

PRICE 4d.

[illegible]

[illegible]

I have in view may be attained. Whether it be by the Bill brought in by my noble and gallant friend

[illegible]

Lord BERNERS had hoped that, after the large majority which had pronounced against the admission of Jews to Parliament, the question was settled at least for the present. But the first time that the subject of the Jews was brought up on far higher grounds than that of expediency—because he thought a Christian people ought to have Christian Legislation—was in the year 1292, when the English Legislature, without a Christian test (Hear, Hear, Hear!) their Lordships prepared to decide that the time had arrived when there was no need for a national profession of faith in the Christian religion, and that the Jews might be admitted to the House of Commons, and that it was inconvenient to continue in constant collision with the lower House of Parliament. For his part however, he could conceive nothing so derogatory to the House of Commons as to admit the Jews to the House of Commons, and he thought that the House of Commons were in the House of Commons men sufficiently pertinacious to press their views repeatedly on any public question their Lordships were to become merely the registrars of the opinions of the House of Commons. He thought that the Crown was inevitable on this subject. Suppose a Jew were created; what would happen? There would be a more serious collision with the Crown than even in the case of a Jew. He thought that the better the House of Lords nor the Monarchy would be safe.

PARL GRAYVILLE.—After the repeated discussion, which have taken place in your lordships' House on the subject it is entirely unnecessary for me to say on the present occasion more than I have already said on a former day. I will, I think, give my answer to it without the slightest hesitation, but I am bound to say not with unmixed satisfaction. I do not think that it is the best mode of settling this question (hear, hear), nor can I agree with the noble earl at the head of the Government in his only consideration of this question, viz. that of the House. There is no disgrace to individuals, nor to Governments, nor to assemblies, in changing their opinions on public ground and uninfluenced by any unworthy motives. (Hear, hear. If, when the noble and learned lord opposite first introduced his Bill into the House, the pressure of circumstances had been so good as it is now, it would have been more desirable also if, when the reasons of the Commons for disagreeing from our amendments came up, instead of immediately disagreeing from those reasons, we had postponed the consideration of them for a short time, as we proposed. I think the noble earl is right in saying that the mode of settling the question, it is the only one which I am able to obtain. I wish to do full justice to the Government on this point. There is no doubt that they have great difficulties to contend with.

difference with his political friends is one from which every Minister must naturally shrink. If the noble earl thinks—though I cannot follow his reasoning—that this course is most in accordance with the dignity of the House, and most likely to obtain the suffrages of his political friends, I am ready to support him. He is perfectly master of the situation. If he had chosen he might certainly have postponed the admission of Jews to Parli-

ment for this session, and probably for some years more. The state in which we are at present is most unsatisfactory. To say nothing of other arguments, the anomaly of our not being able to prevent a Jewish member of the other House sitting on committees, acting in conferences, and taking part in almost every Parliamentary proceeding, except sitting and voting, is so great as to make it a mere mockery for any one to stand up here and appeal to high Christian principles.

ple for the maintenance of such a barren restriction, (Hear.) I believe this Bill will carry out the object which we have in view, and I therefore give it my cordial support. I congratulate the House on there being every probability of its measure now passing into law, and I cannot help congratulating the noble and learned lord opposite, who certain by the industry which he must have thought himself dispensed from showing at a time when other men claim rest and, above all, by the singular ability with which he has y

after year destroyed the force of these appeals made to your lordships' feeling against his Bill, has done more than any other man in this House to bring the question to a successful issue. (Cheers.) But what is more creditable to him than anything else is the utter absence of any personal feeling which he has shown to-night in willingly adopting a course which was most likely to obtain the object which he had in view. (Hear, hear.)

The Duke of CLEVELAND thought that the question

had arrived at such a point that it must be settled now or for ever. It was idle to think that the House of Commons, having carried this measure so often and by such large and increasing majorities, would all at once give it up and their lordships, just as in the case of Catholic Emancipation and of the Reform Bill, would have to yield sooner or later. It had great weight with him that Baron Rothschild had been elected, not once or twice, but repeatedly, by one of the largest and most influential constituencies in the kingdom.

dom. It might be said that if the electors of London were to go on electing a man who could not take his seat if it were their own affair, and Parliament ought not to be called up to alter the law for the benefit of one man. There was, however, the precedent of Mr. Pease, the Quaker, who was allowed to make affirmation in lieu of an oath, and in that case alteration might be said to be for the benefit of one man. He believed that there never had been more than three Quakers in Parliament at one time, and it would be the same with the Jews. They were a small body. The co-

stituencies knew nothing about them and cared nothing about them, and it was not likely a Jew would be elected except by a metropolitan constituency. He would rather leave off his right hand than inflict injury on the Church, but apprehended no danger to the Church from the admission of Jews to Parliament. He hoped that to-night they would do an act of justice, and place every class of British-born subjects upon an equality with regard to the right of sitting in Parliament when chosen by a constituency to represent

The Duke of RUTLAND had heard no new facts, principles, or arguments to induce him to change the vote which he gave on the 29th of April last. It was said that a compromise was now offered, and it was advisable by that means to avoid a conflict between the two Houses of Parliament. Upon what ground did their lordships on the 20th of April refuse their consent by a majority of 40 to the Bill brought up from the House of Commons? Not upon the persons

ground of any difficulty in sitting upon the same bench with Baron Rothschild, but because the admission of the Jews to Parliament would unchristianize the Legislature. Would this Bill obviate that objection? (Hear.) If wanted any ground for opposing such a measure it was to be found in the last clause of the Bill of his noble friend, which he supposed would now be withdrawn, and which enacted that no person of the Jewish persuasion was to hold the office of Regent, of Keeper

the Great Seal, of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, or of the High Commissioner of Scotland. He contended that wherever reasons might be urged against Jews holding such offices applied with equal power to their admission to legal rights in Parliament. There were many of that majority of the House who were willing to accept this compromise for the purpose of putting an end to a difference between the two Houses but who would have no hesitation in rejecting this compromise if they believed that the people of England would

against the admission of the Jews. If the petitions presented to that House afforded any test of the feeling of the country then, while it might be said that there was no strong feeling on the subject, yet public opinion was rather against than for the admission of the Jews. Instead of giving their assent to such a Bill upon the ground of expediency he would recommend their lordships to wait until the constituencies had an opportunity of saying whether they wished this measure to pass or not. The House of Commons were elected upon

present rise of Commons was erected upon a
 ferent cry, and its opinion was no accurate test
 the real desire of the country. He implored the
 lordsships to reject a measure which was equa
 repugnant to their lordships' convictions, to the opin
 of the country, and to the best interests of the nati
 (Cheers).

Lord REDESDALE must say that this Bill was a v
 unsatisfactory mode of settling the question. It invol
 a principle of the deepest importance, and their lord

ought carefully to deliberate before they adopted so dangerous a course. If this Bill became law it was probable that the other House would in the present session pass a resolution to give effect to the Bill, while their lordships would reserve their opinion, and might at a future time come to a different resolution from that adopted by the other House of Parliament. It might therefore happen that years hence the question would be settled in their lordships' house by a simple resolution, and by a majority of a single vote, without the

ample opportunity of discussion which was afforded the forms of the House in the case of a Bill. It might happen that when some individual presented himself at the table to take the oaths his friends would, upon the occasion, and carry at once a resolution relieving him from that part of the oath objected to by Jews. That was a constitutional objection which the House ought to consider.

Lord BROUGHAM considered the objection raised by

noble friend (Lord Redesdale) perfectly groundless. If Bill would enable the House, if it was of opinion that part of the abjuration oath which Jews objected to ought to be taken by persons of that persuasion, to pass a resolution which would entitle any one professing the Jewish religion to take the oath without that portion of it to which had conscientious objections. It would enable them so to modify the abjuration oath as to admit those who scrupled in taking it, but it would be unnecessary to pass

resolution applicable to any particular individual. (His) The noble duke asked what new circumstances had occurred that ought to induce their lordships to change their view on this question. His answer was that a most material circumstance had occurred to induce them to alter their course. It had come to their knowledge that by the act and constitution of Parliament any person could perform nine-tenths of the duties of a member of Parliament without taking any oath whatever; for it had been found

that such a person could sit and vote in committee. (Re)
Besides, he held that there were classes of Christians in P
liament who differed almost as entirely from the whole bo

[illegible]

that if the Council should be reduced from 15 to 12, or should be abolished altogether, none of the members should have a right to claim compensation on the ground of vested interests.

The committee then divided; when the numbers were—

For the amendment 118
Against it 36

The words proposed to be left out were therefore ordered to stand part of the clause.

Sir G. C. LEWIS suggested that the latter part of the clause (providing for the suspension of a member of the Council during the Parliamentary recess for criminal or disgraceful conduct) might be better placed in the Bill.

Sir J. GRAHAM submitted that the 11th section of the Act passed in 1853, whereby the nomination of the Crown might be removed by Her Majesty for inability or misbehaviour, might be very advantageously followed as a precedent on this occasion. (Hear, hear.)

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL concurred in the view taken by the right hon. gentleman (Sir G. C. Lewis), and proposed, on the part of the Government, that after the words "and to the House of Commons" the remainder of the clause should be omitted.

Sir J. GRAHAM was still of opinion that some provision should be made for removing persons on account of incapacity.

Sir H. WILLOUGHBY asked what would be done in the case of persons who were bankrupt or insolvent.

LORD STANLEY said, in reply, that if any person was guilty of improper or disgraceful conduct there would be power to remove him on an address from both Houses to the Crown. As to incapacity, there was a difficulty in laying down a rigid rule that would cause the removal of persons without any fault of their own.

LORD J. RUSSELL said, it was true, as he had stated, that the judges might be removed by an address to the Crown. The same course could be followed in the present instance, and perhaps one effect of such a provision would be to lead to the retirement of persons who they became incapacitated for the discharge of their duties.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER reminded the Committee that every attempt to induce incapacity would be a breach of the Act, and that the object of that independence was the object of the clause.

The amendment of the SOLICITOR-GENERAL was then agreed to, and

To the 12th clause, which provides that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Sir E. PERRY moved the addition of the words, "Or be concerned in any trade or traffic whatever."

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament. He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

Mr. LIDDELL moved the omission of the word "No" at the beginning of the clause, and the addition of "that no member of the Council shall be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament." He said in making that proposition he merely asked the effect of which would be to read that members of the Council should be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

aspire to seats in Parliament, but who would not take any share in the administration of Indian affairs.

After a few observations from Mr. PULLER and Mr. RIDLEY, the committee divided—

Ayes 245
Noes 124

On the question that the clause stand part of the Bill, Mr. RIDLEY moved that it be so altered as not to exclude members of the Council from sitting in the House of Peers; but the proposition was opposed by the Government, and after a short conversation, withdrawn.

On the motion of the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, the CHAIRMAN then reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again this day (Friday) at 12 o'clock.

HERRING FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.
This Bill passed through committee.

On the motion of the LORD-ADVOCATE this Bill was committed *pro forma*, in order that certain amendments might be made in its clauses.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

Majority 65

Mr. BLACKBURN said the amendments had been rejected under rather peculiar circumstances. (Hear, hear.) Three weeks ago the subject had been debated, and on that occasion it was evident that a large majority were opposed to the measure. The debate was then adjourned, the understanding, as he thought, that the Bill was to be abandoned; yet now, at past midnight, when the House did not well know what was going on, the Bill was brought forward for a second reading. He believed that the measure was examined the least it would be liked, and he therefore, it would be thrown out on going into committee.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill, the debate upon which had been adjourned, the House at once divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading 161
Against it 96

THE OATHS BILL.

The following is the list of pairs upon Lord

Lucan's Bill—

Against.	For.
Courtney, Earl of	Bedford, Duke of
Waterford, Marquis of	Meath, Earl of
Beaumont, Earl of	Dorset, Earl of
Beverley, Earl of	Angles, Marquis of
Shrewsbury, Earl of	Rivers, Lord
Hopetoun, Earl of	Cottenham, Earl of
Polwarth, Lord	Forbes, Earl of
Drogheda, Marquis of	Essex, Earl of
Lincoln, Bishop of	Cardigan, Lord
Alison, Marquis of	Lindsey, Earl of
Blanchford, Viscount	Norfolk, Duke of
Plunket, Lord	Admiral, Earl of
Bantry, Earl of	Broadlands, Marquis of
Dalmeida, Lord	Willoughby d'Eresby, Lord
Abercorn, Marquis of	Albion, Lord
Stanford and Warrington, Lord	Allesbury, Marquis of
Foran, Lord	Sydney, Viscount
Denbigh, Earl of	St. Leonard's, Lord
De Vesi, Viscount	Arzly, Duke of
Guilford, Earl of	Manchester, Duke of
Willoughby de Broke, Lord	De Mauley, Lord
Crewe, Lord	Poltimore, Lord
Bolingbroke, Viscount	Stratford, Lord
Orford, Earl of	Zetland, Earl of
Wilton, Earl of	Exmouth, Viscount
Orkney, Lord	Howden, Lord
Hamlyn, Duke of	Monson, Lord
Maclesfield, Earl of	Townshend, Marquis of
Wenlock, Lord	Wentworth, Lord
Wensleydale, Lord	Wentworth, Lord
Downes, Lord	Eversley, Viscount

The Earl of ENNISKELEN was accidentally shut out from the division, or he would have voted against Lord Lucan's Bill.

THE SHAREHOLDERS IN THE BOMBAY RAILWAY AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY COMPANIES.

It is my duty and pleasure to inform you that at the hall at the London Tavern, yesterday, my amendment on the Bill was carried, and the Bill proceeded to a second reading. The numbers were—

For my amendment 3,850
Against it 2,850

Majority 1,000

The Directors, having thus ascertained their weakness, endeavored to adjust the Bill. An amendment to amend the Bill was proposed, and carried by a large majority. The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time.

HORSE-TAMIN

THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—A little book, published by Routledge, of Farrington-street, and sold for sixpence, entitled "*The Art of Horse-Taming*," by J. S. Rarey," is just now in everybody's hands. It is sold at all the railway termini; and is in the windows of most booksellers. It contains a detailed account of the best mode of catching, haltering, taming, backing, and throwing wild horses, and is stated to have been originally published by Mr. Rarey himself in an obscure London publication some years since. The author sold his art as a profound secret to the Earl of Derby and sold his art as a profound secret to the Earl of Derby for upwards of 12,000*l*.

Mr. Rarey's success in England is mainly attributable to his having been introduced to the public under the auspices of the well-known and respectable firm of Messrs. Tait and Son, of 11, Abchurch-lane, London. His art is now being taught by him, and by his son, at all the Hyde Park corners. He has an office in their premises, and is now in the habit of receiving his pupils there. Advertisements in to-day's papers solicit for him.

subscribers come in and pay 10c. 10c. ahead to initiate in his social-scientific system. Tattersall suggests: Is there any longer a secret to be thus sold? Did the book which Mr. Rarley printed before he came to this country, and which Mr. Routledge has reprinted, divulge the said secret, so that, in fact, it was no secret at all at the time he sold it to the subscribers in England? Tattersall to clear up this doubt. I have myself no doubt about the matter; but it is very certain that if Mr. Rarley's book contains a full and lucid account of his method of throwing and taming horses, it will not be worthy of Messrs. Tattersall if they aid and abet another book of the same kind. 10c. 10c. ahead to the confiding public, and to which they can obtain at Messrs. Routledge's shop for the small sum of sixpence.

Mr. Rarley is a cool, resolute man, handy and quick in dealing with horses; and, if anybody chooses to pay 10c. 10c. to see him throw and master a horse, well and good. But if anybody wishes to know the secret of his method, which he professes to impart, and which he binds his subscribers under a heavy bond not to divulge.

Had he himself divulged it to everybody in America, the publication of his book before he came over here and sold it to us in England as a secret? Should we have paid 10c. 10c. ahead to him, and he should have sold it to the world? Messrs. Tattersall have stood godfathers to him,

they have done, but they know that he had not done so? These are the questions which I propose to put before you after we go to call at Hyde-Park-corner, and pay 10*d.* a-head, ought to obtain an answer before they pay a farthing, and to which I submit Messrs. Tattersall, for their own credit, ought to give the same answers fully and honestly."

I am, Sir, your humble servant

£10 10*s.* 6*d.*

[Advertisement.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR.—In the four first editions of the Life of that highly talented gentleman, the late George Stephenson, it is stated on page 154, that "the project of constructing turnpike roads was the subject of frequent discussion in the Legislature, and large sums of money were voted to him by the Government for his services as surveyor." It appears from a disjunct and unconnected place in the House of Commons on the 13th of May, 1835, that votes of money had been granted to Mr. Adaman's sons at various times, amounting to no less than £1,000,000.

The Editor has alluded to on page 315.

In the fifth edition the figures are omitted, but the impression is retained that Mr. Adaman was paid by the Government for inventing railways in reality nothing more than a country road.

I cannot more effectually discuss the public mind of our fathers than by exhibiting meeting after meeting. In accordance, the following extracts from a voluminous report of select committee of the House of Commons, made to the House in 1823 upon the subject, and which I send you enclosed under the name of the said Mr. Adaman and country :—

"EXTRACT FROM REPORT."

"In presenting to the House the result of their inquiry into claim preferred by Mr. M. Adaman for a compensation for his services as surveyor of live having meting through the country, the present and economical system of repairing, making, and managing turnpike roads, the Committee have taken pains to examine in the places the proceedings which have taken place upon this subject by the several Turnpike Acts, and have also examined the accounts."

"Having thus given a distinct and connected account of these recent proceedings, and having taken into their consideration whole of the correspondence which has passed previous to this inquiry, the Committee have concluded to recommend the Postmaster-General, together with the several memorials presented to the House of Commons, and the reports of the Committees appointed accompanying them, and having considered Mr. M. Adaman's statement, to refer the same to a Select Committee, who may pay this report, your committee are of opinion that Mr. M. Adaman's claims are not supported by evidence, and that the sum advanced as and as considerable expense out of his private' property, introduced into very extensive practice a system of repairing, making, and managing turnpike roads, and that the same iron will

[illegible]

as your committee conceives, too apparent to escape the most common observation, that the system is not a system of public expenditure, but a system from which so much profit has already been derived, that the Government are not disposed to incur the expense of more beneficial consequences, both to the condition of the roads and to the public, than the amount of the present enormous and unimprovable expenditure.

It would therefore appear that, so far from having any objection to the proposed bill, the Government are anxious to account between Mr. Ad'ams and the public at this stage thus—

“The committees of the House of Commons certified a sum of 6,877, for travelling expenses which had been claimed by Mr. M'Adam up to the year 1829, and the last year of the bill, and the House of Commons voted to pay Mr. Ad'ams of 2,000, for his invention. Of the first of these sums he was paid only 4,000, which, added to the grant of 2,000, made 6,000, which was the sum which he had in his family ever received, 6,000—that is, 877, less than had actually been expended in travelling.

“The House of Commons voted to pay only 4,000, in place of 6,877, for travelling expenses, not only deprived him the benefit of the grant of 2,000, but left him to pay 877, more than he had actually received, and to the disadvantage of the public and in the face of the decisions of two of the Houses of the House of Commons.

“The House of Commons voted to pay 2,000, but he has not yet received it, and it is not yet appropriated but an honest and a patriotic man.

I have the honour to remain, Sir, your most obedt servant,

WILLIAM M'ADAM.

Bath, June 30.

[illegible][illegible]

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]

