bright, Beales, Foster, and others, in order that their welfare may be more actively secured. As a sample of Mr. Bright's belief or assertions in this respect, made either through sheer ignorance or malice prepense, we find him writing (Oct. 1859) to Rochdale thus:—"Our rich class is the richest in Europe. The administration of the country is in its hands, and a greater proportion of the heaviest taxation in the world is thrown upon the class possessing no property but its labour and wages, than is the case in any other country with whose system of taxation we are acquainted."

The recklessness of such a statement is astounding, and though time after time and fact by fact the correction has been given, this political teacher is either unable to comprehend what is evident enough to the plainest understanding, or is determined to set all veracity at defiance in his alien zeal to damage the character of his country's rulers, and destroy the constitution which has hitherto been that country's glory, and more than that, the cause of its commercial prosperity and national greatness. Had Mr. Bright any knowledge of the taxation of the country

just opposite our shores, he ought to remember the *octroi*, which so heavily and vexatiously taxes the food of all the inhabitants of cities and towns, where the masses of the working classes reside. He forgets even a corn-law still exists there, and that there is a heavy tax on that essential article of consumption, salt. Indeed, as far as this article is concerned, England is the only country in the world where salt has been altogether freed from tax.

An extension or rather lowering of the Franchise has been frequently advocated on the ground that the working classes were almost excluded from it at present, and this statement has hitherto been too readily accepted as correct. We have been told by Mr. Gladstone that between one-tenth and twentieth was about the share the working classes have in the electoral body ; and that “ *therefore* there ought to be “ a *sensible* and *considerable* addition to that portion “ of the working classes—at *present almost infinitesimal*,—which is now in possession of the franchise.” A tenth does not exactly deserve the description of being infinitesimal and far exceeds any share of direct taxation borne by them. The result of subsequent inquiries has however shown the fallacy of these calculations, and it now appears that the working class, is much larger among the electoral body than was ever supposed. The argument therefore for a lowering of the franchise that they may have “ their fair share” as Mr. Baines’s Leeds Petition expresses

it, falls to the ground : and since it now appears that they already constitute more than one-fourth of the electoral body in the Boroughs of England and Wales returning 334 members,\* it may be well asked whether they have not already a fair share according to their qualifications of intelligence, independence and interests, if the question of a fair share has really anything to do with the principles on which representation ought to be based.

This argument of a fair share is very constantly resorted to in different forms by the advocates of Parliamentary Reform. Mr. Bright is constantly referring to the six millions who are excluded while one million monopolize the electoral franchise ; but perhaps he does not know, or if he does, takes care not to mention it, that more than 6 houses out of 7 pay no house duty. Great as may be the anomaly in Mr. Bright's opinion, and at first sight in the eyes of others, a more attentive examination of the relative circumstances of every seven men, taken as they pass let us suppose during any one twenty-four hours through Temple Bar, notwithstanding its learned vicinity, and test each individual according

\* The actual number of electors, deducting duplicates, are as follows :—

	In 1832-3.	In 1865-6.	Members.
Cities and Boroughs,	243,166 =	488,920, returning	338
Counties . . .	369,887 =	542,633 „	160
	<u>613,053</u>	<u>1,031,553</u>	<u>498</u>

to the three essentials of independence, intelligence, and interests, most reasonable people would come to the conclusion, that one-seventh was a very fair share, and a very safe proportion to whom these great privileges,—which embody in them nothing less than the government of the country—should be entrusted. But the fact is there is a great fallacy which is overlooked in this calculation or rather assertion that six out of every seven persons are excluded. This statement is based on the whole male population of the kingdom, keeping out of sight the restriction as to localities in which this privilege is confined. In the first place there is the difference of electoral qualification in Counties and Boroughs. Next there is the circumstance that though all our larger Towns share, very many smaller places are excluded from the opportunity of voting at all. When an argument therefore is drawn from the proportion of men who are included and excluded from the franchise, it should be given in reference to the male population of the places represented, either in the aggregate, or in the several particular instances, when the rates of proportion will be found to vary very considerably. Thus, take Birmingham, and what do we find? According to the Electoral Return presented last session, the electors in round numbers may be put at 15,000, and the male occupiers at 57,600, that is they amount to more than one-fourth.

	The electors are	The male occupiers.
In Manchester	21,500 . .	63,800, near 1-third
„ Liverpool	20,000 . .	60,000, „ 1-third
„ Westminster	13,000 . .	19,000, „ 2-thirds
„ Bristol .	11,300 . .	22,000, „ one-half
„ London City	15,500 . .	12,800
„ Hull .	5,500 . .	19,200
„ Nottingham	6,000 . .	15,600
„ Northampton	2,500 . .	6,300
„ Brighton	6,000 . .	11,000

The proportion of electors to the male occupiers it appears is very much greater than in fact the public have been led to believe by the loose mode adopted by Mr. Bright's favourite illustration. In very many instances it amounts to one-half, occasionally equals the whole, and in the instance of the City of London the number of electors exceeds that of the male occupiers. This last peculiarity is suggestive as to whether the electoral body,—if it is to be increased,—might not have its numbers enlarged by some other qualification than that which is based upon house occupation, or at least when an occupier has some other in addition.

Reference has not unfrequently been made to the early practice of our Constitutional system, which no less involves a fallacy, owing to the early state of society not being properly understood. It is asserted that in former times something like universal suffrage prevailed, as everybody who boiled a pot and paid scot and lot in Boroughs shared in the franchise. But it is forgotten that the persons so

described were a class superior to the population in mass, who were in a state of serfdom or villanage. The Burgess or Freeman belonged to a privileged order, located as much in assertion of a superior status over the masses, as in antagonism to the feudal Lord. The whole history of Parliament is against an individual right of voting having existed at any time. The various charters specially distinguish by whom the electoral privilege was to be exercised, and so early as the 8th of Henry VI. an Act was passed further in respect of Counties, declaring "what sort of men shall be chosers and who shall be chosen Knights of the Parliament."

While such an outcry is raised by certain parties for an extension of the Franchise, nothing is said about an extension of taxation to the same classes, as has already been adverted to ; but there are other charges and duties to the State to which with the electoral privilege the same ought equally to be liable, and for which it may be presumed they would be equally qualified, according to the virtues ascribed to them by their advocates. Thus there are various civil offices, parochial and otherwise, for the duties of which all electors, whether made such by a house above or below £10 value, ought to be called on to exercise their fair share. If there is any one Institution peculiarly English, and of which the country is proud, it is that of the Jury, which in some measure applies to the humbler sphere of local affairs that participation by the citizen, which the electoral

privilege calls upon him to exercise in respect of the great affairs of the Body Politic as a State. It is obvious therefore that what qualifies for the major, ought to more than qualify for participation in the minor description of public duties. By the 6th Geo. IV. c. 50, all persons who possess a £10 a-year Freehold, or £20 as a Leaseholder, or who inhabit a House rated to the Poor at £30 a-year in Middlesex and at £20 a-year elsewhere, or who occupy a house with 15 windows, are qualified to serve in the Superior Courts of Westminster or Courts of Assize, and liable to be summoned accordingly. The serving on a Jury is sometimes not a little burthensome, and it is therefore a fair question to ask those who advocate household or manhood suffrage, whether they are prepared to require all householders or males who have reached the experienced age of 21 years to give their time and minds to sit as jury-men; and whether they are convinced and satisfied that their intelligence and knowledge, and mental training are of that sufficiency as would allow the average of criminal cases and civil causes to be submitted to their authority. How would Mr. Baines like a case of alleged libel,—say on Trades' Unions,—against the Leeds Mercury to be submitted to a jury drawn from the working classes, or how would they deal with a complicated case of interests involved in a commercial partnership, or of Patent Rights, or the delicate issues directed to be tried by the Divorce Court. These questions ought to be

answered and settled at the same time with that of the Franchise, if equality of rights, privileges, duties, services, and taxes are to prevail.

But after all, the true and high question of Statesmanship to be solved, is not so much how certain parties may or may not be affected by the proposed changes in the Constitution, but whether the Constitution itself, or rather Parliament, as the real governing Power of the State, would be thereby improved and made wiser, and more efficient for the great purposes for which it has hitherto existed, is so prized, and is still maintained.

Its high character is not only of national importance as affecting the United Kingdom, but of world-wide influence and interest. There is no assembly like it in the world in times present or in ages past. The Senate of Rome in its palmyest days never reached the height as a deliberative and authoritative assembly as the British Parliament enjoys. Other bodies may have been more skilful in the mere work of legal legislation,—for in this our Parliament is somewhat slovenly and unsatisfactory, and more so now than in former times,—but as an independent, intelligent, and powerful voice of public opinion, which carries weight and influence wherever it reaches, no congress of men approaches it in any part of the world. Who cares in comparison for what may be said in the House of Assembly, or even Senate of the United States of America, much less in the packed, make-believe, and

awed assemblies which exist on sufferance, and are but creations of yesterday among the nations of Europe. The prestige of an ancient and enduring existence,—tried and tested by varied times and circumstances,—is a foundation of strength felt, though sneered at perhaps, by the shallow comprehensions of some modern politicians. If Europe is all attention and perhaps trembles at the enigmatical and brief utterances of an Imperial Ruler, who centres a whole country's real power and speech in himself, not only Europe, but Europe's Rulers, whether perched on their Eagle Thrones on the watch for further prey ; whether princes struggling to support a decaying power ; or statesmen to consolidate a new-born strength, and extend the commercial activity of their countries ; or patriots watching to shake off the trammels of despotism,—all watch the opening of the British Parliament,—are more or less encouraged or restrained by its utterances, guided in their policy by its opinions,—fearful of any exposures its debates may occasion, and active to conciliate or mislead its attention and escape its censure.

This is no imaginary statement of its power, but a reality. Those who would alter its composition and character, so as to be more in accordance with the American model, are bound to prove if they can, that this wholesome influence and power for good of Great Britain, both at home and abroad, would be rendered still more effective, when their proposed new

Constitution is substituted for it. This they are bound to prove and demonstrate as a certainty before the antient lines of that now existing are tampered with, for these once abandoned and broken up cannot again be recovered. No sensible man, or man of ordinary intelligence, according to Mr. Bright's usual phrase, can come to any other conclusion.

The real question at issue, according to the aims, declarations, and arguments of the present agitation, is not whether the Constitution should be strengthened, but pulled down and rebuilt to square with the notions which Mr. Bright entertains of the principles of the Constitution, of which, nevertheless, he is constantly talking; but which it is equally plain that he understands about as little as Mr. Gladstone; at least the principles enunciated by both are at variance with those which have ever been acknowledged as its foundation. "Some are of opinion," says Mr. Bright, "that every man should have a vote. " Personally I have not the smallest objection to the " widest possible suffrage that the ingenuity of man " can devise." Again, "as to how your members " should be allotted to the various constituent bodies, " what is the *obvious* rule? Every elector is of the " same importance in the eye of the law, and why " then should not every elector vote for the same " portion of the Parliament? The metropolitan " and all large boroughs ought to be divided and " subdivided. They ought to have double, or treble, " or quadruple their present number of members."

This new scheme of equal areas of population and electors may be all very simple and very obvious, according to Mr. Bright's understanding, but it is not or ever has been the principle of the British Constitution, and notwithstanding the authority which thus positively asserts these electoral elementary qualities, the British people are not equally simple as not to be able to distinguish between simplicity and complexity, and that where one has to deal with compounds, the solvent remedy is not to be found in simples. That every man of ordinary intelligence, or who has an ordinary knowledge of the history of his country and its constitution should thus venture to preach, is almost incredible; but so it is, and this ignorance as to the real principles of the Constitution, is betrayed more or less in every speech with which our new political prophet favours his auditors. One reference, much used of late, is specially unconstitutional, and can only be the result of very great simplicity or duplicity. If there is any one maxim which is always insisted on, and which so especially distinguishes our Constitution from all others, it is that which forbids the introduction of the name of the Sovereign as favouring any particular measure or as holding any particular opinions. Yet on various occasions Mr. Bright has boldly asserted that the Queen herself as an individual was a partisan of Parliamentary Reform, and though at the meeting at St. James's Hall he took Mr. Ayrton roundly

to task for a disrespectful allusion to Her Majesty, it was on account of her being a woman and a widow, and not because of the unconstitutional tendency of the reference. Mr. Bright and Mr. Ayrton, who both represent constituencies, in which the working class element is very large, seem equally ignorant,—or determined practically to ignore,—this very important as it is one of the prime fundamental principles of the Constitution, which is summed up, though not very accurately, in the two maxims, that “the Queen can do no wrong,” and that “the Queen reigns, but does not govern.” The wearer of the Crown of this country, it is always presumed, has no opinions to be publicly expressed, but in such terms and on such occasions as may be advised by the Crown’s responsible advisers, and no announcement made on such authority can be justifiably twisted into those of a political partisan. This principle is always gall and wormwood to autocracy and democracy, and Mr. Bright, perhaps, is turning courtier. When, however, he sets up to be a Reformer of the Constitution he ought at least to show that he understands the principles of that Constitution, even though he may desire to substitute others.

But, if in his principles Mr. Bright has no claims to be admitted as a Teacher of Constitutional Reform, his mode of practically enforcing his doctrine is still more repugnant to our Constitutional spirit and history, and if he had any thought to make his

nostrums as unpalatable as possible, and prove his unfitness for the task undertaken, the appeal to physical force which has been so freely threatened, whereby he hopes to force his drenches on his reluctant patients, has most thoroughly awakened the public to their danger, and engendered a settled purpose on the part of the intelligent classes of the community not to allow themselves to be quietly absorbed in the body democratic under any consideration. While in other countries revolutionary movements have generally sprung from below, in this land the leaders of all political movements have come from the upper, or intelligent ranks of the nation. The great constitutional struggle between Charles the 1st and his people would never have taken place but for the array of the real intelligence of the country, which rose up against his arbitrary proceedings. The glorious revolution of 1688, and the present settlement of the Crown were essentially the work of the thinking classes headed by the aristocracy and not of the unreasoning masses. And the great movement, only second in importance to that event, which resulted in the Reform of Parliament by the Bill of 1832, was in like manner originated, ordered, and carried through by the aristocracy of the land in the wide and proper sense of that term.

No term, perhaps, has acquired an obnoxious signification more unjustly than the word aristocracy. In its original signification it is exactly that power which every man of ordinary intelligence would desire should have the control of Government, but

somehow it has come to describe invidiously a particular class of a confined and privileged character.

As applied, however, to society, and to the Government of the United Kingdom, the term is of a much wider signification and influence than common language would often imply. In our social system there may be said to be three elements or divisions, which make up what really constitutes this aristocracy. There is first that upper class of noble and ancestral distinction, and more often than else dignified by titles, as Peers of Parliament, and who by their position, and general, liberal, and superior education, —elevated bearing of self-command and self-control; patience under pressure of riches; confidence in the Law, and regard and kindly feeling for inferiors, constitute what in vulgar parlance and opinion is specially regarded as *the* aristocracy. This may be called the aristocracy of Rank and Birth. Next comes the aristocracy of Wealth, to which any one may rise, and in which every one is included who may be fortunate enough to acquire by his industry or otherwise that special qualification. This is the great material power of the country, without which it would be much in the same state as that pictured by the exhaustion of the coal mines. To be sure many of these in the first possessors are often somewhat vulgar and pretentious, and would often be unbearable but for the existence of the body previously described, acting as it does as a wholesome corrective and flux, as they mix and become fused into the social system. In a generation or two superior culture displaces their

rough coating, and brings them up to the level and polish of, and as recruits to the other ranks. There is happily in this country scarcely any class of mere titled individuals with social eminence and privileges, such as are found to exist under the term *noblesse*, in almost all the States of Europe.\* A class simply as noble is not acknowledged as existing here. The nearest approach to these titled nonentities is to be found in Irish and Scotch Lords, not elected to be Peers, and our Baronets, being a simple and not very high sounding title. The latter are to be sure a somewhat questionable order, originating at a rather recent and bad period of our history, and then created for a bad purpose. "The order of Baronets "is said to have been a device of the wily Cecil, to "enable James to levy a voluntary tribute from "such as are ambitious to barter, what Shakespeare "calls *the article of their gentry*, for this newly "devised dignity. James expressed some apprehension that the creation of this new and intermediate "rank would disgust the English gentry, to which "Cecil replied, 'Tush, Sir, you want the money; "that will do you good; the honour will do them "very little.'"<sup>†</sup> It may be all very well to be

\* Horace Walpole often expresses himself with much impatience when foreigners, with high sounding titles, were treated and received in England through the ignorance of society, as if their position placed them on a par with our Peers. These, he observes, are part of the Government of the State, but what, he asks, are Foreign Nobles part of?

† Somers' Tracts, vol. 2, p. 352.

retained as giving, perhaps, harmless distinction to persons, whose claims are not sufficient for the Peerage, and useful as a compliment to royal accouchers, successful manufacturers, Lord Mayors whose reign may be distinguished by some such great political event as the birth of an heir to the Crown, or the accession of a new Sovereign. The title is also sometimes useful for the taming of radical politicians and bending men in various ways to the purposes of Government. But as an hereditary titled order having no special meaning or political position, it were better it did not exist, and knighthood, which becomes extinct with an individual's life, would amply serve all honourable and dishonourable purposes for which this dignity is found useful. How any man of ordinary intelligence can desire such a distinction, is rather unaccountable, except as conferring a small social eminence on new or doubtful pretensions to respectability, and gratifying an individual's desire for importance, in whom sounder personal qualifications may be deficient. When such considerations prevail, it is not surprising it is so often given as the price of political independence, and the reward of political subserviency. Still it has its value in the eyes of the vulgar, with whom a title is a title, and the term my Lady and your Ladyship has particular charms with the female sharers of this rather plebeian dignity. As for the Scotch and Irish Peers the sooner they are gradually absorbed into the real Peerage the better, and as no additions can be made to the former, it were

well any power of adding to the latter should also be abolished.

This subject naturally leads to a few observations on the Peerage itself, a topic which is a favourite for Mr. Bright's abuse and prophecies, and of which he as little understands the true character and value as an important element in our Constitution, as he does the principles of representation on which the Commons House of Parliament is founded. No institution like it exists, or ever has existed, in the political world of nations; or is it of a nature which can or could allow its being at once brought into existence. It is an institution very difficult to justify on any principles of political philosophy. Socially considered it is found often inconvenient, and sometimes even amounts to a nuisance. It is only through its proved practical utility in the State that it became, has always formed a part more or less important, and been hitherto preserved as one of the great features and powers of the British Constitution; and upon the same ground only of practical utility is it likely to be maintained.\* It has grown

\* The House of Lords, in many respects, does its work admirably; but notwithstanding the great increase in its members, the attendance of a very large number of Peers is much more slack than it ought to be, and is much noticed by the public. The published Divisions show this, and one cause may be the system of Proxies, which ought to be done away with. Formerly a Peer of Parliament could not absent himself without leave, as is now the rule in the House of Commons. If Peers take the feminine and not the manly view of their order, and care less for their political duties than the ornamental and social vanities of their position, their measure by others will

up silently through the course of six centuries, which have witnessed the existence and development of that Constitution; and perhaps at no period has it been more regarded as a most essential element as ballast in the working of our parliamentary system, than in the present age, and more especially since the passing of the Reform Bill, which introduced various influences into the House of Commons of a more uncertain, irregular, and less statesmanlike character, than it had exhibited for the last two centuries. Its special mission and position in our system has been as variously described as its attributes and duties. More commonly it has been considered as a useful barrier against the invasions of democracy, and more frequently as a special support and almost defensive appendage of the Throne. This, however, may very fairly be doubted, particularly when its action is closely examined on certain important crises. Though naturally loyal in its ten-

soon be taken by the same scale, and their worth and value suffer in consequence. Socially considered there are occasions on which it is very convenient to have a class of persons of acknowledged position and rank to act as figure-heads to many social arrangements, and who, as a sort of vice-regal asteroids, may be called on as a matter of course to preside, instead of that distinction being left to be scrambled for by vieing magnates of mere purse and assurance. These duties they generally discharge with an unaffected dignity and courtesy, which is fully appreciated by the public,—and as the major part of them are gentlemen, sensitively alive therefore to keeping their word and telling the truth, their statements usually command confidence and authority, however much their opinions may be questioned.

dencies, its interests are often not identical with those of the Crown. Its hereditary nature, be it observed, places it as far as that goes as a power in the State, on an equal footing with the Sovereign, and thereby sharing in reality the chief and a permanent influence in the Government of the country, it operates not unfrequently almost as a strait-waistcoat on the wearer of the crown. It may be very doubtful whether a Constitution such as ours, calling itself a limited monarchy, the supreme power residing in King, Lords and Commons, could exist without this peculiar institution, and this may be one reason why so many imitative Constitutions on the continent and elsewhere have proved failures through the want of such an order;—one that is as impossible to create in a day by a charter or ordinance as to raise oak timber from acorns in a year. As often neutralizing his power it is an institution not looked on always with real favour by the possessor of the throne, and the attempt during the present reign to introduce or rather extend a life element without limit into its body,\* would sooner or later have

\* The excuse was a commendable one, the giving Life-Peerages to Lawyers, but the intention was to have introduced, when the right to create such was conceded, a very miscellaneous medley of dilettanti Peers for Life, mere court or government parasites. The appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords is at present not on a satisfactory footing, but might be easily provided for by the introduction of a counterpart of the Bench of Bishops, a Bench of Lord Justices restricted in number, and by certain qualifications. This might at the same time absorb the appellate jurisdiction now exercised by the Privy Council, of

reduced the House of Lords to be as much the mere creatures of the Crown as the Senate of a French Emperor, or the Legislative Council of a Colonial Governor. Its position and maintenance in its present character and eminence is one of great moment and concern to all real admirers of our Constitution, and any measure likely to work a change in that respect cannot be too narrowly watched. The very numerous creations which have therefore of late years taken place, and enlarged its members to so great an extent, and the results that are likely to arise, if such an increase continues much longer in the same ratio, is a subject of very serious reflection. Whig and Tory Governments have shown equal weakness in this respect, and as numberless Peerages have been distributed among followers of very feeble and questionable pretensions, whether on the score of public services, intellect, or fortune, the House of Lords has been rather weakened than strengthened by the additions. The numbers in the Lords are now fast running on to overtake those exhibited by the Commons, which every one feels to be rather too numerous than otherwise. It is obviously desirable on many accounts that the higher and superior legislative body should not be too large, and under all consti-

which the foundation is most unconstitutional, it being in the power of the Crown at any time to erase the name of any one of its members. All Judges, it is an established maxim, ought to be irremovable, especially those exercising the highest appellate authority.

tutions where the Legislature resides in two such assemblies, the upper and more dignified chamber is always found much less numerous than the more popular branch, witness the very limited scale on which the American Senate is constituted. It may then be worth consideration whether the period has not arrived when some limit—which it has often been proposed to effect by express statute—might not be practically established with advantage. A constitutional axiom once admitted as to the proportion,—for instance, not to exceed two-thirds,—that the House of Lords should bear to the House of Commons, would probably suffice without any formal enactment by law. Public service of a really eminent character should be the main if not the only qualification to entitle any one to be enrolled in the Peerage. But if the Peerage is to be conferred because a man has respectably administered, or as often mismanaged for a few years one of the great departments of the State (having married perhaps a daughter of one of the celestial Whig families), or because he has troublesome pretensions to be so employed; or been useful in some party elections, especially of a crane-neck character; or may be the owner of great estates and wealth (perhaps just on the eve of an election when a party purse is going round); or has worked hard as a mere thick and thin supporter of ministerial and official jobs; and, further, if on a change of Government the in-coming minister is to create an equal number of Peers as a counterpoise to all these nonentities sent there by his

predecessor, the House of Lords will very soon not be able to contain them, even though the Courts on each side of their hall were added and roofed over for their accommodation. That there should be some check on this running to Peerage, which has prevailed so extensively in these latter times, is absolutely necessary if the Peerage is to be preserved. Because a Peerage once belonged to some female or collateral ancestor its revival to oblige some political supporter is not a sufficient justification, much less the multiplying Peerages in particular families. Our Whig rulers have been great sinners on this head. Though it is most important the Peers should be thoroughly independent as to property, to grant a Peerage merely on account of great territorial possessions is most unwise, as it deprives the House of Commons of persons of this class, and the representation of counties consequently often falls to the sons of such, or to persons of inferior pretensions. How Commoners of large landed estates can care to enter the House of Lords is quite unaccountable, as they are much more important personages in every way as great Commoners, able to take part in every phase of political life, than when bound in the golden fetters of the Peerage. Some heads of important families have always so regarded their position, and with the exception of precedence in walking out to dinner, and such petty social distinctions, a man of great independent fortune with ability and talent in the House of Commons can obtain a public position and eminence, which no one can achieve who has

been born in, or kicked up into, the more dignified dormitory of the Legislature. Sir Robert Peel among others set a good example in declining both for himself and his heirs this questionable eminence, as it is said, with a remark that there had been Peers enough created of late to suffice for the next fifty years. What would he have said had he witnessed the shower of Lords which the aspirations of political vanity has produced in the last five years? An increase in the Peerage has often been justified on the ground of the vast increase in the possessors of great wealth and property in the kingdom; but the Peerage was not intended for the deification of such persons, but as a power in the State for the good government of the country, and public policy further makes it important the Commoners should as often as not be on a par with the other order as to wealth and possessions.

To revert, however, to the real and full meaning of that aristocracy in which the Government of this country has hitherto, and it is desirable should in all futurity reside. The foregoing observations have been made with a view of explaining the two first divisions which that term properly embraces in this country. First, the Aristocracy of Rank or Birth. Secondly, the Aristocracy of Wealth and Property. But there is a third partner belonging to this power which, fortunately, in this country governs both. This is the Aristocracy of Intelligence: not that mere superficial intelligence termed general knowledge usually prevalent among all classes of society,

but that real sterling intelligence springing from deep knowledge and power of intellect, which always in this country acts on and effectually controls those classes, which generally predominate in the Legislature, the learned professions, and those to whom the leading posts in the administrative departments of official life are entrusted. This intelligent power is often found more or less in conjunction with the other two sections, but, as often as not, is altogether unconnected with them, when, nevertheless, it still works and eventually regulates all their operations. The voice of this power is continually heard in the higher branches of the daily press and periodical literature of the country, their utterances being as continuously tested by a fairness, freedom, and fulness of discussion scarcely known or tolerated under any other Government. The masses as a body are incapable of understanding fully, and therefore of being guided by this authority, and hence the danger of what is called democracy, that is of mere numbers as the governing power. The teaching by the author of the *Wealth of Nations* would have been and still is as caviare to the multitude, and they only acquiesce in its truths not from conviction, but as following those who, as governors, are accepted as their leaders. The masses, where they have the opportunity, set at nought in their transactions all those principles and rules of action which the science of Political Economy not only so emphatically teaches but proves. The principles of real freedom would never have gained the day had numbers, not intelligence,

prevailed, and so little are they still understood, that by word and deed the multitude constantly appeal to the arguments and practice of protection; and extend a system of universal interference by every means in their power in every quarter which may prove accessible to their influence. Every one knows that conviction as to these truths is but faintly shared even by large sections of other and better informed classes, but who dare not run counter to that aristocracy of intelligence and knowledge, which at present acts as the real guide of public opinion in its highest sense. Hence the danger and folly of admitting to the Legislature classes, not only simply to share power, but to have absolute control, who under no head possess qualifications that might help to improve that assembly. Sir Robert Collier to be sure emphatically denies that the improvement of the Constitution of the House of Commons is the sole question which ought to be kept in view. The contentment of the mass of people he proclaims to be the primary object. This is like giving children what they ought not to have to keep them quiet, a miserable and unstatesmanlike principle in the government of a great nation. The masses are not entitled to be spoken of as if they alone constituted the people, much less the nation.

The doctrine conceded by this kind of hustings' oratory, that the masses have interests at variance with that of the commonweal, is as mischievous as it is untrue, especially when, as far as experience goes,

the masses as often misapprehend the true nature of their interests, and still ignore the best means for their protection and amendment. As for these interests no one can say that they have been neglected by those who have hitherto wielded the chief power in the State; the large amount of legislation expressly directed and intended for their special benefit gives proof of this, and the only doubt may be whether such exceptional and partial legislation is either sound in principle or has really acted for their benefit. The Poor Laws in some of their provisions justify such doubts. The kindly intention, however, cannot be disputed. Mr. Bright is quite at a loss to point out any great and heavy grievance under which the working classes labour, and for which their admission to power would be likely to provide a remedy. That many evils undoubtedly exist is too patent, but they are for the most part of a nature which no Legislature, be it composed how it may, can ever altogether correct. The right to education at the cost of the State, that is of one class at the charge of the rest of the community, is the only practical measure this authority gives out as a likely result, but the extent to which this is now given, its very late introduction, and its constant improvement and extension, leave little ground for complaint; and when his own course is remembered as to how this question was affected by the Factory Bill, one cannot but marvel at his venturing to notice the subject at all. How this right can be justified is

not so easy to explain and establish, and a right to food and employment for regular maintenance would rest exactly on the same foundation.\* The good of the community and not as a right of the individual, is the only ground on which such a scheme of education can be advocated, and this admitted another consequence must follow, that education should not be voluntary on the part of the working classes, but that the State should have a right, as has been carried out in Prussia, to make it compulsory. Such a system has certainly not been called for by the working classes.

The false position in which Parliament has been placed on this question of Reform by the rivalry of parties and their political leaders, is at once unfortunate and discreditable, and it is only owing to that high and sound intelligence, which really forms public opinion and directs and controls the government of the affairs of the nation, that has saved the Constitution hitherto from great and serious damage through the crude principles and race after popularity, which have animated our politicians of action, and the still more crude measures which have been introduced for the carrying out those principles.† The *vis inertię*

\* The Australian Democracy seems about practically to entertain this doctrine of Socialism.

† To Mr. Gladstone may fairly be traced the œstrual deposit from which the present agitation has been mainly hatched. The occasion of a deputation from the London Trades' Council, headed by Mr. Odgers, waiting on him as Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to the Annuities' Bill, was adroitly

of the body politic of the nation accustomed to take a calmer view of what is for their welfare, and to read the worth and motives of political activity, has been sufficient hitherto to put the drag on the Parliamentary coach and prevent its being upset, notwithstanding the runaway disposition of the team in harness, and the energy and vociferations of those holding the whip and reins, with the approving cheers of rival drivers, and the *turba ministrorum* of official cads and grooms.

As to the question itself however public opinion so far admits its importance as to desire if possible its settlement, not from any conviction of its absolute or pressing necessity, or any expectation of good results, but that it may be so disposed of, as to cease to be a political nuisance and hindrance as it has proved to the legitimate and real work of Parliamentary government.\* At the same time as

taken advantage of, when Mr. Gladstone's sensational philanthropy and impulsive vanity could not resist being drawn into making a very strong declaration, condemnatory of the House of Commons, as having failed in their duty to the working classes, and admitting their strong claims, without any qualification, for admission to the franchise.

Mr. Foster, in his speech at Leeds, declared that before Mr. Gladstone took up the question it scarcely was worth attention.

\* Very many of the Institutions of the Country and Government Departments, and still more the ways of administering the same, stand much more in need of Reform and reconstruction than Parliament; but such unfortunately excite

to any definite measures, or mode and manner of dealing with it, public opinion is as yet so un-

but partial interest, and as not affording the same opportunities for display by our oratorical Senators are rarely taken up by them, requiring more trouble, pains-taking investigation, and often knowledge than they care to enter on or acquire. That what has been called a Reform Government backed by large majorities should have heeded these so little is not much to their credit, while their exertions have not been very satisfactory in some of their attempts to amend. Witness the Reform of the Bankruptcy Courts, for which half a dozen carcass edifices still exist, raised at great cost, and in their maintenance costing still more, though quite uninhabitable and next to useless. The state of the law in many other of its walks requires most urgent attention and reform, and in none more than a quicker despatch in both its criminal and civil administration, in which the working classes are often deeply interested both as plaintiffs and defendants. The conduct of the County Courts is not quite what it ought to be or was intended. A municipality or confederation of municipalities for the whole metropolis is another measure of pressing necessity, the present state of which deserves indeed the term hocus-pocus, and which the long supremacy of our Reform administration has only increased the confusion in its antagonistic powers, the desire to establish official supremacy having been the evil genius in the ascendant. A municipal organization for county management, combining the action of the unions with that of the magistracy, is another measure of local self-government which has been equally neglected. Again, how long are our Grammar Schools with their ample foundations to remain as they are, when the demand for middle-class education is so loud? It is time the Legislature, since the Law cannot or will not do it, should declare Grammar to include English as well as Latin and Greek, and the rudiments of all

developed and uncertain, that as far as hitherto expressed, only negative conclusions can be drawn. One point, however, is quite clear,—the country does not desire to have a new Constitution, which, with all his declarations to the contrary, is the obvious intention and inevitable consequence if Mr. Bright's principles are accepted and his proposals adopted. Nay, it is not even a new Reform Bill that the country asks for, but at furthest that the

things necessary to a useful course of education, and which the Founders of these schools would have undoubtedly provided for, had they lived in these times. The Trinity House, as an institution connected with that first interest of the country, its shipping and sailor population, is another which Reform ought to make what it ought to be, as the true representative and in many respects guardian of that great national body, instead of being left a close Corporation of self-elected administrators, whose pretensions to be such are as second-rate as their mode of discharging their duties. The state of the Public Accounts, and the imperfect control and superficial investigation of the Estimates exercised by Parliament, is a still more serious case of legislative neglect, for which those who pretend to be leaders in its debates and transactions are chiefly to blame; but such dry topics afford no opportunity for sensational oratory, and the whole official class combine to smother. The Educational and Poor Law questions, notwithstanding the great advance and improvement in their systems, still call for continuous and practical consideration, while the action of the Trades' Unions on our great staple industries and foreign commerce calls most urgently for inquiry, and as the agency of these is now openly directed to bear on the Legislature it is obvious such inquiry ought to precede any measures that are likely to facilitate this threatened interference.

*Reform Bill* should be realised and perfected as far as possible, in certain points, which are agreed to require revision. And, further, it may be assumed that the country desires no more alteration or change than may be necessary for effecting this end, and more especially that no changes of a mere speculative or uncertain character,—and of which the results cannot be clearly calculated,—should be tolerated or attempted. The great and acknowledged principles,—the old lines of the Constitution—must therefore be steadily kept in view and adhered to in whatever measures may be introduced for its amendment.

The great principle of the British Constitution is and always has been the *representation of interests, not of classes*—of all interests sufficiently important fairly to claim having a voice in the government of the State. And the main object of the great Reform Bill was the restoration of the institution on that principle, and the transfer of its privileges from those interests, which had dwindled to mere shadows,—whatever they may have been originally,—to those interests that in the progress of time had grown up and waxed strong as great and substantial bodies; but still the aim was to preserve a fair equilibrium among these several interests, and not to allow any great overwhelming interest to override and hold dominion over every other. Such a dominion Messrs. Bright, Beales, Foster, Gladstone, and Co., would give to one class, and that the lowest, over

every other, simply because it happens to be the most numerous.

Parliament, from the date when it became a living body and first deserved to be called the great Council of the Nation,—happily fashioned as it was by Simon de Montford,—embodied in itself what was a real representation of the several interests then existing in the kingdom, and thus became an efficient assembly for the government of the country. There were summoned to take part in its deliberations two knights from each shire, two citizens from each city, and two burgesses from each borough. The first, of course, represented the interests of real or landed property, as connected with the ownership, and the services then due by such ownership of the soil. The second the greater, and the third the lesser trading and commercial interests throughout the kingdom, every town of note being included, and each town having some one or more particular interest connected with its existence. The notion of upper, middle, and working classes having clashing or antagonistic interests had nothing to do with this distribution of privileges;—practically it was essentially as to cities and boroughs, a representation of the middle class, the masses, even as freemen, having a less share in such constituencies than they have at present, being in a state of villanage, or as bondsmen. As little uniformity existed in what constituted the Borough Franchise, considerable diversity must have characterised the representatives

selected, and those thus selected for Parliament had at least this merit, that they were all bonâ-fide citizens and burgesses, immediately belonging to and connected with the place that sent them.\*

One feature is remarkable as a universal rule as respects the representation, and which well deserves attention. In all instances *two* persons were to be sent up by each constituency, whether shire or borough, the purport of which may be accounted for in various ways. In the first place the object of the assembly summoned together was for national purposes, and not to look after and protect the local interests of the parties represented, as too often has been regarded as the main point in the distribution of seats in the present age, and by candidates in asking the suffrages of electors. This dualism has always characterised, more or less, the general civil polity of the State. Thus we have two overseers of the poor; two churchwardens; two sidesmen or waywardens; two sheriffs were formerly not unfrequent, and the practice still survives in the city of London. Again, two Judges of assize were appointed to the circuits; and it is still more worth observation, that when the number *two* was departed from, there seemed to exist an abhorrence of an uneven number, and accordingly we find four Judges

\* By an Act of Hen. V. every city and borough was required to elect none but members of their own community,—and it was not till 1571, that a Bill was introduced to render valid elections of non-resident burgesses.

sitting in each of the Supreme Courts, and four Members accorded to the city of London. The practice, whencesoever derived, seems to have been rather of Norman than of Saxon origin. In the Norman kingdom of Sicily each province and city was required to send two deputies ; and the Constitution of Hungary, of much the same date, has always followed the same rule as to the number of representatives elected by each constituency. The principle is also to be found adopted even in the American Senate, each State of the Union, without reference to size, population or wealth, being on a perfect equality, and electing *two* Senators. Thus the great State of New York with its population exceeding three million, about what are to be found in the metropolitan districts of London, and an area of 50,500 square miles, has no advantage over the insignificant State of Rhode Island, with an area of but 1200 square miles, and a population of 174,000 souls, much about what is found in the county of Hertford, or town of Leeds. The advantages of this duality were many, though it may be difficult to trace out exactly the ground which gave rise to it. There existed however this primary advantage, that all the interests thus represented were placed on an equal footing. It might be useful also that two might consult together on important questions, and support each other in their conduct on certain occasions. Again, one might be intended as a check on the other, and also in case of

any mishap arising to one, there remained a second still present to discharge the duties required. One of the chief mistakes made in the great Reform Bill was the departure from this rule, in as much as it seemed to sanction the principle that representation was to be ruled in some degree by population, the principle adopted almost invariably by the various constitutions set up, or attempted to be set up, in modern times. The practice had also another great, though incidental, recommendation, in as much as it gave a minority, if large, a fair chance of being represented. We have heard a good deal of late years of the representation of minorities, and many curious schemes have been propounded,—worthy of the political philosophers of Laputa or Edinburgh,—expressly for securing this object. The giving always two representatives would secure this end as far as ought to be attempted, and would so far operate wholesomely. That small minorities should be represented could never prove otherwise than troublesome, the end of representation being that the government of the country should be carried on in the general sense of the majority, to whom the same is confided, but if minorities are to be expressly provided with representation, every variety and fraction of the minority might equally claim the privilege of having an exponent of their views. Where, however, parties are near upon equality, it often happens each is content to divide the representation, or in an election struggle the candidate of the minority

will often in various qualifications be superior to the second candidate of the majority, and thus commend himself on particular grounds to the suffrages of many electors of independent politics.

The analogy of the elective franchise is still more in favour of this equality, as respects the representation of the constituencies. An elector, let his property be worth but £10 a-year or £10,000 a year in a borough, has no advantage as to votes. The men of Tens, or of Hundreds, or of Thousands, count but as units at the poll-booth. In like manner the representation of all places should be based on an equal footing; or if one place is to have a larger share of representation, in consequence of greater population, extent of area, or value of property, by the same rule a plurality of votes should be given to the elector according to the scale of his property and interests in the community, or at least in the proportion of the taxes he contributes to the State.

If representation was to be regulated by population, and all power thus concentrated in the great interests, the result would be, London, Lancashire, and the West Riding would govern the country, and all the smaller interests would be edged out, just like sparrows by the cuckoo monopolist, and would have no more chance of security—as far as any power they might have of self-defence—than a fleet of Lilliputian gunboats among half-a-dozen Brobdingnag ironclads.

Population, then, should not be admitted as an argument for representation, beyond its being accepted as an outward and visible sign of an inward and material interest, which has sufficient importance to have its place in the great Council of the Nation both on its own account and the duty it owes to assist the general weal.

But if one place, on account of its importance, is admitted to a seat in the Legislature, it follows that all places with similar pretensions should enjoy the same privilege. But this rule, though generally observed when Parliaments were first summoned, has not been sufficiently taken care of in the various re-adjustments that have been accomplished since or provided for in any of the lately proposed redistributions of seats; and as all places of a given importance cannot each have a separate representation, the obvious rule is combination, so that this end might be equally attained. The constitutional practice has long been in favour of this plan, and when Wales was taken within the pale of the constitution, its various small towns were united so as to form one borough. The same rule having been applied to Scotland and to Ireland at subsequent periods, it seems natural such precedents should be adopted for England, and yet so obvious an arrangement has never been proposed, but the strongest repugnance has been shown in many quarters to its introduction.

Any political observer, the most superficial, must be

sensible that the retaining of small boroughs, — particularly when subject to individual nomination, — cannot be maintained, and that sooner or later they must be abolished and their privileges transferred to other and larger constituencies. The usual objection one hears amounts to this, that elections connected with small boroughs must become much more expensive if an agent has to be retained in each of the several towns composing the borough. This may be true, to a certain extent, but Totnes, Barnstaple, Lancaster, and other small constituencies are standing proofs how costly even small places can make themselves, and in this respect can claim to be on a par with Yarmouth, Norwich, or Marylebone.

The ordinary electoral expenses in such groups of boroughs would, however, in all probability be much less than appears to be now necessary as an attendant on the elections which take place in the great hives of industry, and if such grouping should prove effective in checking the main stream of the bribery torrent—as is stated to be the case in Scotland—this argument at least will not hold, even supposing the present general practice of electioneering extravagance is to continue. But it is to be hoped a better spirit is growing up on this head, and that both public opinion and legislative interference will ere long greatly diminish, if not eradicate, this opprobrium of our representative system, and in the amendment of which very considerable advance has already been made, notwithstanding the disclosures

which certain commissions have lately brought to light.

At the passing of the great Reform Bill, the call was general that provisions should have been introduced into that measure to mitigate this crying evil, the existence of which makes the talk about Reform itself almost ridiculous, and savouring much of political hypocrisy. At the time, it was distinctly promised by its authors that other measures should be subsequently introduced to correct what it was felt was necessary to complete and secure the great objects of the Bill itself, while it was argued that the measure was likely to effect much in that direction, especially through the disfranchisement of large numbers of the lower description of voters. The state of parties, however—who each fancied to gain some advantages by the corrupting influence of money power, and resorted to it in consequence—prevented the subject then and ever since being taken up in earnest. Public opinion has, however, much improved since that period, and, as in former days, the receiving presents was not considered wrong by the Judges of the land and the great officers of state, so the receipt of similar retainers by the smaller limbs of the law, as agents, and by citizen electors in return for their suffrages, will sooner or later be considered disgraceful in the giver as well as in the receiver, in spite of the baneful and corrupting influence exhibited by the rank growth and social condition of our modern plutocracy. The

feeling only requires a little countenance and encouragement to become as much a mark of political manners as sobriety and civility are necessary to good manners in all the social relations between man and man, whatever their rank, calling, or station in life.

If a comparison is drawn between the character of the people forming the constituencies of the smaller and larger towns, on many points it is much in favour of the former, and Mr. Bright's assertion that in the smaller boroughs the middle classes are not independent, is generally very far from the truth. As a body they are indeed more independent, being of a higher order, in consequence of the difference of the value of houses. The undue influences brought to bear on them may be different, but the territorial lord and the factory lord are much on a par in this respect, and democratic despotism, when installed as a voting power, in all its plenitude, in our great hives of industry, will be more unscrupulous and influential than either. The inhabitants of moderate sized towns, even where direct territorial power comes into play, are as a body, generally very superior by education and habits to their prototypes in very populous places, perhaps through having more leisure and taking more part in local public business. The social relations that exist between the different classes are also more favourable to individual liberty of action, at the same time that individual responsibility in the

exercise of the franchise, as being more under observation, is more appreciated and effective. These small towns, for the most part, constitute the heart of the liberal interest, and exercise, as such, a very useful influence in their respective districts, which on their disfranchisement would altogether cease. They are, however, often too small to stand very much longer by themselves, whereas, by union, these valuable constituencies would be so far strengthened as to be able to maintain and defend themselves hereafter against the bigger powers. Their existence and preservation is essential as a wholesome corrective of the more ambitious aims of leviathan constituencies with their engrossing tendencies. After all, their interests are often quite as important as those of larger places, for these vast masses congregated together often are only interested in one industry, and some great single trade—needles, for instance, shipping often, carpets, paper, lace, malt, beer, mining, salt, fisheries, are frequently very local and distributed among towns of small extent, and each of these industries, though of smaller dimensions, are important in themselves, and have as good right to political consideration, as the great industrial god cotton.

This amalgamation of the smaller towns would further have the advantage of neutralising individual power, while the influence of property would have that fair share which ought to prevail in all representation. Combination of parties in favour of a particular interest would also be less powerful among

a constituency portions of which are separated by distance, while the tricks and corruption which often prevail during the latter hours of a contested election would be to a great extent paralysed.

The chief recommendation in favour of this union of towns in one constituency arises from its being no innovation, since it has already been carried out in Scotland and Ireland and one portion of England. It has also in its favour the authority of very eminent, real, and what is more, *practical* reformers. It is one the late Mr. Hume had specially in view, as is shown by a Return (No. 441—1852) moved for by him of all places, *bonâ fide* towns, in the kingdom, possessing a population of 2000 persons. Mr. Warburton, a man of still higher intellect and political sagacity, entertained similar opinions. A great injustice would also be avoided by this plan. By the great Reform Bill all places with certain claims and numbers as to population and voters were allowed to preserve their electoral privileges. Now, unless these have dwindled away since the passing of that Act, it would be unjust to deprive them of a right to which their claim was then allowed as sufficient. In the admission of others possessing the same qualification to share with them in its exercise there would be no injustice, and the principle announced on the introduction of Lord Derby's Reform Bill would be secured, though in a sounder mode than was then intended, by the declaration there was to be no disfranchisement. There are near upon 500 towns which might thus be

introduced to a share in the franchise, having a population of 2000 and upwards, and perhaps many places under that number of inhabitants of a marked character and interests might also be admitted.

If, in addition to this the revival of the old constitutional practice of giving always two members to each constituency was adopted, the importance of each constituency would be raised to such a scale both as to population and electors, as would secure to each a respectable position, as the former need rarely be under 15,000 or 20,000, or the latter 1,000. Many boroughs would still be small to be sure compared with the larger places, but be quite large enough to be important, useful, and thoroughly independent as constituencies. That nothing but bloated multitudinous bodies should be represented and have the whole government of the country in their hands would be most unfortunate. Mr. Bright objects to government by lords and rich men, and what he describes as a corrupt aristocracy. In place of such—even suppose it to exist, which is a fallacy—he would establish an oligarchy of overgrown factory towns, in which the electoral body would be ruled, cowed, and subjected by the union combinations of the masses, and the dastardly and destructive engines of physical force.

When Mr. Bright contends that a lowering of the franchise would put an end to corruption under the influence of those robust qualities that come from industry and labour, the practical working of such a constituency as established by the municipal

elections, seems to be thrown away upon this one-sided political partisan. All evidence and experience go to show that a very large proportion of the occupiers of poorer tenements care not for the franchise except for money and drink; and if electors are subject to little control by the tyranny of landlords, the bewitching influence of publicans exercise no little sway in favour of the candidates for municipal honours. Voting papers are frequently filled up for and not by the voters, and the immoral tendencies of these elections are described as having a most debasing influence on the community at large. The employers of labour also frequently exercise great control to secure the return of what persons they please. The more respectable inhabitants therefore stand aloof from having anything to do with these elections, and leave the government of our towns in the hands of an inferior class. The same results we may be sure will ensue in our parliamentary elections, if they are to be ruled by the same parties by whom the municipalities are determined, and "the influence of wealth and high culture, and of those qualities that come from leisure," will be supplanted by "the influence of the robuster qualities that come from industry and from labour," and which robuster qualities we know are similar to those exhibited by the freemen, who still remain on the electoral lists. At a very recent election which took place, Mr. Read, the mayor of Penryn declared, "that if the potwollopers were done away with, and they must be before long,

the liberals would have a flying majority at Penryn." Yet Mr. Bright would make the potwollopers all powerful in every borough.

Any one who has had personally anything to do with electioneering, must be aware that the chief trouble and uncertainty is always found with the lowest grade of the present ten-pound electors. "Time enough yet, Sir, when you call again, may be able to give you an answer," is a very common rejoinder, the meaning of which is well understood. This is not the case with those in a superior position, who having generally some principle and opinion, and some knowledge of political questions, have usually made up their minds and are prepared to satisfy the candidates at once as to their intentions. The reserve of the humbler electors, on the contrary, rarely arises from any real political principle or desire to obtain further information,—though there are of course many honourable exceptions,—but their uncertainty arises solely from some mean motive, or apprehension of disobliging some influential employer or customer, or spiritual or lay adviser, and not unfrequently from a desire to be at least a supporter of the winning side. That more elevated views as to the exercise of the franchise, arising from self-command, self-control, respect for order, regard for superiors, would be found among the class now excluded as inhabiting dwellings under a value of £10 is sheer nonsense, and the most fulsome and untruthful of flatteries.

With the exception of Mr. Bright and his

followers, who now professedly agitate for the supremacy of numbers, almost all the advocates for an extension of the suffrage so as to introduce a greater portion of the working classes into the constituency, speak always of "a limited portion" to be so admitted, even when the arguments used justify no such partial distinctions. So says Mr. Gladstone. "There ought to be, not a wholesale, not an excessive, but a sensible and considerable addition to that portion of the working classes—at present almost infinitesimal—which is in possession of the franchise." But the grounds on which their admission at all is claimed would apply to the whole body; and any exceptions or exclusion, would according to his logic be an injustice; and no just or tenable scheme has yet been propounded by this panegyrist of the working classes through which the franchise could be confined to a limited portion. The same views in various terms are constantly propounded by our popular candidates, but without any definite proposals for carrying the same into operation, except it may be by reducing the household qualification from a ten-pound to a seven-pound value. It has often been felt as a matter of regret, that however recommended by simplicity, the brick and mortar qualification should be the only one by which the franchise should be obtainable, and many what are called the fancy franchises have been proposed in consequence. These, however, have all been felt to be more or less unsatisfactory, insufficient for the end devised, and perhaps even

dangerous, as often founded on some basis which might not always be maintainable. The old boroughs under their charters had certainly the merit, if it is one, of providing constituencies resting on very different qualifications, being sometimes of very narrow, or moderate, or very extensive dimensions in consequence. For the most part they were very eclectic bodies. This was the state of things from the earliest times, and not what Mr. Bright's imagination has reported it to be, and to which he proposes to restore it.\* The concurrence in all legislative measures by "the commonalty of the realm" was always acknowledged, but "according as had been before accustomed." (15th Ed. II. 1322.) This power of the commonalty† "*as accustomed*"

\* A reference to Lord Somers' authority has already been adverted to, as having been mis-quoted. Indeed it exactly tells the other way. The occasion arose in 1702, in a conference between the two Houses on the Occasional Conformity Bill, which the Lords refused to pass, and Lord Somers was one of those entrusted to support their reasons for their dissent. One of these was as follows: "That in some Corporations, the Lords take the election of members to serve in Parliament to be only *in such as are concerned in the government of them*, as at Buckingham, &c., and the Lords would not by this Bill deprive men of their birthrights,"—viz. by imposing the test it created.

† "The term Commonalty is generally used for the middle rank of the King's subjects, such of the Commons as are raised above the ordinary sort, and having the management of offices. . . . Companies incorporated are said to consist of Masters, Wardens, and Commonalty."

*Brady's Gloss. to his Introd. to Eng. History.*

was then but a very humble one to what it has arisen in later ages. The body qualified as freemen was perhaps the most numerous class of voters, but their admission was often under great restrictions, and often limited to a choice selection of the persons who now answer the description of the mechanic and working classes, and were the masters rather than the journeymen of their particular craft. Unless these are introduced wholesale within the pale of the constitution, according to Mr. Bright, they might as well live in Russia; a short residence in that country might however disabuse Mr. Bright and his believers as to there being no liberties worth having in their native land, unless accompanied by the exercise of the electoral privilege.

If, however, the working classes are to be enfranchised, it may be therefore questioned whether a denomination of freemen might not be re-introduced as preferential to bringing such indirectly and partially about by lowering the household franchise, the arguments for which are not conclusive as to the adoption of any particular limit of value.

The main advantage to be gained by lowering the money value would be so as to make it *rateable* value, and thus close the door against a large proportion of the objections taken before the Revising Barrister. In the large constituencies—say those exceeding 50,000 population,—no lowering of the value of the house ought to be attempted even with this view.

House occupation ought however to be the basis

in every instance of a right to vote. Society ought to have the security given by "a local habitation and a name" as a hold upon one, who claims to have a voice, ever so infinitesimal, in regulating the government of the country, and the charges which are laid upon its property. It is on this ground the claim of those who are mere lodgers, seems so unreasonable, whatever their educational fitness may be. It would be a singular anomaly to confer a right in reference to national affairs, which is refused as respects the minor affairs of the locality. Lodgers also let it be remembered escape all liability to rates, or the discharge of various civil duties and municipal offices. The payment of a certain amount of direct taxes might justify a lodging franchise, but these instances would probably be too few to make their introduction of any consequence.

A satisfactory mode of selection from the unfranchised classes has hitherto been an insuperable barrier to the introduction of a limited portion. Merit is a condition impossible to determine, however easy it may be in reference to proper objects to be decorated with the three degrees of the Civil Order of the Bath and Victoria Cross, or by examination for admission to the Civil Service. Unfortunately, almost all proposals to meet the difficulty partake of the character of what are called fancy-franchises. Even Mr. Walpole's militia qualification, and Mr. Clay's educational tests, failed to stand the crucible of common sense and practical

application.\* The payment of a certain amount of direct taxes on the face of it would be an unobjectionable qualification in conjunction with a house occupation of ever so small value. These taxes might be however the assessed taxes, income tax, or trade and professional licences, but the second of these would imply the perpetuity of this most fair, but most immoral tax, which, though all but a certainty, no one would like to admit or in a measure thus to confirm. The house tax levied on rateable value is not only a very fair impost—as one *pro aris et focis*,—but should be permanent and universal, with a power of exemption in consideration of straitened circumstances to occupiers of houses under £10 value.

In seaports one very reasonable and suitable qualification might command a vote, by admitting all those who hold a certificate to act as master or mate in the mercantile marine. The ownership of a certain amount of registered tonnage in shipping property might also confer an electoral qualification. Such, however, should still be based on a house occupation, and be limited to seaport boroughs.

Still the question arises whether some sound

\* In Australia an educational test was attempted, but shrunk to a voter being able to write his name. This, however, was only retained as being essential to the mechanical working of the Ballot as there introduced. The results as to this Ballot system might be well worth inquiring into by the Mother Country.

principle might not be introduced so as to give those now unenfranchised some share in the electoral privileges, and if this could be given so as to be divided among the whole body, the invidiousness of an exceptional selection would be avoided. Taking a comparative view of the respective interests, property, independence and intelligence of those who now constitute the electoral body with those who do not, and considering further that the working classes already form a very considerable section of the former, —one quarter—an addition from the last equal to about a fifth of the first would more than cover any further claim they may be supposed to have on the electoral privilege. According to this calculation for every hundred electors now on the roll as burgesses, twenty might be added to be selected from the unenfranchised householders in the borough, and who when once so admitted under the denomination of freemen, should remain ever after on the electoral list so long as they continued to inhabit a house of any kind within its boundaries, paying all rates and taxes\* for the same. It ought clearly to be

\* The non-payment of rates and taxes has frequently been contended against as a disqualification of an elector, and no doubt a neglect in the collecting of these has often operated very unfairly as to the exercise of the privilege. But in truth an amendment is required as to the practice, often pursued in the collection of rates, which ought to be enforced with much greater regularity than often exists at present. Strictly speaking, no new rate should be granted till the previous one has been fully collected. This, however, is often full of

a life privilege when once attained. The mode of selection it may not be so easy to determine, as the proportion to be thus enfranchised; but two suggestions offer themselves as more especially worth consideration. By the first, the unenfranchised inhabitants might be called on to make this selection to be added to the burgess roll. By this mode the whole body would, to some extent, have a voice in the elections, and so far meet Mr. Bright's requisition at Leeds, "that *every working* man throughout the kingdom shall form a *fair* portion of every free constituency." As the choice of these burgess-freemen would depend upon the whole community, the best known and most respected might probably obtain the privilege, though political, or rather local, party-feeling and the trade union combinations, especially in the first instance, would struggle to monopolise the nomination. As in after years only vacancies would have to be supplied, a greater diversity of opinions would most likely prevail among these freemen as a body. It is also to be recollected the working classes would not always have their own way, as many small shopkeepers and other parties constitute a considerable portion of the unenfranchised householders. Another plan of admission, however, might be adopted, which though less complete in some respects would probably difficulty; but the making any third rate should be absolutely illegal, and the non-payment of the one rate last made should alone operate as a disqualification.

be fairer on the whole. This may be called *admission by seniority*, that is, those who have been longest resident in the borough, and continuously paid rates and taxes,—not necessarily for the same premises, but for a dwelling of some sort,—should have a right by preference to be entered on the roll as freemen. One advantage in this would be a better chance of admission for all opinions and sections belonging to the lower ranks of society, and the avoidance of many evils that might attend choice by election. Such voters would feel also more independent, who by the other system might consider themselves bound to vote in accordance with the views, or perhaps at the dictation of the party to whom they owed their position. Length of residence in any place is usually a favourable testimony to steadiness of character and employment, and there is some reason that he, who has contributed for the longest period to the local burthens of the place, should have a preference in the enjoyment of any privileges that might be conferred thereby.

House occupation, in conjunction with various descriptions of property or payment of taxes, might further justify or secure the electoral franchise, such as a sum of £100 vested not less than two years previous to the claim, and so long and there remained in the Savings' Bank, which makes every such person a creditor of the State, and interested in the National Debt. The direct payment of income tax should have the same effect. But it might

further be worth consideration whether house occupation of any value might not be admitted as a qualification, provided the claimant should thereby be called on to pay the house tax. The Roman citizen often acquired that distinction at a great cost, and if the electoral is so valuable a right as it is represented, the citizen acquiring it might elect to pay for it by at least rendering himself liable to the same charges as those whose privileges he claims to share. This of course involves an extension of the house tax to every description of elector, —whether at present liable or not,— and which might have a very wholesome effect in making the community at large take some interest in the national expenditure.

If an alteration in the Borough franchise is not very urgently called for on any ground of abstract right, much hope of securing a more independent, intelligent, and incorruptible constituency than exists at present, or reasonable prospect of improving the House of Commons itself, there is still less to be advanced, either on these grounds or any other, for an alteration of the franchise affecting the constituencies of Counties.

Keeping in view always that the main principle of the Constitution is a *representation of interests and not of numbers or different classes* of society, and that in each of these interests various classes have frequently equal interests, the Knights of the Shire constitute, and ever have constituted, a very

important element of the House of Commons. As respects the constituencies themselves no one can say those of the County are insignificant either as to number of electors or the interests they embody. Even the Lilliput counties, Rutland and Radnor, and their Dilly the Isle of Wight, have each respectively 1774, 1597, 2362 electors, and the average number of voters in each county are quite large enough for any useful or practical purpose, while any great increase in their numbers would be a serious misfortune, both as an elective machinery and as a true representation of their particular interests. Having on more than one occasion taken a leading part in opposing the changes contemplated by my excellent friend Mr. Locke King's crotchet for reducing the county franchise to £10, subsequent examination and reflection have more than ever confirmed the opinion I have always, both in the House of Commons and on the hustings, expressed on the subject. In the first place its adoption would make the county representation one dependent like that of the boroughs on mere householders, instead of being one that specially represents real property, the ownership of the soil, and the various minor interests more immediately connected with that one great and staple interest in the country. To have swamped this by a flood of mere house occupiers would at once have been unjust and impolitic. But, in the next place, a state of circumstances would have been produced as must inevit-

ably have led to other and greater changes, and put an end ultimately to all county representation. Owing to the actual or near equality and identity as to character in the county and borough franchise, a system of electoral districts must inevitably have ere long been introduced. When a borough, say with 1200 electors, returned two members to Parliament, while the surrounding county, with perhaps its 12,000 electors, returned in like manner but two members, the electors in both voting under the same qualification, an irreconcilable absurdity would have been created which no explanations, however ingeniously elaborated by Mr. Disraeli or Mr. Gladstone, could have justified, or made it possible to retain beyond a very brief period; and if for convenience alone, one universal dead level average as to extent of area, population, voting qualification, and number of voters, would have been, sooner or later, established throughout the realm. The diversity of interests, which now distinguish town and county, would have been obliterated and overwhelmed by whatever might happen to be the preponderating interest and power in the country. It may be fairly argued that such an electoral redistribution has many merits to recommend it, particularly that of simplicity, and with a certain class of our politicians simplicity seems very strongly to recommend itself to their understandings; but be that as it may, it has not hitherto been the principle of the British Constitution, which is one that seeks,

as far as possible, a varied expression of the interests existing under very different circumstances, of very different degrees of importance, and belonging to very different sections of the population and localities of the kingdom ; it contemplates and has hitherto secured us a Parliament centralizing as embodying various elements, but not itself centralized in its origin and character. As far as experience teaches, the members who take their place in the House of Commons as knights of the shire are certainly quite as intelligent and well informed ; as efficient in the conduct of business ; as honest, conciliatory, and well-behaved ; and as independent and free from jobbery in their conduct, as gentlemen are generally supposed to be, and may bear on all these points a not unfavourable comparison with the members returned by the great hives of industry ; nay, some think under all these aspects they have a considerable advantage over this more pretentious class of representatives. It may be doubtful, however, whether the county members, though perhaps somewhat more correct in their speech and statements, possess the same degree of oratorical facility \*

\* At the recent opening of the Union Society of Cambridge, Lord Houghton, one of our new Peers, ascribed the hesitation so often observed in so many of our public speakers to the complex genius of our language. But this, very little observation must convince anyone, is not the true cause, but rather a natural diffidence arising from the speaker possessing knowledge enough to make him feel doubtful whether he is quite master of his subject. Irishmen, on the contrary, who use the same complex language, are never at a loss in its use, while

as those sent to Parliament by the power-loom constituencies, than whom they also are decidedly less liberal in their use of the Queen's English, whether quantity or quality are regarded in the expression of their sentiments. Though the present House of Commons is denounced as hopelessly corrupt by Mr. Bright, there is no reason for believing that Knights of the Shire are more corrupt or more corruptible than Mr. Bright himself and his immediate admirers and followers, and would probably be found,—could it be tested,—quite on a par with any equal number of persons taken indiscriminately from those passing through Temple Bar at any time of the day, even during the small hours when the market-salesmen and early-rising mechanics, with their robust qualities, are hastening to their daily toils. Should the class of men now representing the counties cease to be a distinctive element in the constitution of Parliament, the House of Commons would be not a little deteriorated, and no additional infusion of energetic Members, such as now represent the Metropolitan Boroughs and factory constituencies of the West Riding and Lancashire, could compensate for their absence, or tend to elevate the character of the House itself higher in the opinion and confidence of the country and the world at large, than it at present occupies.

their knowledge is usually somewhat defective in extent and accuracy. A limited liability as to knowledge with unlimited confidence in self generally makes the readiest if not the most valued orator of a popular assembly.

It is to be hoped then, whatever changes may be attempted in the representation, that the present character of the county constituencies and county representatives will not be tampered with. Even if the proposal was accepted of a reduction in the franchise by leasehold from £50. to £20., the lesser value should be required as depending on land, and to be exclusive of any value by a house occupation. As respects the distribution of the county representation, if any changes are to be made, it would be highly desirable the great mistake of giving any constituency three Members should be rectified. Two or three of the counties, which now have that privilege, have little claim for it; while some might very fairly be divided into two, and have an additional member allotted, particularly in those instances where boroughs now exist with very extensive rural districts. These ought all to be lopped off from such anomalous Boroughs as Aylesbury, New Shoreham, Wenlock, Shaftesbury, Wareham, Christchurch, Woodstock, Eye, Wilton, Tavistock, &c. &c., in spite of the territorial magnates in their neighbourhood, the boroughs in each case being reduced to the *bonâ fide* town area. Their original formation was to a great extent a Whig job, contrived to benefit, as was professedly acknowledged at the time, the agricultural if not their estate interests. Dorsetshire, besides having a larger share of members than it has any preten-

sions to on any grounds, is particularly ill-used by these rural extensions of its boroughs.

As respects however the general distribution of the representation, as at present allotted through the kingdom, as little disturbance as possible should be attempted. On the whole this is now pretty fair, though where there is an evident redundancy, some few seats might be transferred to other districts where the deficiency is equally obvious. As respects the three Kingdoms, there is no justifiable reason for any derangement as to the present proportions. Scotland and Ireland were both benefited by the great Reform Bill at the expense of England, and if both these countries have made great progress within the last thirty years, the progress of England during the same period has in proportion been still more considerable. It was very natural for a Prime Minister under very strong Scotch predilections and influences, and a Scotchman as leader in the House of Commons with equally strong characteristics of his race,—though his speech bewrayeth them not except in its redundancy,—to propose a considerable addition to the Scotch representatives, all subtracted from England, and to balance and disguise the partiality, to make a similar present to Ireland. Every one, however, who has sat in the House of Commons must feel the Caledonian element is quite as powerful as it ought to be, and however great their native merits and virtues, their mental,

philosophical and speculative activity and intelligence, there are still other merits belonging to the true Englishman, which are not understood by and sometimes found wanting in the race indigenous to the regions beyond the Tweed. It should also be recollected that many Scotchmen find their way into English Boroughs, but as for an Englishman being thought worthy to be selected as its representative by any Scotch constituency, there is but one present instance of the kind, and he would have had no chance of such a distinction, had he not taken unto him to wife a daughter of the Philistines. On what pretence the late proposal could have been made, has not been sufficiently explained, though Mr. Bright, at Glasgow, was ready enough with his anti-English preferences on all subjects, fully to concur in its justice, and which would further be in accordance with the American rule, he always advocates, which makes population (minus negroes, if there chance to be any), the one and only measure for the adjustment of representation. On this scale Scotland might claim to have its number of members raised from 53 to 63, but as the same rule would require a similar division in the local distribution, ten of these at least would be allotted to the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, while London ought to have as many as all Scotland put together. But on the score of increase of population, the claims of Scotland are less in comparison with those of England than they were, as by the last census it appears

the population of England and Wales during the ten previous years has increased 4.33 per cent., while that of Scotland is but 2.26 per cent. If, on the other hand, the payment of Income tax ought to have anything to do with this adjustment of representation, Scotland has just about her fair proportion, as respects the United Kingdom, while that of Ireland is more than double what it ought to be; the share of England being short by 53 members in comparison with Scotland alone, a deficiency which is about balanced by the Irish redundancy. On these grounds there seems to be no reason for altering the present proportions as now existing in the United Kingdom, and certainly not to the detriment of England, even though it might be shown that the members returned by the sister Kingdoms were less steeped in that corruption ascribed to the House of Commons generally by Mr. Bright, and were pre-eminent in their character for independence, business habits, and statesmanlike talents. Much clamour is often raised about justice to Ireland and justice to Scotland, and though nothing is ever said about it, there is such a thing as justice to England, which, for her own sake, and that of her somewhat forward sisters, ought not to be lost sight of, and it may be as well to recall this to their notice.

Scotchmen, through Parliament, have practically then their full share in the Legislature, which they make still stronger, as, without reference to party, they always act more or less in unison; while, as

respects the executive administration in all its varied branches,—military, judicial and civil,—they generally manage to secure of places and profits a portion much beyond their primary claims, if not their merits. Scotchmen are frequently promoted to offices in England in which England is alone concerned; but an Englishman has not the remotest chance of the loaves and fishes conferred by office on the other side of the Tweed. England will do well, then, not to show too much indifference or magnanimity whenever any distribution of Parliamentary power is in contemplation.

Whatever schemes may be taken in hand, however, by any Government respecting this redistribution, it will be all waste labour if some attempt is not made to reform the evils,—the debasing evils,—which are now so unblushingly allowed to attend the working of our electoral machinery. The lower the franchise descends the greater will be the difficulty to bring about any reformation in these practices. It ought, therefore, if possible, to precede, or at least accompany any measures affecting the franchise. Because it may not be possible to establish a system of entire purity, there is no reason why the election booth should not be cleansed as far as circumstances may allow, instead of regarding such as an Augæan stable, by giving up the very attempt. It were better to try ballot than to do nothing; but that other remedies from the Legislative pharmacopœia may do much there is no reason to doubt, if

honestly prescribed and patiently administered. The first object should be to make bribery disgraceful, and one of penalties both on the giver and receiver ; but this, the disfranchisement of a whole borough is not calculated to effect, and still less so because it is a matter of rejoicing to some other place, which receives the forfeited privilege. The disgrace to be effectual should be made to tell directly on individual candidates and their agents in the first instance, and only secondarily on the electors as a body. Instead of turning, therefore, such a Borough Danae as Totnes into the streets by a writ of divorcement *a mensâ et toro* of Parliament for having allowed her virtue to have been overcome by a shower of gold, a bill should be introduced affecting Jupiter himself, the undoubted author of that shower, and the various Mercuries—particularly of the legal order, who ought to be oracles, not breakers of the law,—employed in the impregnation. If all these parties were made incapable ever after of sitting in Parliament, or of exercising the electoral privilege under any circumstances in any part of the kingdom—the proper end of all punishment would be attained, and others deterred from following their example. As for the boroughs themselves, where such practices so pervade the whole constituencies as proved at Totnes, Yarmouth, &c., the expenses of the Commission of inquiry should be thrown on the municipal rates, making all parties thereby as interested in the prevention as they are now in the pre-

valence of such irregular advantages, in like manner as the Hundred is made responsible for any damages occasioned by disturbances of the peace within its limits, however favourable the breaking of windows may be to the interests of the local glaziers.

It is, however, mainly to the improved state of public opinion—which is decidedly in advance of our electoral practices—that an effectual amendment is likely to be brought about, and as one who for now forty years has had some experience in elections, it may safely be affirmed that present opinion contrasts most favourably with that which prevailed at the commencement of that period.

At the Hertfordshire Election, immediately after the passing of the Reform Bill, Sir John Sebright—who had been selected as seconder of that first introduced by Earl Grey's government—in returning thanks to his constituents, thus concluded his address: "Gentlemen, we have reformed the House of Commons, it is now for you, Electors, to reform yourselves."

Whatever course the present Government may determine on taking on this question, the duty of Parliament is plain enough, and it is to be hoped may prove equal to the occasion, instead of allowing itself to be the mere instrument of the ministry or opposition of the day, or for party purposes the supporters or opponents of any measures that may be introduced. Parliament at certain seasons has a

higher mission than mere regard for official interests and supremacy, which too commonly operate as the rudder of their proceedings. Through the vast expansion of the executive Government and its all-pervading machinery throughout every section of the social community—(especially the legal)—and all the institutions of the land, a marked antagonism has grown up of late years between the body of Parliament itself, and the official class, who may be regarded as a distinct profession and power in the State, and which, according to Mr. Bright's authority, exists and is known in the United States as the Bread and Butter party, united and intertwined at the roots by the under-masters of modern Bureaucracy, co-operative and coherent in themselves, whatever benches they may occupy in the House, and whatever may be the subscribed articles of their political belief. When the existence, however, of the Constitution is at stake, it is for Parliament itself, and not the Ministry, to indicate the course that is to be taken, and to give instructions—(for instance, as by resolutions, perhaps founded on previous inquiries directed by the House itself)—to those who, though they may be the ministers of the Crown, are the servants of the public, in so far as their will and care for their weal is expressed by Parliament. The existence of any Ministry ought not therefore to depend on the passing or non-passing of any constitutional settlement, the responsibility of which should rest with Parliament itself, the Ministry being rather their

agents than instructors in the measure. The Government of the day—be it of what party it may—would show their respect for Parliament rather by inviting its attention than by advising it as to how the subject should be settled. Not only is much inquiry yet needed, and the accuracy of many facts still to be verified, but certain constitutional principles ought to be solved and defined—not by crude, hap-hazard, ill-digested propositions,—but on a broad and statesmanlike basis, as the foundation on which any measure ought to be made to rest for the future permanent security of *our present*—not another *newly-created*—Constitution.

If such ought to be the course of the House of Commons as to the *internal* influences to which it may be subjected, its character and dignity are not less at stake in meeting the *external* influences now evoked and openly threatened to control their free action and judgment by the oratorical Prophet of Brummagem Politics. This amounts to nothing more nor less than raising a spirit and the practical action of terrorism. Out of the vasty depths of the social cauldron—seething and heaving with the lowest, least enlightened, and multitudinous masses of the sons of labour—an exhalation of Vesuvian darkness is summoned to overspread the land, and overpower with its smothering forces all the brighter and nobler elements of human intelligence and knowledge. The successful issue of the catastrophe confidently assured by “this gigantic agitation,” as its

author terms it, it will be the duty of Parliament as confidently to meet and test by the simple touch of Ithuriel's Constitutional spear, by pure drops from the fountain of truth—the experience of the past—and the inexorable and incontrovertible evidence of facts as indisputable as the light of day. As there is little chance that the intelligence and spirit of Parliament will be deceived or cowed by misstatements, without strength save in the hardihood of assertion, and ignorant and illogical sophisms, and the remedy of fear it is apprehended may not be as effectual as intended, another base auxiliary has been therefore summoned, and an attempt made to deprive Parliament of its chief strength by undermining its character. It is not uncommon for a beggar, when he finds whining and entreaties fail, to turn round and discharge a volley of abuse and threats. In like manner Mr. Bright, professing to be a man of peace, and belonging to a sect which affects to be of the straightest in the cause of truth and goodwill towards men, in all the plenitude of priestly arrogance, denounces in no measured terms the corruption of the House of Commons, of which he is a member, and describes it as a hocus-pocus assembly.

That the House of Commons may have many corrupt elements in it—may often pass unnoticed and even countenance great and gross jobs; and that its individual members may from time to time prove notorious and even criminal delinquents, there is no denying; and, indeed, out of so large a num-

ber as 658 persons, it would be strange were it otherwise, inasmuch as they are selected from the great body of the public at large, among whom corruption and jobbery are rife enough; and though a body not returned by manhood or household suffrage, the class of members most amenable to the character given them by Mr. Bright are generally those who have been chosen by constituencies that approach the nearest to such electoral qualifications. Attention has been lately much directed by the Press, and even by the member for Lambeth, Mr. Thomas Hughes, to the 'enormous number of persons who had been convicted of using false weights and measures' among his constituents, who received the remark with derision. Mr. Locke, the member for the adjoining borough of Southwark—appointed Recorder of Brighton by the late Government—has been in the habit—as became such a legal functionary anxious for the suppression of crime—of yearly moving for such a Return—costing from its bulk no small trifle in the printing of Parliamentary Papers—but unfortunately all names and consequent exposure were suppressed. If in future these were given in the Return, and as to whether the delinquents belonged or not to the order of electors, the information might operate wholesomely on his constituents, as well as be useful to Mr. Bright in tracing out the causes, when he next undertakes to denounce the corruption of the House of Commons, as compared with other sections of society. In Southwark

one half of the electors, and in Lambeth one third are presumed to belong to the working classes. It might also be worth inquiry whether electors of this description would come within Mr. Gladstone's exception of being "presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness." If so, a conviction for using false weights might be made to operate very efficaciously as a double purge in cleansing both the electoral and commercial lists.

The class of members who have been most distinguished for their jobbery, and contributed of late to the degradation of the standard of commercial morality, as the chief agents in most questionable transactions, Mr. Bright can easily take account of himself, while the readiness evinced by those, who may be regarded as his immediate followers, to accept office, and Parliamentary silence at the hands of Lord Palmerston—though previous to their official enlistment, and still more since that noble Lord's death, their denouncement of his policy was and has been most severe—is an instructive comment on their political morality and justification of their leader's censure.

Whether the Parliament Mr. Bright proposes to create will be of purer mould and likely to maintain a higher character for wisdom, ability, and incorruptibility, we have only his assurance and vaticinations to depend on, but a crop of figs from thistles has hitherto been considered an impossibility. When he calls upon the country to supersede the

class legislation now existing—based on property and knowledge,—by a class legislation—based on numbers, of small knowledge and less property,—on the ground of the former “including every form of corruption and evil,” he is bound to prove that the latter are entirely free, or at least less contaminated with what he objects to the former. This challenge, though often made, he has hitherto studiously avoided.

With the attempt to damage their character as a body among other forces brought to bear on individual members, that of ridicule has been freely resorted to, and a cry about a cave of Adullam—which shows our oracle has not studied Scripture to more purpose than Lord Somers’ opinions—has found a free if not very enlightened response. Why any one, who thought fit to deny the excellence of the late ministerial Reform Bill—(which every one now asserts was not worth a rap)—had need to take refuge anywhere, is not very clear, but if a refuge was needed, a figurative cave of Adullam was quite unexceptionable, notwithstanding the miscellaneous company resorting there. The chief defender of that cave was no less a person than David himself, when, armed with the sword of Goliath, he and his followers were driven to protect themselves against Saul, and his head servant Doeg the Edomite. This latter worthy, when his other servants refused, did not scruple at Saul’s bidding to fall upon and slay with the edge of the sword fourscore and five priests of the Lord, besides a multitude of other

innocent people, their agency as witnesses of the Truth being their sole offence. Truth, then as now, unless speaking pleasant things, being deemed disrespectful and punished accordingly. Peradventure in these days there exists a political Saul, with tall talk, head and shoulders above that of other men, with whom may be linked as his chief abettor, a modern Doeg, whose tongue and even hand as an Edomite is raised against every man, and ready to destroy all those who have hitherto been the chief strength and guardians of our Constitution. Which company it may be preferable and safest to join, no intelligent, honest, or sane person can for one moment doubt. Whether any special David or not exists as its defender, the Sword or Strength of that Constitution—which like that of Goliath, as Lord Somers observes, is not to be used but on great occasions—in the hands of the House of Commons will suffice for its defence, and the discomfiture of its assailants, if only wielded with that wisdom and firm trust in themselves and their cause which has hitherto ever distinguished the British Parliament, and thus elevate still higher that position which it holds throughout all lands where the cause of Freedom—real, rational, enlightened Freedom—and all the valued excellencies which make nations great, are believed in, admired and cherished.

---

# OUTLINE OF A REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS

## IN ENGLAND AND WALES,

According to the principles laid down in the preceding pages, in which two Members have been invariably given to each Constituency, except in the instance of the City of London. The Boundaries of Counties have been observed as near as possible in the grouping of the Boroughs, except where evident convenience suggested the contrary.

The figures of the new places introduced are not strictly accurate, the Census Returns not giving the Towns separate from the Parishes. In like manner many Towns may be omitted, from being situated in more than one Parish.

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
I.						
NORTHUMBERLAND	A. 1,249,299					
N. Division	P. 65,962	550,799	33,472	12,382	3,109	2 — 2
S. Division	P. 106,855	610,604	27,622	20,056	5,511	2 — 2
<hr/>						
1. Berwick	13,265	41,064	3,443	1,883	731	2 — 2
Alnwick	5,670			833		
Morpeth	13,794	46,990	3,289	2,312	448	1 — 0
Hexham	4,655			620		
	<hr/> 37,384			<hr/> 5,648		
2. Newcastle	109,108	334,467	46,298	13,979	6,630	2 — 2
<hr/>						
3. Tynemouth, & N. Shields	36,741	86,748	7,965	4,952	1,271	1 — 2
Blyth	2,901			515		
	<hr/> 39,642			<hr/> 5,467		<hr/> 10 — 10
<hr/>						
II.						
CUMBERLAND	A. 1,001,273					
E. Division	P. 75,972	446,769	20,033	15,196	5,455	2 — 2
W. Division	P. 73,988	378,863	20,780	14,902	4,602	2 — 2
<hr/>						
1. Carlisle	29,417	70,106	8,222	5,140	1,304	2 — 2
Longtown	2,717			476		
Brampton	2,379			514		
Alstone	2,918			655		
	<hr/> 37,431			<hr/> 6,785		
2.* Cockermouth	7,057	26,069	1,651	1,543	336	2 — 2
Wigton	4,011			934		
Keswick	2,610			588		
Penrith	7,189			1,596		
	<hr/> 20,867			<hr/> 4,661		
<hr/> Carried forward						<hr/> 8 — 8

\* Boroughs with a large Rural District, the figures given are of the Town only, where such could be ascertained, and are usually marked M. Lts. for Municipal Limits.

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
3. Whitehaven . . .	18,842	44,920	6,977	3,751	648	8 — 8
Egremont . . .	2,511			505		1 — 2
Workington . . .	6,467			1,530		
Maryport . . .	6,037			1,353		
	<u>33,857</u>			<u>7,139</u>		<u>9 — 10</u>
III.						
DURHAM . . . A.	622,476					
N. Division . . . P.	169,543	607,753	48,112	31,167	6,042	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	170,412	840,711	57,085	31,611	7,263	2 — 2
1. Durham . . .	14,088	32,917	5,733	2,007	1,056	2 — 2
Bp. Auckland . . .	6,480			1,186		
Barnard Castle . . .	4,178			757		
Houghton le Spring . . .	3,824			710		
Chester le Street . . .	2,550			518		
	<u>31,120</u>			<u>5,178</u>		
2. Gateshead . . .	33,587	84,590	5,816	4,391	1,165	1 } 2
S. Shields . . .	35,236	83,961	2,908	4,443	1,113	1 }
	<u>68,823</u>			<u>8,834</u>		
3. Sunderland . . .	85,797	240,211	22,457	11,188	3,468	2 — 2
Seaham Harbour . . .	6,127			833		
	<u>91,924</u>			<u>12,021</u>		
4. Hartlepool . . .	12,245			1,726		
W. Hartlepool . . .	12,603			2,190		
Stockton . . .	13,357			2,485		0 — 2
Darlington . . .	15,781			2,683		
	<u>53,986</u>			<u>9,084</u>		<u>10 — 12</u>
IV.						
WESTMORELAND . . . A.	485,432	92,089	15,042	9,203	4,237	2 — 2
	P. 48,788					
1. Kendal . . .	12,029	36,441	3,846	2,590	439	1 — 2
Ulverstone } in Furness,	6,630			1,348		
Dalton } Lancash.	2,812			538		
	<u>21,471</u>			<u>4,476</u>		<u>3 — 4</u>
V.						
LANCASHIRE . . . A.	1,219,221					
N. Division . . . P.	374,489	1,535,527	106,652	70,528	13,006	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	627,656	2,643,411	172,256	119,021	21,555	3 — 2
				<u>Carried forward</u>		<u>5 — 4</u>

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						5 — 4
1. Lancaster . . .	16,005	48,154	5,601	2,992	1,465	2 — 2
Fleetwood . . .	3,834			546		
Kirkham . . .	3,380			616		
Lytham . . .	2,556			446		
Blackpool . . .	3,506			684		
	<u>29,281</u>			<u>5,304</u>		
2. Preston . . .	82,985	204,751	22,147	15,050	2,562	2 — 2
Chorley . . .	15,013			2,748		
Southport . . .	8,940			1,438		
	<u>106,938</u>			<u>19,236</u>		
3.* Clitheroe, M. Lts.	7,000	38,658	2,935	1,433	438	1 — 2
Colne . . .	6,315			1,357		
Padiham . . .	5,675			1,140		
Burnley . . .	28,700			5,085		
Accrington . . .	13,872			2,579		
Haslingden . . .	6,929			1,205		
Bacup . . .	10,935			2,085		
New Church . . .	3,115			630		
	<u>82,581</u>			<u>15,494</u>		
4. Blackburn . . .	63,126	144,598	16,281	11,306	1,894	2 — 2
Church . . .	3,000			546		
Over Darwen . . .	14,327			2,537		
Great Harwood . . .	5,294			637		
	<u>84,727</u>			<u>15,026</u>		
5. Bolton . . .	70,395	184,488	25,647	13,129	2,186	2 — 2
Farnworth . . .	8,720			1,720		
Atherton . . .	2,692			683		
Leigh . . .	10,621			2,098		
	<u>92,428</u>			<u>17,630</u>		
6. Bury . . .	37,563	124,772	12,001	7,257	1,352	1
Heywood . . .	12,824			2,630		
Rochdale . . .	38,184	114,490	13,473	7,705	1,358	1
Todmorden, part in W. Riding . . .	11,797			2,360		
	<u>100,368</u>			<u>19,952</u>		
7. Wigan . . .	37,658	78,048	10,183	6,696	863	2 — 2
Ormskirk . . .	6,426			1,193		
Hindley . . .	8,477			1,030		
	<u>52,561</u>			<u>8,919</u>		
Carried forward						18 — 18

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
8. Oldham . . . .	94,344	245,868	20,660	18,335	2,285	18—18
Middleton . . . .	9,876			2,090		2—2
	<u>104,210</u>			<u>20,425</u>		
9. Manchester . . . .	357,979	1,398,607	279,900	65,375	21,542	2—2
10. Salford . . . .	102,449	351,352	27,220	19,128	5,397	1—2
11. Liverpool . . . .	443,938	2,402,584	331,994	65,781	20,618	2—2
12. Warrington . . . .	29,947	72,940	8,415	5,146	768	1—2
Newton . . . .	5,009			1,048		
Prescot . . . .	6,066			1,204		
St. Helen's . . . .	18,396			3,146		
Tydesley . . . .	3,950			815		
Widnes . . . .	4,803			855		
Much Woolton . . . .	3,296			643		
	<u>68,467</u>			<u>12,857</u>		
13. Ashton . . . .	33,917	83,471	7,575	6,460	967	1—2
Droysden . . . .	5,980			1,163		
Staleybridge, part in Cheshire	24,921			4,868		
	<u>64,818</u>			<u>12,491</u>		<u>27—30</u>
VI.						
YORKSHIRE, W. RIDING A.	1,709,307					
N. Division . . . . P.	419,972	1,580,772	218,032	183,638	10,056	} 2—2
S. Division . . . . P.	461,022	1,838,211				
1. Halifax . . . .	37,014	116,059	18,666	7,807	1,771	2—2
Elland . . . .	3,643			760		
Sowerby . . . .	5,382			1,060		
Holmfirth . . . .	2,466			499		
	<u>48,505</u>			<u>10,126</u>		
2. Bradford . . . .	106,218	378,053	46,365	22,518	5,189	2—2
Cleckheaton . . . .	4,721			999		
	<u>110,939</u>			<u>23,517</u>		
3.* Leeds . . . .	207,165	585,483	71,933	44,651	7,217	2—2
4. Huddersfield . . . .	34,877	133,011	16,283	6,955	2,138	1—2
Dewsbury . . . .	18,148			3,639		
Batley . . . .	7,206			1,480		
	<u>60,231</u>			<u>12,074</u>		
Carried forward						11—12

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						11—12
5.* Sheffield . . .	185,172	529,030	53,113	38,052	8,557	2—2
Rotherham . . .	7,598			1,484		
	<u>192,770</u>			<u>40,536</u>		
6. Wakefield . . .	23,150	71,246	8,275	4,773	1,086	1—2
Barnesley . . .	17,890			3,565		
Heckmondwike . . .	8,680			1,830		
	<u>49,920</u>			<u>10,168</u>		
7.* Pontefract . . .	11,736	35,275	2,919	2,596	699	2—2
Selby . . .	5,271			1,173		
Thorne . . .	2,591			628		
Doncaster . . .	16,406			3,594		
Goole . . .	5,850			1,168		
Castleford . . .	3,876			813		
	<u>43,730</u>			<u>9,972</u>		
8. Skipton . . .	4,533			950		
Keighley . . .	15,005			3,091		
Otley . . .	4,458			954		
Yeadon . . .	4,109			863		0—2
Guiselley . . .	2,226			473		
Bingley . . .	5,238			1,173		
	<u>35,569</u>			<u>7,484</u>		
9. Ripon . . .	6,172	21,795	1,716	1,382	348	2 } 2
Knaresborough . . .	5,402	10,562	1,358	1,318	272	2 }
Harrowgate . . .	4,737			920		
Tadcaster . . .	2,327			563		
	<u>18,638</u>			<u>4,183</u>		<u>20—22</u>
VII.						
YORKSHIRE . . . A.	1,350,121					
N. Riding . . . P.	201,004	1,364,943	67,397	40,814	15,438	2—2
1. York City . . .	45,385	148,717	61,599	9,162	4,277	2—2
2.* Richmond . . .	5,134	22,032	2,069	1,382	348	2 }
*Northallerton . . .	4,755	29,901	1,623	1,058	442	1 }
*Thirsk . . .	5,350	30,539	1,617	1,205	380	1 }
	<u>15,239</u>			<u>3,645</u>		
3. Middlesborough . . .	18,992			3,117		
Guisbrough . . .	3,794			794		
*Whitby . . .	12,051	39,957	3,973	2,464	703	1—2
	<u>34,837</u>			<u>6,375</u>		
Carried forward						9—8

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £.	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						
4. Scarborough	18,377	88,196	6,139	3,940	1,351	9 — 8
Bridlington in E. R.	5,775			1,363		2 — 2
	<u>24,152</u>			<u>4,303</u>		
5. *Malton	8,072	25,610	2,109	1,694	600	2 — 2
Pickering	2,640			588		
Pocklington	2,671			600		
Gt. Driffield } in E.R.	4,244			948		
	<u>17,627</u>			<u>3,830</u>		<u>13—12</u>
VIII.						
EAST RIDING	A. 768,419					
	P. 127,053	1,084,637	60,429	26,259	7,400	2 — 2
1. *Beverley	9,654	43,353	3,464	2,156	1,239	2 — 2
Market Weighton	2,178			460		
Howden	2,376			539		
	<u>14,208</u>			<u>3,155</u>		
2. Hull	94,661	307,153	36,994	19,516	5,566	2 — 2
						<u>6 — 6</u>
IX.						
LINCOLNSHIRE	A. 1,775,437					
N. Div. Lindsay	P. 193,757	1,414,990	80,050	41,057	12,372	2 — 2
S. Div. Holland	P. 146,602	1,147,534	68,595	30,557	9,260	2 — 2
1. *Great Grimsby	15,060	54,448	3,715	3,161	1,273	1 — 2
Barton	3,795			888		
Louth	10,560			2,400		
Brigg	3,138			654		
Gainsborough	6,320			1,403		
Crowle	2,304			563		
	<u>41,177</u>			<u>9,069</u>		
2. Lincoln	20,999	70,883	11,282	4,315	1,713	2 — 2
Market Raisin	2,468			536		
Horncastle	4,846			1,057		
Sleaford	3,745			800		
	<u>28,313</u>			<u>5,908</u>		
3. Boston	17,893	56,400	4,591	3,901	1,021	2 — 2
Alford	2,658			592		
Spalding	7,034					
Holbeach	2,083					
	<u>29,668</u>			<u>4,493</u>		
Carried forward						9—10

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						9—10
4. *Grantham . . .	11,121	42,256	3,898	2,254	755	2 } 2
Stamford . . .	8,047	24,125	3,610	1,636	512	2 }
Bourn . . .	3,066			616		
Crowland . . .	2,413			554		
Oakham } in	2,091			424		
Uppingham } Rutland	2,186			397		
	<u>28,924</u>			<u>5,881</u>		<u>13—12</u>
X.						
RUTLANDSHIRE . . .	21,861	157,113	10,208	4,641	1,774	2—2
XI.						
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE . A.	526,076					
N. Division . . P.	88,886	266,249	16,717	18,600	4,065	2—2
S. Division . . P.	71,443	462,486	24,739	15,558	3,427	2—2
1. *East Retford, M.Lts.	2,982			648		2—2
Blyth . . .	2,086			466		
Clarborough . . .	2,412			529		
Worksop . . .	7,112			1,546		
Mansfield . . .	8,346			1,866		
	<u>22,938</u>			<u>5,055</u>		
2. Newark . . .	11,515	39,836	4,208	2,558	710	2—2
Southwell . . .	3,095			695		
	<u>14,610</u>			<u>3,253</u>		
3. Nottingham . . .	74,693	257,275	27,180	15,441	5,934	2—2
						<u>10—10</u>
XII.						
DERBYSHIRE . . A.	658,803					
N. Division . . P.	159,044	582,452		31,437	5,055	2—2
S. Division . . P.	137,192	674,127		28,844	7,976	2—2
1. Derby . . .	43,091	124,827		8,981	2,450	2—2
Ilkeston . . .	3,330			709		
Melbourne . . .	2,194			528		
Clay Cross . . .	3,501			591		
Ashborne . . .	3,501			760		
Belper . . .	9,509			1,976		
	<u>65,026</u>			<u>13,545</u>		
Carried forward						6—6

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members Pres. Fut.
2. Chesterfield . . .	9,836			Brought forward		6 — 6
Staveley . . .	2,400			1,909		0 — 2
Bakewell . . .	2,704			416		
Alfreton . . .	4,090			485		
Wirksworth . . .	2,592			678		
Glossop—about . . .	15,000			637		
				1,000		
	<u>36,622</u>			<u>5,125</u>		<u>6 — 8</u>
<b>XIII.</b>						
CHESHIRE . . . A.	707,078					
N. Division . . .	182,347	852,946	51,930	35,907	6,026	2 — 2
S. Division . . .	160,481	943,655	51,946	31,557	6,826	2 — 2
1. Chester . . .	31,110	93,996	12,833	5,971	2,274	2 — 2
Nantwich . . .	6,225			1,310		
Crewe . . .	8,159			1,473		
Middlewich . . .	3,146			717		
Sandbach . . .	3,252			713		
	<u>51,892</u>			<u>10,184</u>		
2. Birkenhead . . .	51,649	269,551	19,016	7,189	4,563	1 — 2
Runcorn . . .	10,434			2,092		
New Brighton . . .	2,404			367		
	<u>64,487</u>			<u>9,698</u>		
3. Macclesfield . . .	36,101	75,210	6,159	8,342	861	2 — 2
Congleton . . .	12,344			2,620		
Knutsford . . .	3,375			660		
Bollington . . .	3,845			772		
	<u>55,865</u>			<u>12,394</u>		
4. Stockport . . .	54,681	134,153	13,790	11,255	1,348	2 — 2
Altrincham . . .	6,628			1,240		
Dukinfield . . .	15,024			3,086		
Hyde . . .	13,722			2,615		
	<u>90,055</u>			<u>18,196</u>		<u>11 — 12</u>
<b>XIV.</b>						
STAFFORDSHIRE . . . A.	728,468					
N. Division . . . P.	162,986	961,230	56,980	33,312	10,763	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	260,262	937,830	77,228	50,722	10,841	2 — 2
1. Newcastle-under-Lyne	12,938	28,255	2,411	2,659	1,077	2 — 2
Burslem } from . . .	17,821			3,510		
Tunstall } Stoke . . .	11,207			2,086		
Leek . . .	10,045			2,219		
	<u>51,011</u>			<u>10,474</u>		
				Carried forward		6 — 6

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						6—6
2. Stoke upon Trent .	10,865			2,135		2—2
Hansen . . .	14,678			2,900		
Ditto in Shelton .	18,331			2,803		
	<u>43,874</u>			<u>7,838</u>		
3. Stafford . . .	12,532	29,143	2,854	2,241	1,540	2—2
Stone . . .	4,509			889		
Uttoxeter . . .	3,645			796		
Cheadle . . .	3,191			701		
Rugeley . . .	4,362			898		
	<u>28,239</u>			<u>5,525</u>		
4. Lichfield . . .	6,893	25,023	1,955	1,456	564	2—2
*Tamworth, M. Lts. .	4,326			923		2—
Burton on Trent .	13,671			2,595		
	<u>24,890</u>			<u>4,974</u>		
5. Wolverhampton .	147,670	368,741	23,828	28,432	4,830	2—2
6. Walsall . . .	37,760	88,695	8,092	7,445	1,296	1—2
Wednesbury . . .	15,298			2,793		
West Bromwich . .	17,024			2,363		
Kinfare . . .	2,163			449		
	<u>72,245</u>			<u>13,050</u>		<u>17—16</u>
XV.						
SHROPSHIRE.	A. 826,055					
N. Division . . .	P. 114,247	655,031	35,747	22,976	5,315	2—2
S. Division . . .	P. 69,346	520,123	33,496	13,804	4,170	2—2
1. Shrewsbury . . .	22,163	87,549	9,988	4,445	1,553	2—2
Oswestry . . .	5,414			1,125		
Ellesmere . . .	2,114			413		
	<u>29,691</u>			<u>5,983</u>		
2. Ludlow . . .	6,033	14,118	1,743	1,253	400	2—2
Bishop's Castle . .	8,083			414		
*Bridgenorth . . .	7,699	31,831	2,331	1,570	614	2—
	<u>15,815</u>			<u>3,237</u>		
3. Wellington . . .	5,576			1,162		0—2
Shiffnall . . .	2,046			423		
Newport . . .	2,856			543		
Market Drayton . .	3,661			803		
Whitchurch . . .	3,704			793		
	<u>17,843</u>			<u>3,724</u>		
Carried forward						10—10

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						
4.*Wenlock, M. Lts. .	19,696	80,000	6,000	4,000	900	10—10
Ironbridge .	3,095			638		2—2
Dawley Magna .	6,365			1,179		
	<u>29,156</u>			<u>5,817</u>		<u>12—12</u>
XVI.						
WORCESTERSHIRE . A.	472,165					
E. Division . . P.	129,690	692,023	35,580	26,718	6,875	2—2
W. Division . . P.	67,256	518,844	23,010	13,941	5,221	2—2
1. Dudley . .	44,975	103,876	9,870	8,714	1,358	1—2
Stourbridge . .	8,116			1,669		
Hales Owen . .	2,911			580		
Oldbury . .	15,615			2,907		
	<u>71,617</u>			<u>13,870</u>		
2. Kidderminster .	15,399	37,226	3,868	3,354	612	1 }
*Bewdley . .	7,084	23,047	1,949	1,598	356	1 }
	<u>22,481</u>			<u>4,952</u>		
3. Worcester . .	31,227	105,933	15,283	6,330	2,309	2—2
Gt. Malvern . .	4,484			709		
	<u>35,711</u>			<u>7,039</u>		
4.*Droitwich, M. Lts., with Dodderhill Township . .	4,319			911	400	1—2
Bromsgrove . .	5,262			1,148		
Redditch . .	5,571			1,135		
Evesham . .	4,680	17,138	1,505	967	337	2—
Pershere . .	2,905			615		
	<u>22,737</u>			<u>4,776</u>		<u>12—12</u>
XVII.						
WARWICKSHIRE . A.	563,946					
N. Division . . P.	117,127	649,719	35,415	25,323	6,710	2—2
S. Division . . P.	90,938	645,532	39,532	19,421	3,517	2—2
1. Birmingham . .	296,076	966,363	114,349	59,060	14,997	2—2
2. Coventry . .	41,647	117,091	10,071	9,154	4,967	2—2
Bedworth . .	3,968			888		
Nuneaton . .	4,645			1,149		
Atherstone . .	3,857			860		
	<u>54,117</u>			<u>12,051</u>		
Carried forward						8—8

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						8 — 8
3. Warwick . . .	10,570	41,423	4,132	2,272	690	2 — 2
Leamington . . .	17,958			3,257		
Kenilworth . . .	3,013			660		
Stratford on Avon . . .	3,672			785		
Rugby . . .	7,818			1,417		
	<u>43,031</u>			<u>8,391</u>		<u>10 — 10</u>
XVIII.						
LEICESTERSHIRE . . A.	514,164					
N. Division . . . P.	92,078	550,616	32,508	20,083	4,767	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	77,278	471,421	28,666	17,216	6,283	2 — 2
1. Leicester . . .	68,056	201,056	18,496	14,595	4,762	2 — 2
2. Loughborough . .	10,830			2,438		0 — 2
Ashley de la Zouch . .	3,772			830		
Castle Donniston . .	2,291			561		
Winckley . . .	6,344			1,375		
Lutterworth . . .	2,289			513		
Market Harborough . .	2,302			476		
Melton Mowbray . .	4,047			890		
	<u>31,875</u>			<u>7,083</u>		<u>6 — 8</u>
XIX.						
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE . . A.	514,164					
N. Division . . . P.	91,294	567,414	32,678	19,499	4,016	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	89,553	596,706	35,248	19,991	5,293	2 — 2
1. Northampton . .	32,813	96,893	10,426	6,150	2,620	2 — 2
Brackley . . .	2,239			497		
Daventry . . .	4,124			892		
Wellingborough . .	6,067			1,279		
Towcester . . .	2,417			546		
	<u>47,660</u>			<u>9,364</u>		
2.*Peterborough . .	11,735	52,158	3,684	2,401	641	2 — 2
Oundle . . .	2,450			488		
Kettering . . .	5,498			1,162		
	<u>19,683</u>			<u>4,051</u>		<u>8 — 8</u>
XX.						
HUNTINGDONSHIRE . . A.	229,544					
. . . P.	57,996	391,552	22,358	12,419	2,999	2 — 2
Carried forward						2 — 2

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
1.*Huntingdon . . .	6,254	30,692	2,644	1,285	383	2—2
Ramsey . . .	2,354			553		2—2
St. Ives . . .	3,221			708		
St. Neot's . . .	3,090			642		
	14,919			3,187		4—4
<b>XXI.</b>						
CAMBRIDGESHIRE . . . A.	525,182					
N. Division . . . P.	149,755	934,847	57,213	32,246	7,060	3—2
S. Division . . .						0—2
1. Cambridge . . .	26,361	114,500	10,778	5,388	1,769	2—2
Newmarket . . .	4,069			770		
Ely . . .	7,428			1,559		
Wisbeach . . .	9,276			2,076		
March . . .	3,600			874		
Wittlesea . . .	4,496			1,087		
	55,230			11,754		5—6
<b>XXII.</b>						
NORFOLK . . . A.	1,354,301					
E. Division . . . P.	148,798	886,823	52,410	33,058	7,939	2—2
W. Division . . . P.	161,218	1,043,430	60,270	35,298	6,534	2—2
1. King's Lynn . . .	16,170	40,598	5,186	3,637	852	2—2
Downham . . .	2,458			567		
Fakenham . . .	2,182			460		
Swaffham . . .	2,974			675		
Wells . . .	3,098			779		
	26,882			6,118		
2. Norwich . . .	74,891	171,413	22,088	17,112	4,817	2—2
3. Yarmouth . . .	34,810	71,769	6,497	9,162	4,277	2—2
4.*Thetford . . .	4,208	10,703	1,375	900	224	2—2
Diss . . .	3,164			669		
Wymondham . . .	2,152			546		
Dereham . . .	3,070			702		
Aylesham . . .	2,388			524		
North Walsham . . .	2,898			679		
	17,878			4,024		12—12
<b>XXIII.</b>						
SUFFOLK . . . A.	946,681					
E. Division . . . P.	146,833	763,845	45,100	31,989	6,769	2—2
W. Division . . . P.	126,634	670,622	39,313	27,332	4,269	2—2
						4—4

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						4—4
1. Bury St. Edmunds	13,318	41,878	4,978	2,852	676	2—2
Brandon . . .	2,203			512		
Stowmarket . . .	3,531			749		
Sudbury . . .	6,879			1,484		
	<u>25,931</u>			<u>5,697</u>		
2.*Eye, M. Lts.	2,430			489		1—2
Bungay . . .	3,805			867		
Beccles . . .	4,266			984		
Halesworth . . .	2,382			517		
Southwold . . .	2,032			484		
Lowestoff . . .	10,663			2,290		
	<u>25,578</u>			<u>5,631</u>		
3.*Ipswich . . .	37,950	125,597	11,661	8,272	1,291	2—2
Woodbridge . . .	4,513			1,115		
Hadleigh . . .	2,779			625		
	<u>45,242</u>			<u>10,013</u>		<u>9—10</u>
XXIV.						
ESSEX . . . . . A.	1,060,549					
N. Division . . . . . P.	162,441	823,496	50,183	35,534	4,908	2—2
S. Division . . . . . P.	207,270	1,201,031	73,040	39,130	7,338	2—2
1.*Colchester . . . . .	23,809	72,031	6,279	4,447	1,404	2—2
Harwich . . . . .	5,070	14,284	1,069	811	386	2—
Halstead . . . . .	5,707			1,314		
Coggeshall . . . . .	3,166			7,14		
	<u>37,752</u>			<u>7,286</u>		
2. Chelmsford . . . . .	5,513			1,666		
*Maldon, M. Lts. . . . .	4,785	20,000	1,000	1,014	700	2—2
Saffron Walden . . . . .	5,474			1,181		
Braintree . . . . .	4,305			980		
Brentwood . . . . .	2,811			532		
	<u>22,887</u>			<u>4,873</u>		
3. Romford . . . . .	4,361			890		0—2
Waltham Abbey . . . . .	2,873			502		
Barking . . . . .	5,076			1,059		
Stratford . . . . .	15,994			2,773		
	<u>28,304</u>			<u>5,224</u>		<u>10—10</u>
XXV.						
HERTFORDSHIRE . . . . . A.	391,141					
E. Division . . . . . P.	166,511	873,363	56,644	33,666	6,228	3—2
W. Division . . . . . P.						0—2
Carried forward						3—4

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						
1. Hertford . . . . .	6,769	23,172	2,382	1,227	543	3 — 4 2 — 2
Ware . . . . .	5,002			1,005		
Bishop's Stortford . . . . .	4,673			953		
Hitchin . . . . .	6,330			1,233		
	<u>22,774</u>			<u>4,418</u>		
2. St. Alban's . . . . .	7,675			1,503		0 — 2
Watford . . . . .	4,385			897		
Hemel Hempsted . . . . .	2,974			586		
Gt. Berkhamstead . . . . .	3,631			738		
Tring . . . . .	3,130			649		
	<u>21,795</u>			<u>4,373</u>		<u>5 — 8</u>
XXVI.						
BEDFORDSHIRE . . . . .	A. 295,582					
	P. 121,874	522,108	32,368	24,670	4,845	2 — 2
1. Bedford . . . . .	13,413	47,733	4,344	2,752	1,106	2 — 2
Biggleswade . . . . .	4,027			838		
Amphill . . . . .	2,011			406		
Leighton Buzzard . . . . .	4,330			833		
Dunstable . . . . .	4,470			884		
Luton . . . . .	15,329			2,724		
	<u>43,580</u>			<u>8,437</u>		<u>4 — 4</u>
XXVII.						
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE . . . . .	A. 466,932					
N. Division . . . . .	P. . . . .					3 — 2
S. Division . . . . .	P. 119,073	707,069	39,075	24,634	6,126	— 2
1.*Aylesbury, M. Lts. . . . .	6,168			1,313		2 — 2
*Buckingham . . . . .	3,849			818		2 —
Newport Pagnell . . . . .	3,676			649		
Stony Stratford . . . . .	2,005			393		
Olney . . . . .	2,258			540		
	<u>17,956</u>			<u>3,724</u>		
2.*High Wycombe . . . . .	8,373	24,709	2,084	1,703	551	2 — 2
*Great Marlow . . . . .	5,451	20,000	2,000	1,072	300	2 —
Little Marlow . . . . .						
Chesham . . . . .	2,208			477		
Eton . . . . .	2,840			537		
Slough . . . . .	3,425			627		
	<u>22,297</u>			<u>4,616</u>		<u>11 — 8</u>

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
<b>XXVIII.</b>						
OXFORDSHIRE . . . A.	472,717					
N. Division . . . P.	125,379	733,924	42,409	27,036	5,798	3 — 2
S. Division . . . P.						— 2
<hr/>						
1. Oxford City . . . :	27,560	100,607	10,633	5,234	2,594	2 — 2
Thame . . . . .	2,917			517		
Henley on Thames	3,419			687		
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	33,906			6,430		
<hr/>						
2.*Banbury . . . .	10,216	40,350		2,068	614	1 — 2
Chipping Norton . .	3,137			638		
*Woodstock . . . .	2,500			550	286	1 —
Bicester . . . . .	2,798			620		
Witney . . . . .	3,458			741		
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	22,109			4,617		7 — 8
<hr/>						
<b>XXIX.</b>						
GLOUCESTERSHIRE . . A.	805,102					
E. Division . . . P.	103,804	699,391	40,659	22,053	7,515	2 — 2
W. Division . . . P.	143,410	688,490	36,509	29,859	9,368	2 — 2
<hr/>						
1.*Tewkesbury . . .	5,876	19,136	1,498	1,268	325	2 — 2
Cheltenham . . . .	39,693	196,108	14,328	7,912	2,793	1 —
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	45,569			8,280		
<hr/>						
2. Gloucester . . . .	16,512	55,713	10,013	2,854	1,715	2 — 2
Dursley . . . . .	2,734			695		
Wotton-under-Edge	2,477			550		
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	21,723			3,899		
<hr/>						
3.*Stroud . . . . .	35,517	118,549	10,523	8,183	1,356	2 — 2
<hr/>						
4.*Cirencester . . .	6,336	24,314	2,299	1,300	464	2 — 2
Tetbury . . . . .	2,285			491		
Horseley . . . . .	2,558			630		
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	11,179			2,421		
<hr/>						
5. Bristol . . . . .	154,093	553,497	26,730	23,590	11,303	2 — 2
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
						15—14
<hr/>						
<b>XXX.</b>						
HEREFORDSHIRE . . A.	534,123					
P.	102,321	722,516	37,768	21,118	7,179	3 — 2
<hr/>						
Carried forward						3 — 2

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members Pres. Fut.
1. Hereford . . .	15,585	62,446	4,713	Brought forward 3,005	1,215	3—2
Ross . . .	3,715			736		2—2
	19,300			3,741		
2. Leominster . . .	5,658	28,423	1,187	1,157	367	2—2
Ledbury . . .	3,263			598		
Bromyard—about . .	2,000			450		
	10,921			2,205		7—6
<b>XXXI.</b>						
MONMOUTHSHIRE . . .	A. 368,399	541,311	34,417	27,923	4,904	2—2
	P. 144,056					
1. *Monmouth, M. Lts.	5,783			1,177		1—2
Newport . . .	23,249			3,666		
Usk . . .	1,545			311		
Abergavenny . . .	4,621			538		
Pontypool . . .	4,661			880		
Tredegar . . .	9,383			1,720		
	49,242			8,392		3—4
<b>XXXII.</b>						
SOMERSETSHIRE . . .	A. 1,047,220					
E. Division . . .	P. 172,712	1,161,276	60,135	35,571	11,867	2—2
W. Division . . .	P. 159,551	925,127	53,130	32,529	8,632	2—2
1. Bath . . .	52,528	239,998	21,000	8,017	2,960	2—2
2. Wells . . .	4,648	12,936	1,554	863	275	2—2
Frome . . .	9,522	18,202	2,449	2,066	414	1—
Shepton Mallet . . .	2,194			468		
Glastonbury . . .	3,496			691		
	19,860			4,088		
3. Bridgewater . . .	11,320	27,351	2,797	2,123	644	2—2
Yeovil . . .	7,957			1,420		
Weston-super-Mare . .	8,038			1,127		
South Petherton . . .	2,031			423		
Watchet—about . . .	2,000			400		
	31,346			5,493		
4. Taunton . . .	14,667	45,708	3,880	2,899	839	2—2
Wellington . . .	3,689			793		
Crewkerne . . .	3,566			725		
Ilminster . . .	2,194			468		
Chard . . .	2,276			446		
	26,392			5,331		13—12

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
XXXIII.						
DEVONSHIRE . . .	A. 1,657,180					
N. Division . . .	P. 150,178	776,541	36,791	31,171	9,592	2—2
S. Division . . .	P. 220,209	1,079,005	60,599	43,275	8,746	2—2
<hr/>						
1. Barnstaple . . .	10,743	25,372	2,963	2,186	715	2—2
Bideford . . .	5,742			1,188		
South Molton . . .	3,830			867		
Torrington . . .	3,298			707		
Crediton . . .	4,048			923		
Ilfracombe . . .	3,034			652		
	30,895			6,323		
<hr/>						
2. Exeter . . .	41,749	154,273	15,261	6,854	3,088	2—2
Topsham . . .	2,772			539		
Exmouth . . .	5,228			1,106		
	49,749			8,499		
<hr/>						
3. *Tiverton . . .	10,447	37,708	3,223	2,210	465	2—2
*Honiton . . .	3,301	9,965	760	714	267	2—
Collumpton . . .	2,205			520		
Ottery St. Mary . . .	2,429			542		
Sidmouth . . .	2,572			537		
	20,954			4,523		
<hr/>						
4. Torquay . . .	16,419			2,183		0—2
Teignmouth . . .	6,022			1,134		
Newton Abbot . . .	3,221			1,083		
Paignton . . .	2,628			523		
Dawlish . . .	3,505			680		
	33,795			5,603		
<hr/>						
5. Totnes . . .	4,001	12,665	1,095	793	382	2—2
*Dartmouth . . .	4,444	12,378	826	825	282	1—
*Ashburton . . .	3,062	10,778	675	574	350	1—
Brixham . . .	4,390			928		
*Tavistock . . .	8,857	40,950	4,025	1,133	426	2—
Oakhampton—about	2,000			450		
	26,754			4,703		
<hr/>						
6. Plymouth . . .	62,599	144,118	18,203	6,084	2,944	2—2
<hr/>						
7. Devonport . . .	64,783	102,484	8,588	5,434	2,820	2—2
<hr/>						
						22—18

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members, Pres. Fut.
<b>XXXIV.</b>						
CORNWALL . . . . A.	873,600					
E. Division . . . . P.	136,998	510,593	26,667	27,240	5,781	2—2
W. Division . . . . P.	169,614	441,290	32,219	33,920	4,615	2—2
<hr/>						
1. *St. Ives, M. Lts. . .	7,027	20,000	1,900	1,453	400	1—2
Penzance . . . .	9,414			1,941		
Hayle—about . . . .	3,500			700		
St. Just, in Penwith . .	3,000			600		
	22,941			4,694		
<hr/>						
2. Truro . . . .	11,337	27,191	4,548	2,391	567	2—2
Camborne . . . .	7,208			1,415		
Redruth . . . .	7,919			1,445		
	26,464			5,251		
<hr/>						
3. *Helston . . . .	8,497	19,118	1,253	1,683	348	1—2
Falmouth and Penryn . .	14,485	32,259	3,053	2,238	837	2—
	22,982			3,721		
<hr/>						
4. Bodmin . . . .	6,381	21,780	1,339	1,191	397	2—2
St. Austell . . . .	3,825			777		
Padstow . . . .	2,480			500		
St. Columb, Maj. I. . .	2,800			500		
St. Blazey and Par . .	4,200			1,000		
Wadebridge—about . .	2,000			500		
	21,686			4,468		
<hr/>						
5. *Liskeard . . . .	6,585	23,279	1,339	1,146	434	1—2
*Launceston . . . .	5,140	23,747	1,578	1,020	371	1—
Callington—about . .	2,500		about	450		
Saltash . . . .	3,287			650		
Torpoint—about . .	2,000			400		
E. and W. Looe . . .	2,724			500		
	22,236			4,166		14—14
<hr/>						
<b>XXXV.</b>						
DORSETSHIRE . . . . A.	632,025					
E. Division } . . . . P.	135,695	708,660	41,964	27,580	6,203	3—2
W. Division } . . . .						0—2
<hr/>						
1. Bridport . . . .	7,719	17,191	2,111	1,581	472	2—2
*Lyme Regis, M. Lts. . .	3,215			683	250	1—
Beaminster . . . .	2,000			450		
Sherborne . . . .	5,523			1,072		
	18,457			3,786		
<hr/>						
Carried forward						6—6

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						6—6
2. Weymouth . . .	11,383	37,331	3,359	1,864	909	2—2
Dorchester . . .	6,823	16,368	2,477	1,030	432	2—
	18,206			2,894		
3. *Poole . . .	9,759	23,191	2,437	2,034	521	2—2
*Wareham . . .	6,694	26,479	1,484	1,339	273	1—
Wimborne . . .	2,271			438		
Blanford—about . .	3,000			500		
*Shaftesbury, M. Lts.	2,497	44,700	2,601	497	461	1—
	24,221			4,808		14—10
XXXVI.						
WILTSHIRE . . . A.	865,092					
N. Division . . . P.	79,362	457,677	29,777	17,615	5,146	2—2
S. Division . . . P.	73,932	412,958	23,521	15,841	3,343	2—2
1. *Marlborough . . .	4,893	16,132	2,177	821	275	2—2
*Malmesbury . . .	6,881	36,034	694	1,406	329	1—
Swindon . . .	4,167			716		
*Cricklade, M. Lts. .	2,018			453		2—
Highworth . . .	3,629			836		
Wootton Bassett . .	2,191			443		
	23,779			4,675		
2. *Chippenham . . .	7,075	33,771	2,778	1,345	392	2—2
*Calne, M. Lts. . .	2,494	22,585	1,584	501	174	1—
Bradford . . .	4,291			1,306		
Melksham . . .	2,452			577		
Trowbridge . . .	9,626			2,119		
	25,938			5,578		
3. Devizes . . .	6,638	19,716	2,365	1,336	359	2—2
*Westbury . . .	6,495	27,920	1,613	1,526	300	1—
Warminster . . .	3,675			808		
	16,808			3,670		
4. Salisbury . . .	12,278	32,976		2,344	691	2—2
*Wilton with Burcombe	2,304			483	265	1—
Mere . . .	2,370			509		
	16,952			3,336		18—12
XXXVII.						
BERKSHIRE . . . A.	451,210					
	P. 128,590	780,101	46,580	26,611	5,066	3—2
Carried forward						3—2

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £.	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £.	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						3 — 2
1. Windsor . . .	9,520	33,356	4,542	1,577	651	2 — 2
Maidenhead . . .	3,895			734		
Wokingham . . .	2,404			472		
	<u>15,819</u>			<u>2,783</u>		
2. Reading . . .	23,045	92,686	9,526	4,859	1,769	2 — 2
3. Abingdon . . .	5,680	12,887	1,665	1,189	304	1 — 2
*Wallingford, M. Lts.	7,794	45,082		554	357	1 —
Faringdon . . .	2,943			596		
Wantage . . .	3,064			628		
Newbury . . .	6,161			1,342		
Hungerford . . .	2,031			382		
	<u>22,672</u>			<u>4,691</u>		<u>9 — 8</u>
XXXVIII.						
HAMPSHIRE . . . A.	1,070,216					
N. Division . . . P.	131,634	672,940	36,369	23,422	4,185	2 — 2
S. Division . . . P.	112,652	456,233	29,179	21,632	5,677	2 — 2
Isle of Wight . . . P.	47,428	193,452	14,463	8,766	2,362	1 —
1.*Andover, M. Lts. . .	5,221	23,127	1,822	1,058	255	2 — 2
Basingstoke . . .	4,654			945		
Odiham . . .	2,800			590		
Kingsclere . . .	2,000			450		
Aldershot—about . . .	10,000			660		
	<u>24,675</u>			<u>3,643</u>		
2. Winchester . . .	14,776	51,067	5,171	2,392	963	2 — 2
Romsey . . .	2,116			443		
*Lymington, M. Lts.	2,621	18,957	1,420	483	347	2 —
*Christchurch . . .	6,880	49,698	2,550	1,415	419	1 —
Ringwood—about . . .	2,000			400		
	<u>28,393</u>			<u>5,133</u>		
3. Southampton . . .	46,960	169,462	17,385	7,712	4,189	2 — 2
4. Portsmouth & Gosport	102,588	257,515	17,921	17,248	4,671	2 — 2
5. Newport, M. Lts. . .	7,334	26,557	2,581	1,591	643	2 — 2
Ryde . . .	9,269			1,734		
Cowes . . .	5,482			1,015		
Ventnor . . .	3,208			514		
	<u>25,293</u>			<u>4,854</u>		
Carried forward						18—14

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						18—14
6.*Petersfield . . .	5,655	31,919	2,045	1,135	296	1—2
Fareham . . .	4,011			884		
Havant & N. Warb- lington—about . . .	3,000			500		
Alton . . .	3,769			700		
	<u>16,435</u>			<u>3,219</u>		<u>19—16</u>

## XXXIX.

SUSSEX.						
E. Division . . .	A. 936,911					
W. Division . . .	P. 126,234	634,538	33,760	23,485	6,670	2—2
	P. 53,625	308,850	18,407	10,708	2,607	2—2
1. Chichester . . .	8,059	24,187	3,536	1,601	562	2—2
Bognor . . .	2,523			487		
Arundel . . .	2,498	7,988	1,014	528	174	1—
Midhurst—about . . .	2,500	20,000	1,000	500	300	1—
Petworth . . .	2,326			443		
Littlehampton . . .	2,350			497		
	<u>20,256</u>			<u>4,056</u>		
2.*Shoreham . . .	3,351	100,000	5,000	513	1,200	2—2
Broadwater . . .	6,463			1,188		
Steyning . . .	1,620			323		
Worthing . . .	5,808			1,051	400	1—
*Horsham . . .	6,747			1,267		
	<u>23,989</u>			<u>4,342</u>		
3. Brighton . . .	87,317	453,802	40,065	13,983	5,958	2—2
4. Lewes . . .	9,716	32,000	4,135	1,820	676	2—2
Eastbourne . . .	5,795			1,005		
	<u>15,511</u>			<u>2,820</u>		
5. Hastings . . .	22,910	146,524	8,768	3,290	1,871	2—2
*Rye . . .	8,202	45,438	3,170	1,684	373	1—
	<u>31,118</u>			<u>3,974</u>		<u>18—14</u>

## XL.

KENT						
E. Division . . .	A. 1,039,419					
W. Division . . .	P. 165,261	1,012,982	60,306	31,638	8,250	2—2
	P. 277,058	1,556,138	89,573	50,395	9,811	2—2
Carried forward						4—4

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
Brought forward						4 — 4
1.*Canterbury . . .	21,324	57,056	5,193	3,908	1,603	2 — 2
Faversham . . .	5,858			1,119		
Whitstable . . .	4,183			840		
Milton . . .	2,731			505		
	34,096			6,372		
2.*Sandwich . . .	2,944			649		2 — 2
Ramsgate . . .	11,865			2,209		
Margate . . .	8,874			1,827		
	23,683			4,685		
3. Dover . . .	25,325	91,178	7,363	3,991	2,318	2 — 2
Deal . . .	7,531			1,589		
Walmer . . .	3,275			434		
	36,131			6,014		
4.*Hythe & Folkestone	21,367	74,708	3,119	2,843	1,291	1 — 2
Ashford . . .	5,522			1,049		
Tenterden . . .	3,762			711		
	30,651			4,603		
5.*Maidstone . . .	23,058	88,711	9,280	4,119	1,817	2 — 2
Tunbridge . . .	5,919			1,165		
Tunbridge Wells . . .	13,807			2,493		
	42,784			7,777		
6. Chatham . . .	36,177	69,375	2,528	5,185	2,104	1 — 2
Sheerness . . .	12,015			1,998		
	48,192			7,183		
7. Greenwich . . .	139,436	406,170	35,177	19,365	9,805	2 — 2
8.*Rochester . . .	16,862	52,718	6,103	3,074	1,458	2 — 2
Gravesend . . .	18,782			3,062		
Dartford . . .	5,314			996		
	40,958			7,132		18 — 20
XLI.						
SURREY . . . A.	478,792					
E. Division . . . P.	209,345	1,527,873	73,459	35,114	9,913	2 — 2
W. Division . . . P.	109,546	506,028	29,664	21,042	4,081	2 — 2
Carried forward						4 — 4

Counties and Boroughs.	Area and Population.	Rateable Value. £	Charge of Property and Income Tax. £	Inhabited Houses.	No. of Electors.	Members. Pres. Fut.
				Brought forward		2—2
1. Southwark . .	193,593	702,835	122,458	25,659	11,631	2—2
2. Lambeth . .	294,883	1,023,871	111,496	44,529	27,754	2—2
3.*Reigate . .	9,975	64,745	2,963	1,583	920	1—2
Croydon . .	20,125			3,698		
Richmond . .	7,423			1,246		
Epsom . .	4,890			831		
	42,413			7,358		
4. Guildford . .	8,020	28,916	3,031	1,466	667	2—2
Godalming . .	2,321			491		
Kingston . .	9,790			1,764		
Chertsey . .	2,910			578		
Farnham . .	3,926			754		
Dorking . .	4,061			585		
	31,028			5,838		11—12

## XLII.

MIDDLESEX . .	A.	180,136					
E. Division . .	}	P. 368,424	2,230,820	127,670	58,953	14,847	2 { 2
W. Division . .							
1. London City . .		112,063	1,920,582	821,021	13,398	15,534	4—4
2. Tower Hamlets . .		647,845	2,152,293	202,051	88,310	34,115	2—2
3. Finsbury . .		387,278	1,706,400	203,450	44,410	25,461	2—2
4. Marylebone . .		436,252	2,634,503	365,412	47,896	23,588	2—2
5. Westminster . .		254,623	2,245,646	701,040	26,286	12,546	2—2
Chelsea . .		63,439			8,314		
		318,062			34,600		14—16

N.B.—Portions of the Tower Hamlets and Finsbury might be transferred to the City of London.

## SUMMARY.

Counties.	Members. Pres. Fut.		New Towns.	Counties.	Members. Pres. Fut.		New Towns.
1. Northumberland	10	10	3	Brought forward	272	268	235
2. Cumberland	9	10	9	29. Gloucestershire	15	14	7
3. Durham	10	12	9	30. Herefordshire	7	6	3
4. Westmoreland	3	4	...	31. Monmouth	3	4	3
5. Lancashire	27	30	34	32. Somersetshire	13	12	10
6. Yorkshire, West Riding	20	22	22	33. Devonshire	22	18	16
7. Yorkshire, North Riding	13	12	4	34. Cornwall	14	14	15
8. Yorkshire, East Riding	6	6	4	35. Dorsetshire	14	10	4
9. Lincolnshire	13	12	15	36. Wiltshire	18	12	8
10. Rutlandshire	2	2	2	37. Berkshire	9	8	6
11. Nottinghamshire	10	10	5	38. Hampshire	19	16	12
12. Derbyshire	6	8	10	39. Sussex	18	14	5
13. Cheshire	11	12	12	40. Kent	18	20	12
14. Staffordshire	17	16	9	41. Surrey	11	12	8
15. Shropshire	12	12	10	42. Middlesex	14	16	...
16. Worcestershire	12	12	7	Oxford University	2	2	...
17. Warwickshire	10	10	7	Cambridge Uni- versity	2	2	...
18. Leicestershire	6	8	7	London University, with Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, Fel- lows of Royal and other Scien- tific Societies, and Inns of Court	0	2	...
19. Northamptonshire	8	8	6		471	468	344
20. Huntingdonshire	4	4	3	Welsh Counties	15	15	...
21. Cambridgeshire	5	6	5	Welsh Boroughs	14	14	...
22. Norfolk	12	12	9		500	497	...
23. Suffolk	9	10	10				...
24. Essex	10	10	10				...
25. Hertfordshire	5	8	7				...
26. Bedfordshire	4	4	5				...
27. Buckinghamshire	11	8	6				...
28. Oxfordshire	7	8	5				...
Carried forward	272	286	235				...

The three Boroughs in South Wales, Swansea, Merthyr Tydfil, and Cardiff, with their vast Populations and important and growing interests—particularly as to Shipping—have a strong claim to have an additional Member given to each, which would complete the list of the English Members. If possible, however, it would also be very desirable to place the Isle of Man on the footing of a Welsh County, and give one Member to it as a County and one Member for its Boroughs.