

THE

PERMISSIVE BILL

MORE URGENT THAN ANY

EXTENSION OF THE FRANCHISE:

AN ADDRESS

AT RAMSGATE, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1865,

BY

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN.

MANCHESTER:

ABEL HEYWOOD, OLDHAM STREET.

LONDON:

F. PITMAN, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1865.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN'S

ADDRESS AT RAMSGATE

IN FAVOUR OF THE PERMISSIVE BILL

OF

MR. LAWSON, M.P., FOR CARLISLE.

GOOD FRIENDS! Electors of East Kent! I come to you with Mr. Raper, deputed by a great Association, to discuss some matters connected with the trade in strong liquor. The United Kingdom Alliance is at once a moral and a political association; but I wish now to confine myself to its political aspect. I leave to Mr. Raper to expound and defend our proposed measure; and desire to argue before you the more limited question, whether on political grounds our measure is well timed; whether at the approaching elections it ought to give way to Parliamentary Reform. The United Kingdom Alliance recommends a certain bill called Permissive. I too recommend it, and in so far speak for them; but the arguments are my own. Each of us who supports the measure of the Alliance, must support it as he best can from his own point of view. The Alliance is not answerable for my politics; so, please to understand, I speak for myself only.

May I ask you kindly to hear me through? I shall be happy to answer questions in due time, when the chairman bids me; but it will greatly save time and obviate confusion not to interrupt me, but hear me continuously before you put any questions. I give you fair warning: I am not going to speak *down* to you. I do not address you as a mob that can be led by a few clap-trap words, but as thoughtful men, who can attend to grave business, and keep to the point of an argument. I count on an intelligent and attentive audience.

I may possibly say things which sound eccentric. I cannot expect from you thoughtful attention unless you understand my political *aims*. If I try to persuade you as to the best political *means*, you will naturally ask, what is my political creed. Briefly then, I am not an Aristocrat. I am much more than a common Radical. I do not call myself a Democrat. I call myself a Nationalist. I desire that national interests, not class interests, should rule.

I have tried to put my creed into short articles. It runs thus:

1. I claim that no War and no Treaty be made until after Parliamentary discussion and approval.
2. That the Food of the nation, which is at every moment on the high seas, shall not be endangered by holding to antiquated maxims.
3. That Established Churches shall either be *bona fide* national, or shall not exist at all.

4. That the Peerage shall be an institution for the national benefit, and no longer a fortress against the nation.

5. That merit, high born or low born, shall have a free career for the national benefit, without any unpassable gulf between rank and rank. For this, we need Decentralization.

To sum up, you see, I do not grudge Aristocracy to exist, nor grudge to its members well-earned honours; but I desire that it may no longer be a dead "cold shade" over the national tree, but may be a living outgrowth from its roots. I claim *such* organic change in our legislative institutions as may remedy the huge over-occupation, the frightful and ruinous drifting, which is complacently called the "Parliamentary Government" of this vast empire: nor do I bestow the lofty title Parliamentary Reform on any change which does not give us permanently such a legislature of Lords and Commons as will deliberately undertake at least three arduous problems—how to reconcile religious institutions with national sentiment; how to reconcile in India patriotism with loyalty; and how to give to industrious peasants some better prospect for old age than Rheumatism and the Poor House. Now, if you choose to call this Democracy, then I am a Democrat.

If any of you desire extension of the franchise, I cannot guess for what public and honourable ends you press it, if not for such as I have recited. I do not believe what I have heard, that many artizans wish for the Parliamentary vote as a tool by which they may screw up wages. Others say, what is more credible, that increase of personal importance is all that the unenfranchised aim at; and that this will satisfy them, though it lead to no change whatever in public measures. If that be true, it is not illiberal in us of the United Kingdom Alliance to insist that *your* scheme can better afford to wait than *ours*. Our battle is against wife-beating, and other violent crime; against female ruin; against pauperism, insanity, jails, poor-rates, and degradation to the larger part of society. If the Parliamentary Reform, of which we hear, is to begin and end in this and that persons' petty exaltation, without substantial results, then we claim priority for our measure, which aims to make the working classes richer, happier, better educated, more able to win, to use, and to keep power.

If you wish to clip your own wings, to stunt your hearts and minds, to degrade your action, to lower your moral and social force, then seek for narrow, selfish, or flimsy ends. But if you desire to ennoble and intensify your action, to bless and be blessed, you must adopt broad and noble aims. You must not seek for power, nor care much to give it to others, for the gratification of vanity, but for the national welfare and for the interests of justice. If extension of the suffrage will lead to these,—or so far as it will lead to these,—so far I desire it. But I have, I confess, much jealousy, lest it be so given as only to increase the expense of elections, make it impossible for any but the very rich to become M.P.'s, establish a closer oligarchy on a broader basis, and give to existing evils another 30 years of life.

If universal suffrage has given France over to one Emperor, mere extension of our suffrage may be so managed as to sell England to 1000 or 500 rich men.

Public enthusiasm never lasts long. Reform by mere extension of suffrage, easily exhausts its virtue in one election. The reasons are not obscure; but let me just press on you the lesson of the last 33 years. The second Reformed Parliament in 1835 barely ejected the Tories from power, and that, not by a direct vote, but only by a side wind; by a vote which made Sir Robert Peel fear, that after it he would be unable to collect Irish tithe, except by military force. In 1836, the East India Company rudely defied the Whig ministry, and scandalously annulled the principal boon guaranteed to the Hindoos by the Parliamentary charter of 1833. In 1837, the House of Lords found that it was safe to put a flat veto on the Commons; and thenceforward, so far as public measures were concerned, the Reform Act of 1832 might as well not have been passed. From 1838, is dated our long series of wars, only one of which had national approval. Naturally, from the same year Mr. Cobden dates the ever-increasing expenses of the Government; yet PEACE and RETRENCHMENT were two watchwords of the Whigs. Is not this outline enough to show, how insufficient and insecure a reform is mere extension of the franchise? I sincerely believe, that the broader basis on which the present House of Commons stands, has given it a far greater boldness to uphold dangerous evils than the old unreformed house could have ever exhibited.

A lowering of the suffrage which leaves the great towns to be outvoted by the little ones, will not frighten the ruling classes; and perhaps may be quickly given, in order to stave off really effective reform. But if we want a measure which is to be fruitful in after-results, it will not drop into our mouths from heaven. Undoubtedly the resistance will be great, and I do not believe that we can possibly be ripe to overpower it at the next election. To exert yourselves at present, is to waste your force. It is to me clear, that the English Radicals quite underrate the obstacle of the House of Lords. That House is not only able to cripple a reform which it does not dare wholly to stop: it is able also to counter-work and reduce to nullity a reform which it has let pass. Consider in detail one fact, to which I have just alluded. In 1837, Lord Morpeth carried through the Commons a bill to cut down the Irish Church. It had been approved by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. Nevertheless, it was cast out by the Peers; and Lord Lyndhurst, then their chief speaker, did his worst to goad Ireland into disloyalty by envenomed words, as if by way of revenge on Lord John Russell's mode of ejecting Sir Robert Peel. More than a quarter of a century has since passed, and though every eminent Whig has recorded his emphatic condemnation of the Irish Protestant Church, no one has since dared to stir against it. The most urgent object to every patriotic statesman is, to win the loyalty of Ireland. But the Lords virtually say—"It shall not be done:" and therefore no minister for 28 years has dared to renew the attempt. Such is the power of that house to stand out

against a majority of the Commons, against the permanent conviction of successive Whig ministries, against the entire mass of the English Dissenters, against all the Liberals and all the Democrats of the land, against five-sixths of the Irish, against the pressing necessities of the empire, and against the reproaches of all civilized nations.

The most popular ministers, if they are not prepared to reform the House of Lords, know that they must yield to it: hence they lose credit with the nation, by paring down all measures in dread of a collision with the Lords. The first question with every practical Statesman is, not what will most benefit the nation or the empire, but what will not too much displease a small number of gentlemen, born to irresponsible power, who live and breathe in an atmosphere of their own; who are often unaware, alike what the nation desires, and what the empire needs; who often signally despise both English and European opinion, and have little to suffer from any misgovernment. To reform the Commons and leave the Lords as they are, is like the mistake of a dentist, who pulls out the wrong tooth.

Five years ago, any American reform which left out slavery would have been a mere cheat; so now, any reform which passes by the House of Lords seems to me a palpable delusion. The sagacious American reformers of 1860 knew that they could not then root up their national nuisance; but they resolved to cripple it by stopping its growth. The *Hereditary Peerage* is our "root of bitterness," which we cannot tear up, but can stunt and forbid to grow; after which it will die away, and its poison will evaporate. Lord Palmerston has himself shown us how to deal with it. He advised the Queen to appoint a Life Peer, Lord Wensleydale. Of course, the law officers of the crown had been consulted. Her Majesty, in their opinion, retains unimpaired her ancestral right, of which she has never been legally deprived. But the Earl of Derby and his majority among the Peers felt the weapon piercing the joints of their harness, and boldly took on themselves to oppose the Queen's previously undisputed prerogative. The nation was ignorant and inattentive. The House of Commons had no opportunity of speaking. Thus Lord Palmerston (it seems) was frightened, and gave way. But he has instructed us as to the mode, and Earl Derby as to the importance, of this reform. We have but to insist that *henceforward* no Peers at all shall be created, except for life, and after a vote of the Commons declaring that the person to be ennobled has deserved it *by public merit*. For this great and fruitful reform, we do not absolutely need any passing of a bill by the House of Lords. They are to be operated upon, not to be consulted. We need only that the Commons make an address to Her Majesty, that the nation applaud, and that the Executive be firm: then the obstructive Lords will learn that it is discreet to be silent. The process will be conservative, and will advance the future permanent honour of the House, while reconciling it to the nation. It will at most take but one act of coercion, and will supersede the countless dishonouring coercions of which some Radicals dream.

Forgive me, if I have carried out this argument beyond what the

occasion demands; but I wished to show that I do not advance an impossible to divert you from a possible reform. I believe that to popularize the Upper House will reconcile the United Kingdom to itself, and will secure all legitimate and desirable reforms in detail; among which will be included the extension and redistribution of the Parliamentary suffrage from time to time. I was much delighted by reading the spirited speech of young Lord Amberley son of Earl Russell at Leeds, in which he said, that those who object to ignorant men exercising the suffrage ought equally to object to hereditary Peers, who, with no ostensible political wisdom, obstruct the legislation of the country. Such a sentence from the eldest son of a Peer deserves to be written in gold. I make no doubt that that young man will in due time richly deserve to be recommended by the Commons to Her Majesty for a Peerage, and would *prefer* that mode of entering the Upper House, as far more to his honour, than to succeed to it merely because he is the son of a distinguished father.

But unless a totally new spirit be infused into the House of Peers, no legislation of the Lower House will give to our peasants, and to the Irish peasants, relief from the incubus which for centuries has crushed them. We shall get little chance of throwing off secret diplomacy, cabinet treaties and cabinet wars; no chance of effective administrative reform, much less of opening the public service to low-born merit; no chance of economic government, without which Mr. Gladstone cannot give us Financial Reform; finally, not much chance of throwing open the National Church to the nation. If a new Reform Bill is to be carried under Lord Palmerston's auspices, its object of course will be to prolong the power of Whiggery, and break the force of the formidable popular movement which is now distinctly foreseen. I expect no good to the country from the death-bed repentance of the Whigs. The measure would not be Mr. Gladstone's, but Lord Palmerston's. I honour Mr. Gladstone much for his spontaneous action in this matter. I earnestly hope that he is our coming man; but he is not yet ripe. Perhaps he is too prudent to be ripe yet. Since I heartily desire that he may be the glorious leader of the English workman into an honourable future, and believe that he is personally capable of it;—since I would greatly prefer to wait until he is untrammelled by any superior in the cabinet;—I hope I may, without disrespect, say, that to carry a worthy reform he needs the Irish nation as his allies; and he cannot win that alliance if he be thought to give, not only religious devotion, but also political allegiance, to the sectarian Church of England and Wales. In short, so long as he is Parliamentary representative of a University intensely opposed to change, it is hard to be sanguine as to his power of carrying reforms which shall apply a sharp knife to the morbid part.

Why have I gone into this? It is to show that no great and fruitful organic change can be squeezed out of Lord Palmerston's cabinet by dint of the coming elections. A cry of Reform, to go to the country with, is policy for the administration, not for the people. In illustration of this, let me remind you of the events of 1856.

An unauthorized war had been begun in China by an English official in a cause obviously scandalous. Lord Palmerston adopted the acts of his subordinate, and ordered the continuance of hostilities. The war was emphatically repudiated in the House of Commons; among others, by Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone,—and was disallowed by a decisive vote. The Prime Minister, thus solemnly condemned, punished the House by a dissolution, and (as the phrase is) appealed to the people. But the constituencies were so eager for Reform, that, in general, they would not vote at all about the Chinese War, and elected men on the mere pledge of (somehow or other, to some extent or other) lowering the franchise. Hence the new House was silent about the unjust war, and kept Lord Palmerston in his seat, in hope that he would throw to his faithful dogs under the table some morsel of Parliamentary Reform. The Radicals were cheated of their tid-bit. Did they deserve anything better? If they had taken national morality, national righteousness, for their first interest, Palmerston would never again have led the Whig party. Russell and Gladstone, who had indignantly espoused the cause of justice, would naturally have fraternized with Cobden and Bright, who could have taken office under *them*, but never under Lord Palmerston. The second and third Chinese Wars, as also the Persian War, would have been prevented. The war of Japan, and the horrible civil war of China, could not have arisen. Nay, the Indian Mutiny was hardly possible but for the simultaneous Persian and Chinese Wars. All that bloodshed and misery, all that guilt and dishonour lying on our empire, and more which is perhaps impending or even now being perpetrated in Japan, and, finally, all our vast expenses, might have been saved; and a Radical ministry would have been possible ten years earlier. Until quite late, it was treated as certain that Mr. Gladstone's Reform must wait until the Tories have come back into power, and have been abruptly driven out. Mr. Leatham, M.P. for Huddersfield, informed us that Lord Palmerston had made his political will in favour of the Tories. What has since changed the expectations of Radicals? It is an extreme imprudence to be elated by the first overtures of single ministers, made without pledging themselves to anything definite. If those who call themselves Reformers mean to obtain any great result, they must not sell themselves cheaply, but make a stiff bargain, and not expect immediate easy success.

Do I speak thus to damp your hopes? Or are my own hopes languid? Not at all. Never was I so hopeful; never so democratic in my aspirations. A star in the far west has shone out to gild our lowliest homes. The destruction of slavery in America is the elevation of free labour in England. President Lincoln was once a rail-splitter; Vice-President Andrew Johnson was once a tailor: is that nothing to England? Events are going rapidly towards the full enfranchisement of all who can read, whether white or black. Congress has voted freehold land to white and black soldiers alike. Many negroes are already freeholders. As soon as the war is ended, and its great results are manifest, Englishmen of the middle ranks

will begin by the ten thousand to ask, how English and Irish peasants may be raised to the level of the Negro. I should not wonder to see rather quickly a burst of enthusiasm in England, which will work political miracles. But enthusiasm is like gunpowder; it only flares and makes a noise, unless you shut it up tight. Keep it close till the right moment, and it will rend rocks. Therefore, I say, wait a little for the right moment. Do not expend your ammunition prematurely and for a small prize. Do not burn down your house to roast a pig.

Men in office generally try to weaken opposition to a reform by assuring opponents that it will lead to little or nothing. The opponents do not believe this, and it does not lessen resistance; but it lowers enthusiasm of supporters, and prepares excuse for lukewarmness or treachery. I believe we cannot be too frank in defining and avowing all our intentions, when we desire only that which can be asked reasonably and yielded honourably. Public men will not volunteer to proclaim their ulterior objects: the country outside of Parliament must take this work. The Hon. Chas. Sumner was brutally assaulted by a ruffian senator for speaking on the floor of the Senate against Slavery. So, if Mr. Bright, before the country moves for it, were to say something in Parliament about reforming the House of Lords, he might be tumultuously silenced, and endure a metaphorical knocking down. All M.P.'s are afraid of losing the ear of the House. For this reason, and also to secure united action, mutual trust and conscious solidarity, a sharply defined programme (or "platform," as the Americans call it) is needful. A great national movement has many sides. Many forces are to be combined. Each group needs to be assured that its especial measure, if delayed, yet shall not be sacrificed. Without deputations, consultation and time, no valid programme can be formed which will represent the compact desire and resolve of a national mass. An opportunity is rising which may not recur for a century. Reformers need to expand their thoughts to the magnitude of the crisis. It would be a national crime in them to waste it, and allow themselves to be trailed in the narrow rut of past and futile effort. Fresh thought, I say, and time are needed. Ireland has to be consulted, and a fraternal league formed, which shall bless both countries, and establish the throne of Queen Victoria's children. I do not think that any worthy programme, based on intelligent national desire, can be made before the next election; but we may easily repeat the mournful blunder of 1856.

At present, with a view to the noble reform which we may reasonably hope at an early date, I respectfully suggest that the most urgent matter, while organizing and consulting, now is, to remove the chief causes which unfit the working classes for the use of power. What is more damaging to democracy than an election carried by the tipping houses? What more notorious than that the publicans believe themselves arbiters of the elections, and do actually terrify M.P.'s.? If it be so even now, how much worse would it be under a much lower suffrage? The upper classes might justly refuse voting power to those who would sell it for a few pots of beer; but—I pray

all democrats to observe—the classes which profit politically by the sottishness of voters try to keep the drinkshops as they are, and talk of the poor man's *right* to his *enjoyment*. Great as is the political evil of elections thus biassed, greater far is the chronic indigence and the crime caused by the omnipresent tipping house. Surely a national evil on the greatest scale demands a national remedy.

The prevalent outcry just now against the Permissive Bill is, that it is *tyrannical*: to this topic therefore I beg to give a few words. By the best Parliament of modern times, the first Reformed House, a committee was appointed in 1834 (which included the late Sir R. Peel) to report on the drink trade. An immensity of evidence was heard, and an elaborate report was made. In the close of that remarkable document, the committee expresses earnest hope that His Majesty's Government "will introduce, early in the ensuing session, "some general and comprehensive law for the progressive diminution "and ultimate suppression of all the existing facilities and means of "intemperance, as the root and parent of almost every other vice." Is that a tyrannical proposal? What more does the United Kingdom Alliance desire? If those energetic Radicals, whom I name for honour, Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P. for Leicester, and Mr. E. A. Leatham, M.P. for Huddersfield, will suggest a "comprehensive" bill milder than ours, and equally effective "to diminish and ultimately suppress all the facilities and means of intemperance," they will soon take the wind out of our sails, and I certainly shall not regret it. I utterly disown the wish to hinder adult persons from getting drink, whether as medicine or as diet, which they legitimately claim; and I positively deny that the Permissive Bill *will* or *can* so work as to forbid this. It will only force those who deliberately wish for strong liquor to take somewhat more trouble and forethought; and that is inevitable with every law which is to suppress, or greatly to lessen, the facilities of intemperance. To lessen facility is to increase difficulty: who can wish for the former and condemn the latter? And who is the real father of our Permissive Bill, though he is now shy of acknowledging his offspring? A gentleman whose talents and accomplishments, equally with his trade as a brewer, and his connections as M.P., give him weighty ballast against the blasts of tyrannical philanthropy. I suppose you know—it is Mr. Charles Buxton. He did not hesitate to pronounce the contest against the drink trade, in which trade he has so deep a pecuniary stake, to be "but one aspect of the war between heaven and hell." Have those who are inactive in such a war earned any right to censure the eager, and to affect philosophic wisdom? If honourable Radicals, while opposing us, leave the solemn recommendations of the committee of 1834 to be a dead letter;—if they involve that noble committee in the condemnation which they pass upon us;—they will not earn honour, nor will they promote the cause which they love. We are told, in tones of indignation, that we (*we* forsooth!) must not deprive the virtuous working men of their legitimate indulgence, in order to keep away dangerous drink from the vicious. Who then passed the laws to cripple the drink trade in Maine, in Massachusetts, and so many

American States; in New Brunswick, in Nova Scotia, in Victoria? Was it a few meddling philanthropists? Nay, but the mass of working men, whose vote is there omnipotent. It is they who claim to defend their legitimate interests against unscrupulous capitalists who trade in vice: nor could our Permissive Bill ever be carried out except by the deliberate judgment of the bulk of the working classes. Why have precisely those States and Colonies which exercise the widest suffrage introduced severe laws against the tipping trade? Plainly because the trade undermines democracy by morally degrading the voting population. Against this fact set another, that the tipping trade has its main advocacy from our most aristocratic and rich classes; and can you doubt which side the true and intelligent lovers of democracy ought to take?

In national, equally as in private life, the law holds—"Seek ye first the interests of righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you." If we want a highly democratic Parliament, we shall get nearer to it at the next election by setting up the Permissive Bill as a test than by any other rallying cry now before the nation. If you omit those supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance who have no political colour at all, of the rest there are at least eight democrats for one Whig or Tory. Our movement, like the giants of fable, has sprung out of the soil: all its strength is from below. Few in the highest classes yet understand its justification and its sources; but they will understand it, after more Parliamentary debates. Many hold off from us from not yet believing that the working classes are the arbiters of the contest, and that they give their interest to us when they have no vote to give. Such Radicals will come over to us. And if, here and there, our movement bring a Tory into Parliament, such a Tory will find himself in company rather new, and may chance to learn some new sentiments, especially if he were to become our pet. It is ten to one that he will come forth at least as good a liberal as Mr. Massey, late M.P. for Salford, or Mr. Roebuck, Austro-Imperial member for Sheffield, or the liberal Baronet who rejoiced at the "bursting of the Republican bubble" in America; or some dozen others, who hoist themselves into Parliament by a promise to extend the franchise, and there promote unjust war, profligate expenses, endless jobberies, and ill-bestowed patronage. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that many who assume the title of Liberal are inwardly convinced that it is wicked to oust them from their seats. We, on the contrary, believe the public interest to be supreme. No Radical M.P. dares plainly to assert that his past services can atone for present obliquity of view. The great champion who surnamed himself the British bulldog *Tear'em*, Mr. Roebuck himself, though apparently cynical enough to say anything that comes uppermost, has not yet claimed his seat as a perpetuity. Surely the duty of voters is to provide for the future, not to give reward for the past; nor is it despotism in them if they will not sacrifice the national interests to gratitude or respect. When they meet obstinate resistance, it is not *their* fault if they sorrowfully conclude that the candidate for their suffrages is not equal to the task of the day.

I lament to add, that many Radicals have learned Political Economy in a very base school, which denies that the State has any thing to do with the immoral tendencies of a trade. Their scornful tone, their idle sarcasms against Paternal Government, and their undisguised hatred of moral legislation, drive me to the conviction that they will not listen to our arguments until they have felt our power; and that the ignominious rejection of a few, who have Mr. Roebuck as their worst and disgraceful type, would be very wholesome to the kingdom. I believe it would much improve even the *honesty* of Parliamentary Liberals, which certainly is in much need of reinvigorating applications. The middle classes and the unenfranchised classes cannot better advance their political importance than by honestly espousing the moral interests, about which those who think themselves "the educated" talk finely and act feebly. The Government has, for ages past, assumed the duty of restricting and regulating a trade fraught with vice, disease, pauperism, and crime. We demand that it shall do its avowed duty; carry restriction so far as shall effect the avowed objects. But it will not, it cannot; for it has accepted a fatal bribe—21 millions of annual revenue paid to it by the trade. That is why a movement from without is essential, a movement based on a principle, which, because nothing can be of use which is not broad and popular, gentlemen who are not sufferers by the trade call tyrannical. The Government, for 30 years past, is open to the severest reproach; for, in spite of the elaborate urgent advice given by the celebrated committee, to reduce the trade to a minimum,—the Government, I say, of its own mere will, with no new investigation, no new fact, does just the reverse—perpetually expands the trade; makes the revenue more and more dependent upon it; nay, has forced the trade upon Turkey and India, against the protest of Mahomedans and Hindoos, and carries it by force in the train of British armies, just as it has forced the opium trade on China. I look on the conduct of our ruling classes towards this trade as a proof how utterly hollow is the morality of their rule, how empty their ecclesiasticism. Why, in England, this traffic breaks the heart of wives, and makes paupers of the children; it facilitates seduction and harlotry, and is the parent of violent crime. Is it not a sort of hypocrisy to set up establishments for reforming criminals while multiplying the shops which make the worst portion of the criminality? Whether this horrible tide of evils, with all its jails, and courts, and taxes, is to be turned now, or five years hence, is of vast moment. The result comes home to the dearest and most substantial interests of scores of thousands of families. Of what so great importance is it that the franchise be extended instantly, rather than five years hence? All who deserve it will get it ere long. What solid result it is to bring so quickly to weeping wives and starving children, I have not yet heard. Until I hear it, I think you will wisely make it your first political object to carry out the advice of the Committee of 1834,—*to suppress all the facilities and means of intemperance by some comprehensive law.*