

**The permissive bill debate : House of Commons, Wednesday, July 13th, 1870.**

**Contributors**

Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons.  
United Kingdom Alliance.

**Publication/Creation**

Manchester : United Kingdom Alliance, [1870?]

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/tmzr6s3c>

**License and attribution**

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

# THE PERMISSIVE BILL DEBATE.

*House of Commons, Wednesday, July 13th, 1870.*

ON the order of the day being called for the Second Reading of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, an enormous number of petitions were presented in its favour, some of them being extremely large. Great amusement was occasioned by the presentation of one from Glasgow by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, which was of so bulky a character that it was obliged to be brought up to the table by the combined efforts of the hon. baronet and Mr. Candlish, who fairly bent under its weight as they walked up the wide space between the Ministerial and Opposition sides of the House with it.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON, on rising to move the second reading of the bill, was greeted with a cheer from his supporters on both sides of the House. He said: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am obliged to bring this question before the House at so late a period of the session. It is not from any wish of mine that I have been unable to bring it forward at an earlier period, but the House will remember as well as I do that at the beginning of this session we were all in expectation of Her Majesty's Government, in accordance with the promise made in Her Majesty's gracious speech from the throne, bringing in some measure for the purpose of dealing with the licensing system, and I thought it would not be respectful either to Her Majesty's Government or to the Home Secretary if I introduced my project for the purpose of dealing with the subject of intemperance when we were all in daily expectation of the Government bringing forward their measure. But we all of us now know that that bill has not been brought forward. I see that my right hon. friend has just now come into the House, and I will say at once that I do not wish in any way to reproach him for not fulfilling the promise which he made last session. No doubt he intended to do so, but the force of circumstances was too strong for him, and he found that he had neither time nor opportunity to carry his bill this session, and therefore he deemed it better to postpone it. But I must say that I do not think that it was good policy for him to do so. I think not; but at the same time I am quite sure that he has acted conscientiously, and it is not for me nor any one else who may happen to feel strongly on the matter to reproach him. I must express my regret at the course he has taken, for however important may be the measures which have been brought before Parliament this session, there is, I believe, no measure approaching in importance, or which is calculated to do so much good to the kingdom in general as a measure dealing with the subject which we are now discussing. (Cheers.) No one is more alive to the importance of this subject, I am convinced, than the right hon. gentleman the Home Secretary himself; for he has actually stated that it is a question "affecting the whole happiness of the community." However much I and those who are acting with me may feel gratified at this recognition by the Government of the importance of the subject, still believing, as we do, that we have a special remedy for the evil which afflicts us, we cannot take upon ourselves the responsibility of sitting still while we see the extent of the evil which is going on around us without making some attempt to remedy it, and therefore I think I am justified in bringing forward my bill. (Cheers.) Now, in the first place, I will take the opportunity of reminding the House that this bill has only been twice before it. Many hon. members think that it is a very old question, and one which has been repeatedly discussed in this House. That is not so, and the fact is that it was only brought forward for the first time in the year 1864, and then it was defeated by a majority of no less than seven to one. A new Parliament intervened, in which I had not the honour of having a seat; but last year, in the first session of the first Parliament which was elected under household suffrage, I again introduced this bill, and the result was that instead of being defeated by a majority of seven to one, the House only divided two to one against the measure. That shows the rapid growth of public opinion on this important subject. One reason, no doubt, why there was such a majority against the bill was because many hon. gentlemen very naturally looked forward to the measure which the right hon. gentleman intended to introduce. No doubt the same argument will now be used as was used on a former occasion with respect to the passing of a very useful measure; but I hope that the right hon. gentleman will not be led to fight against this bill to-day, because he may be as



thoroughly in earnest as he was last year. For it is quite possible that circumstances may again prevent him from bringing forward his measure next year. I hope, therefore, whatever may be in the minds of the Government with respect to the mode of dealing with the licensing question, they will not permit it to militate against a full discussion of the merits of the bill which is now before the House. Another argument which will no doubt be very much used is this, that we are now engaged in passing a great and important measure for promoting a system of national education, and that in an effective system of national education will be found the real cure for drunkenness. That, I think, is my right hon. friend's own strong impression; because although he admits that restrictive measures are to some extent necessary, yet he bases his main hope of eradicating drunkenness and improving the general morals of the people on a comprehensive system of national education. No doubt there is some truth in that view, but I am very much afraid that the hopes which are entertained of the diminution of drinking, intoxicating beverages from the spread of education are based on a very exaggerated notion of what will be the result of such education. And I do not say this without some good ground, because it is remarkable that in that very country which is held up *par excellence* as the country in which the people are the best educated, the most moral, and the most orderly in the world, I mean the States of New England, they have found an admirable system of national education insufficient to cope with the evils of the liquor traffic, and in point of fact it is in that country that all the attacks upon it have been initiated. With regard to this education question and the results which are expected to flow from it, I should very much like to know how it is expected to put an end to drunkenness. I am quite sure that no one proposes to teach the people to become teetotalers. Besides, whatever you are going to teach them, surely they know already that it is wrong upon their part to get drunk. (Hear, hear.) I do not suppose that there is a single man addicted to drinking, and who is now ruining himself and his family, who does not know very well that he is doing wrong. He knows, and he admits it, to be a bad habit, the indulgence of which he cannot resist, because he is seized with an uncontrollable appetite that leads him to the public-house whether he will or not. The only education that can provide a remedy for this state of things is a system of education which will give to a man an increased power of self-control, and I very much doubt whether any system of book-learning will give to a man that power of controlling his appetite to which my right hon. friend looks as the real cure for drunkenness. It is not only poor and ignorant people who fall victims to this vice; it is, on the contrary, men of all ranks and all classes, high and low, rich and poor, intellectual and ignorant, whom it assails. And here I must trouble the House with one or two quotations, because, of course, my unsupported words would go a very little way in support of these allegations. What said the hon. gentleman the member for Berkshire, who sits below me on these benches? In the debate of last year, on this very bill, in some remarks about drunkenness, after showing that the beer-shops were not so blameworthy as some suppose, he said:—

If he were called upon to name those within his knowledge who had ruined their prospects in life, who had lost good situations, and had fallen from comparative ease and competence to a state of degradation, they would not be the men belonging to the labouring class following agricultural or mechanical pursuits, but they would be men of a superior class and of good education—men who had enjoyed comfortable homes and good salaries, and who, in spite of all, had fallen victims to that abominable and frightful vice.

But let me quote another authority upon this point, and it is that of a gentleman whom no one will charge with being an enemy to education, although he may not think it a radical cure for drunkenness. Hear what the Rev. B. Renzi, the chaplain to the Leeds borough gaol, says:—

Out of 1,041 prisoners committed in 1852-3, only 138 had never been to school.

The Rev. Josh. Kingsmill, in his official report of Pentonville penitentiary, for 1849, says:—

Of 1,000 convicts, 957 had been scholars in the different day-schools, high and low, in the country, and nearly half that number, on an average, five years.

The *Daily News* shows that returns sent in in 1849 from the governors of 100 prisons show that out of 5,996 prisoners then in gaol, 2,900 had been Sunday scholars. At a meeting of ticket-of-leave men, called by H. Mayhew, March 12, 1856, to which 50 responded, it appeared that more than one-half had been educated either at day-schools or Sunday-schools. In Parkhurst prison, out of 937 boys confined in 1844, 734 had been at day-schools, on an average, nearly four years. Mr. Smith, governor of Edinburgh gaol, says, in 1845:—"The number of recommitments of those who can read well is much greater than the number of those who cannot read at all." Therefore I do not think that any specific for the vice of drunkenness is to be found in any system of national education. But I am told that the upper classes have improved immensely as compared with the last generation. Well, be it so; I don't know that elementary education has had much to do with the improvement in this respect, visible in the upper classes.



Although it may be quite true that country squires no longer drink their three bottles of wine after dinner, and sit till they fall under the table—(laughter)—surely it is not because these squires read and write better now that this most beneficial change has been brought about. It is the improved tone of society and the influences by which they are surrounded which has educated them and has led them to regard drunkenness as a vice which is wholly unbecoming good and respectable citizens. But, sir, notwithstanding we have had those influences at work for a long time, it appears to me that no great impression has been made upon the drunkenness of the country at large. With all your teaching and preaching you do not go to the root of the matter, and in the expressive words of the chaplain of the Preston House of Correction, “the improvement which takes place in the country, with respect to drunkenness, is so slow that it can be measured only at very long intervals of time.” That appears to me to be perfectly true. I do not want to weary the House, but I must quote a few statistics to show hon. gentlemen how mistaken they are when they say that everything will go on smoothly if we will only let things alone. I have known former Home Secretaries get up in this House and quote the judicial statistics for various purposes, and among others to show that intemperance was diminishing; but any one who refers to the judicial statistics will find in them a convincing proof that the evil of drunkenness in this country is not diminishing, for while in 1866-7 there were 100,375 drunk and disorderly persons proceeded against, in 1867-8 they had increased to 111,465, and last year there was a further increase of over 11,500. That does not look as if things were improving very much. (Hear, hear.) But still more remarkable is it, that even since the licensing bill of the hon. baronet the member for North Essex (Sir Selwyn Ibbetson) was passed, in all the large towns from which I have got returns, in Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Leeds, Bradford, and Birmingham, there has been an increase in the cases of drunk and disorderly persons charged before the magistrates. I cannot account for it, but still it is the fact. In Liverpool the increase in all kinds of offences connected with drink, but exclusive of drinksellers’ offences, was not less than 1,726, the returns for the four months ending January 31st, 1869, being 5,463, while those returned in the four months ending January 31st, 1870, was not less than 7,189. In Manchester I find from the report of Captain Palin, the head constable, that the number of persons “proceeded against during the year are nearly three times the number they were ten years ago. In these offences there is a considerable increase, drunkenness, however, showing most prominently. The persons arrested for this offence in 1860 gave 23 per cent. of the total persons proceeded against, which has increased to 40 per cent. during the past year. There are many other offences arising immediately out of drunkenness which cannot be classed under this head. Some idea of this may be gathered from the fact that 65·1 per cent. of the persons arrested were drunk when taken into custody. The increased demand upon the time of the police which this offence occasions materially interrupt that constant attention to their duties which is so necessary for the effectual protection of property and detection of criminals.” I dare say some attempt will be made to controvert these statistics, but I believe that they will be found to be quite correct. Well, then, what are we to do? If we do not legislate, what steps are you going to take? Do you expect that religion and moral influences will operate more powerfully than they have hitherto done to make men better? and, if not, what new influences do you expect will be brought into play to put a stop to this abominable vice of drunkenness? It appears to me that if we sit still and do nothing the same causes will operate in the same manner, and exactly with the same effect. I must confess that I see little hope of checking the drunkenness of the country unless some such measure as this be adopted. We seem to be no more advanced by standing quietly by and looking on, trusting to the advancement and improvement of the people, than a man who sits down on the river bank and expects that the stream will flow away. Now, sir, the principal causes of drunkenness are the temptations which are being constantly put in the way of people by the system of licensing houses in every part of the country for the sale of intoxicating drinks. It appears, from a report just published from the Inland Revenue office, from an able memorandum drawn up by Mr. Thring, at the request of the Government, that the licensing system was established, partly for police and partly for fiscal purposes. All that I can say about that is, that if this licensing system is established for these two objects, one for police and one for revenue purposes, with respect to the first it has been a total and complete failure, while with regard to the second it has been a brilliant success. I cannot imagine, in a financial point of view, anything more successful, for you receive something like £24,000,000 or £25,000,000 of money from various sources of revenue derived from the manufacture and sale of drink of all kinds; but on the other hand, as regards police, your licensing system has been a total failure. (Hear, hear.) That is proved by the number of amendments which are continually brought forward. Probably from first to last there have been three or four hundred Acts of Parliament dealing with this matter trying to make beneficial what has hitherto proved so injurious. In 1830 we had the Beer Act. We were told that good wholesome beer would carry everything before



it. Well, sir, we have tried it for nearly forty years, and we have found it to be a hopeless failure. Then, again, in 1860, the Prime Minister introduced the Wine Act, and he stated in the House that he introduced it as a temperance measure. But, sir, if it has done no harm, which may be doubted, it has certainly done no good, as is perfectly apparent from the facts which I have laid before the House. Now, there is a great cry got up that this is neither a question of beer nor wine, but it is all a question of adulteration. I am glad to see the hon. member for Derby in his place. He is a great friend of the licensed victuallers, and when presiding at the festival of their asylum last May he said that he was "one of the fifth generation of a set of tradesmen who for more than one hundred years had been cultivating with all their hearts the good opinion of the licensed victuallers of the country. Some 15,000 of them were in constant communication with him." They were "the most ancient and most useful body of tradesmen that ever existed in the world, engaged in the production and the distribution of the various beverages without which, he believed, mankind would become no better than a set of monks." (Laughter.) That is, according to the hon. member, the effect of the beer barrel. (Laughter.) The hon. member strenuously denies that licensed victuallers adulterate the beer. That may be so. My hon. friend may be right, I admit; but on the other hand, may he not be mistaken? However, whether right or wrong, it is equally a condemnation of the licensing system. Either, it is good sound beer which does the harm, or else your licensing system fails in obtaining satisfactory dealers. On either theory, I say the case must go against him. The other new suggestion is that you should have some fresh licensing body. I have no objection to that, and I am sure that it would be regarded as a boon by the magistrates, who have to discharge under great difficulties a most delicate and onerous duty; but I am not certain that any other body of men could have discharged it with more satisfaction to the public at large. An elective body has been tried. You have it in Scotland, while in parts of Ireland you have licences granted by a recorder who is free from local influences. I do not attack the exercise of this power by the magistrates, and I am now proposing no new body at all. Let hon. gentlemen fully understand that mine is not a licensing bill in any shape or way. But, supposing you have a new licensing body, what are the duties which are to be entrusted to them? It is stated upon good authority that there are three duties which at present they have to perform. They first have to consider whether the man is properly qualified for the purpose of carrying on such a business; they next inquire whether the house in which he lives, and for which he applies for a licence is a proper one for carrying on the business; and, thirdly, they are to inquire what are the wants of the neighbourhood in which the man is going to sell drink. Now, sir, I am not going to interfere with the present system except in one direction. I still leave to the magistrates the power of inquiring into the man's character and position, and also into the state of his house. But I do say this: Let us guide them, let us assist them in the most difficult part of their duty, namely, that of finding out the wants of the inhabitants, and whether they require the opening of a drinking-shop. Let us have a local machinery by which they can inform the magistrates whether they want these establishments or not. Now, that is the whole case, and it is really nothing more than the adoption of some means of providing a guide by which the magistrates may know whether they displease or please the people by licensing their beershops and public-houses in his district. The bill, therefore, which I propose, absolutely does not shut up a single public-house or beershop, but leaves it entirely to enlightened public opinion to operate on the question when it is sufficiently strong. What would be the result? In a number of places it would have no effect at all, but there are other places where the inhabitants generally suffer from the drunkenness of a portion, and they have a perfect right to call for some check to the crime and misery caused by drunkenness, and it may be that in such places they will adopt the machinery of my bill and thus veto the issue of any licences for the sale of drink within the districts in question. The magistrates would thus be saved from the disagreeable and delicate duties which are now cast upon them by the present system. I do not say in how many cases it would operate, I only say that it is just that the people themselves should have the power of saying whether they think it is good for them to have public-houses opened in their neighbourhood or not, and it is the possession of that power for which I am pleading on their behalf to-day. (Cheers.) Understand that this is a question in which the public are deeply interested. It is for this power of voting on a question which intimately concerns their welfare that there were last year petitions from upwards of 800,000 petitioners to this House, while there were only four petitions, all of which came from Licensed Victuallers' Associations, against it. It is this power which the committee of Convocation declare to have been exercised in many cases with the most beneficial effect; and in the report which they issued on the subject they strongly recommend that the people should be entrusted generally with such a power. Then, again, we have had a number of petitions on the same subject this year, though it is quite true that we had not so many as we had last year. The



reason of that is obvious. People cannot be always petitioning upon any subject. They feel that they have expressed their opinion once, and that opinion is equally strong now as it was last year. Sir, I am very happy to think that the right hon. gentleman the member for Birmingham, whose absence we all so much regret, in one of the last speeches which he made, endorsed the principle of the bill which I am now advocating. He said that he thoroughly approved the principle of the measure, but he went on to say that the machinery was as bad as it could possibly be. Well, I am now talking of the principle of the bill only, and if it is argued that its machinery is bad, then I say alter it in committee. I am not prejudiced in favour of the machinery, and will willingly consent to any alteration which may tend to make it more effective. I took the best which I could find, and adopted the machinery of this bill from an excellent act which has worked extremely well. But all I contend for is the principle which was supported by the right hon. gentleman the member for Birmingham in his speech. I must, however, allude to the objection which that right hon. gentleman took to the measure, because he thought it right to vote against the bill simply on account of the machinery. Now on the second reading of a bill, it is perfectly clear that it is the principle alone, and not the machinery which is proposed for the purpose of carrying that principle into effect, which ought to guide us in our vote. If hon. members do not like permissive legislation, they should say so boldly. Numbers of our laws are more or less of a permissive character, and you put the power of licensing into the hands of licensing boards, instead of having any general rule on the matter. It is then permissive. That system is now entirely in the hands of the magistrates, and all that we wish is to give the people a vote in a matter which so much affects them. I am not afraid of the argument that will probably be used that this is simply the introduction of the Maine Liquor Law. I am not going to stand up here and say that I don't know that; indeed, I quite admit it. Mr. Hume said he would vote for the Maine Law if he believed it would cure drunkenness, and in that opinion I perfectly concur. It is now known that wherever that act is put into operation in accordance with popular principles, it has always proved an effectual cure for drunkenness.

Mr. BASS: But you cannot put it in force.

Sir W. LAWSON: Well, but at all events you might let the experiment be tried.

Mr. BASS: It has been tried, and has failed.

Sir W. LAWSON: As my hon. friend is about to speak, perhaps he will inform me what I very much wish to know, namely, when and where the law has failed when it has been put into operation in accordance with the will of the inhabitants. I must confess that I shall be perfectly astonished to hear it, for, as at present advised, I do not believe that there has been one case in which it has failed where it has been carried out in accordance with the will of the people. (Hear, hear.) While I am on the permissive part of this question, I may ask what does the Vice-President of the Committee of Council say with respect to permissive legislation? While acknowledging that it was not to be advocated as final legislation, he said that he could point to cases to show that it had not seldom succeeded. Well, sir, all we want is that the experiment should be tried. If it fails, and if it is shown that when public-houses in a particular district are removed, crime and misery continue to exist to the same extent as they did before the public-houses were removed, why nobody else will remove them; but if, on the contrary, their removal is accompanied by a general rise in the moral, social, and material condition of the people, then it will follow that this, like all other good movements, will become progressive, and in the end that the removal of public-houses will become general. (Cheers.) A great deal has been said against this bill because it is permissive legislation. I must confess that I do not see the force of that argument. Has not permissive legislation worked extremely well in many other instances? The Health of Towns Act was a permissive measure, and surely if you think it right to make the people clean and healthy by a permissive bill, there is no reason why you should not try to make them sober by another. The measure which has been passed for the establishment of free libraries and museums, which has answered so admirably in many parts of the country, was a permissive bill. It has not been adopted in London and in many other places, but there was no harm in giving them power to adopt it; and while it has enabled the people to establish many admirable libraries in the towns in which they required them, it did not force their establishment in others, so that nobody was hurt by it. Then the right hon. gentleman the member for Morpeth introduced a permissive bill not many years ago, namely, a measure by which the town council of any town which chose to adopt it could make by-laws closing public-houses at certain specified hours, and empowering the police to visit them in the middle of the night. That act is adopted in many places, and, so far as I can see, no person is aggrieved by it, or suffers from its operation. I must, therefore, confess that I do not see any force in the cry which has been raised against this bill on the ground that it is permissive legislation. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, there is another objection which has been raised to the measure, which I must confess is a very fair one, and that is, that it is an attack upon the rights of inhabitants that ratepayers only are to vote, and that they



ought to take the opinion of all the inhabitants before the measure should be put in operation. Nothing would give us greater pleasure than to do so if we could, but there is no machinery for getting at them that we know of. If there were we should be all ready and glad to adopt it. Another objection is that the measure is an encroachment upon individual liberty, but that may be said more or less of every Act of Parliament, which is more or less an encroachment upon individual liberty. Surely if you have a right to put down gambling-houses you have an equal right to put down drinking-houses. Then there is another great lion in the way which I will at once allude to, and that is the compensation which the licensed victuallers ought to receive for what they would undoubtedly consider to be an undue interference with their trade. Now I will read at once what the licensed victuallers themselves say upon this matter. I hold in my hand a petition which has been sent up to the House from the Licensed Victuallers' Association. They object to what they call piecemeal legislation. They state:—

That your petitioners have learned that a bill is now before your honourable House which proposes the total suppression of public-houses in certain places at the will and by the permission of two-thirds of the inhabitants of such places.

That the said bill is a proposal apparently in the interest of temperance and based on an assumption that the system of issuing licences under the direction of the local magistracy is imperfect.

That your petitioners have invested a large amount of capital in providing public accommodation, subject to and on the faith and stability of existing regulations; therefore, whatever changes are proposed to remedy alleged defects, your petitioners may perhaps be excused urging your honourable House carefully to consider the aggregate dependencies of the trade in the suppression of which is involved the convenience of society.

Your petitioners respectfully submit that it is one thing to keep the trade within respectable limits, but that the provisions of the bill now before Parliament are an opposite extreme, unwarranted by the character and tendency of the people to intellectual and moral improvement.

Your petitioners beg to remind your honourable House that the bill seeks only to embrace certain districts, and, where it shall be so determined, the careful discrimination of magistrates is to be superseded by passion and prejudice; capital will be imperilled by those who are more zealous than wise. Apart from the confusion created and encouraged by the bill, where two townships adjoin, the supply will merely be removed from one side of the street to the other.

That the licensed victuallers of the United Kingdom have sunk capital in their business in sums varying from £200 to £10,000, amounting in the aggregate to upwards of £60,000,000 sterling. Government has compensated slave owners, proctors, Chancery clerks, palace court practitioners; it has also respected the good fortune of every sinecurist, and recognised the title of the beneficiary of every venerable abuse. Your petitioners therefore ask that their property and interest also shall not be confiscated as proposed without adequate compensation. That your petitioners, for the reasons above stated, are of opinion that the said bill is unjust in theory, and its preamble untrue, its provisions impracticable, and therefore pray it may not receive the sanction of your honourable House.

I cannot understand whoever it could have been that told them that this House was not at liberty to repeal any act that has been passed on this subject, just in the same way that it is at liberty to repeal an act of Parliament upon any other subject. Surely they are not so foolish as to suppose that the laws made by this House are as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. However, I do not object to the petition, but if their case is really made out, how does the matter stand. Your licensing body, your magistrates, are empowered by the public to make a bargain with them in consequence of which the publicans in consideration of paying so much money are privileged to sell drink for one year. The State has a right to decline renewing the bargain. But, sir, whether they are to be compensated or not, surely has nothing whatever to do with the second reading of the bill. I want to know whether a man who builds a house with the intention of getting a licence for it, well knowing that the very act of getting a licence will raise the value of that house 50 per cent., is to be compensated when the house returns to its actual value, especially when we know that the increase in its value to the extent of 50 per cent. or so has been made at the expense of the depreciation of the value of the property all around it. But only let us clearly know on what ground the demand is made, for until then we cannot give it a definite answer. (Hear, hear.) At the same time I will say that any compensation will be cheap which would put a stop to the spending of the hundred millions of money which the country expends annually on intoxicating drinks. I intended to have quoted a list of cases in which the prohibitory principle has been put in force, and the manner in which it has always answered its purpose, but I will leave that to my hon. friends who will speak after me, and to my noble friend who will second this motion, and will give his own experience, having seen the benefit of it. My noble friend the other night attended a large and enthusiastic meeting at which he stated how of his own knowledge the prohibitory principle had worked, and the strong reasons which induced him to demand it for his fellow-countrymen, having seen the effect of it in different parts of the country in which he lives. The House will allow me to say that this bill interferes with that of nobody else. My right hon. friend the Home Secretary does not even give us a hint of what sort of a bill he proposes to introduce next year in regard to this question. Let him understand that this bill interferes in no shape or way with any other. No doubt the measure which he will bring in will improve the licensing system, and in point of fact any bill which is brought in must be of benefit. I feel sure of that, without seeing it, because I am convinced that it must go the length of restricting the facilities which now exist for obtaining drink, if he makes any change at all. But his measure is not passed yet, nay it is not even introduced. I only say, in the meantime at all events, don't thrust the liquor down the throats of the people. I do not mean to say that my bill is a



panacea for all the evils of the country, but I believe that it will do an immense amount of good with no corresponding amount of injury. But if it does a small portion only of good, surely it is worthy of the consideration of the House. Might I, before I conclude, just quote the eloquent words of the right hon. gentleman the member for Birmingham, in the last set speech which he made before his illness. He said, speaking to his constituents,—

If we could subtract from the ignorance, the poverty, the suffering, the sickness, and the crime which are now witnessed among us, the poverty, the suffering, the sickness, and the crime which are caused by this one single but the most prevalent habit or vice of drinking needlessly, which destroys body and mind, and home and family, do we not all feel that this country would be so changed, and so changed for the better, that it would be almost impossible for us to know it again?

(Cheers.) Now if our measure only tends in that direction, surely it is not one which this Government, the friends, we hope, of the people, can find it in their hearts to oppose. Surely a great responsibility will rest upon any statesman who, without any plan of his own before the House, simply chooses to obstruct others. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I hope that the right hon. gentleman will not take that course, and if he does, I hope that the House will support me in a measure which I do not pretend to say will be a perfect cure for drunkenness, but which at any rate will give to the people of this country a chance of doing what they believe to be for the advantage of themselves and the welfare of the nation. (Cheers.)

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON: In rising to second the motion of the honourable member, I will not trespass long upon the attention of the House. Indeed, the eloquent speech of the honourable baronet has rendered it unnecessary for me to do so, in the first place, and, in the second, I am fully aware that the subject is one which creates so great an interest in the House, and the main points of which have been so well put before them, it is not necessary for me to address it at any great length. I will, therefore, not weary the House, but I must appeal to honourable members to dismiss from their minds some of the prejudices which have been created with respect to this subject, and I implore them not to be carried away with the idea that this measure is conceived in the spirit of the olden times in which were enacted sumptuary laws, or that it is sought in any way to interfere with the individual privileges of the subject. What is the real object in passing this bill? It is to enable the inhabitants of this country in certain districts to have some voice and influence upon a subject which must materially affect their social and moral welfare. Now, I do not think that this can be considered as an exceptional or preposterous demand to be made to this House by the people of this country. If this were a measure which had for its object to relieve the people from any particular burden in the shape of taxation it is quite possible that such a measure might not meet with our approval; but it is a bill not for obtaining relief from any taxation or from State burdens, but one which simply asks that men shall be permitted, within the limited districts which are named in the bill, to express an opinion whether they consider that public-houses are necessary, and if they come to a resolution that they are not, to close them. It may be said, and I dare say will be, that this is a considerable interference with the privileges of others; but I trust that this House will consider what has brought about the public feeling which so backs up the efforts of the honourable member. What is it that has created so wide-spread a feeling in the country? Is it not that the legislation of past times has been so faulty as to have created a state of affairs which has been acknowledged to have operated most prejudicially? Is it not that injudicious legislation in regard to the Beer Act of 1830 has created so much dissatisfaction in the public mind? That has been conceded by all successive Governments. Up to the present time no one of them has been able to grapple with the difficulty. Everybody must be aware of the high authority you have in regard to the evils of drunkenness. It must be perfectly apparent. You have all the leading judges, magistrates, police authorities, united as one man in stating that by far the greater proportion of the offences which are committed are the result of intoxication, and that intoxication has been increased by the unfortunate facilities for obtaining a supply of liquor in this country. Under these circumstances, as I conceive, the great public cry has come up to this House, and I hope the House will listen to the prayer of so many hundreds and thousands of persons, asking for some measure of relief of the nature of that which is now before the House. All who heard the able address of the honourable baronet must be aware that he does not wish to enforce every letter of the bill. He only wishes the spirit and object to be carried into effect; and if that is done the people will be able to raise their voices and make arrangements which will only affect their own locality. That is all that the House is asked to do. Now, sir, all who read the public papers must be aware how many utterances come to us on this subject. The House is aware of the remarkable statement which has been made by the committee appointed by the Lower House of Convocation of the province of Canterbury, numbering in its dioceses 12,000 parishes, and a population of upwards of 14,000,000. That committee was appointed to inquire into the deficient state of education. They make a very remarkable report, in which they mention the surprising fact that there are nearly 1,000 parishes in which certain of the restrictive measures of this bill are already in operation, and producing most beneficial results. We are not altogether without some reasons for knowing what beneficial effects would be produced by legislation on this subject. Every one must be aware of what has been the operation of the act brought in by Sir Selwyn Ibbetson in respect of the sale of intoxicating liquors, and every one will admit the advantages which would be derived from that enactment, and must be further aware of the vast improvement that has been caused by other acts restraining facilities for drinking. The beneficial result of these acts has been acknowledged by all parties. We are all of us aware that last session the unlimited sale of liquor was in some degree checked, and I am happy to know that the public at large have been compelled to acknowledge the benefit of that measure. Now, sir, I wish to remind the House that



Parliament is not invited to endeavour to make men sober and moral by special enactments, but this bill invites Parliament to undo its own evil work, and to remedy the evil which it has itself caused. That is agreed upon all sides, and this is all that Parliament is asked to do. I am sure that every one who reads this bill must acknowledge that it embodies in the fairest spirit the demands of the people. (Hear, hear.) I may, perhaps, be permitted to say that this unanimity of feeling in regard to this bill has been nowhere more apparent than in the sister country of Ireland. We have obtained from that country evidence that this feeling is shared by every class of the inhabitants of Ireland. The Roman Catholic Church has come forward and denounced the evils of the existing state of things, and countenanced this movement in a manner which is gratifying to all the supporters of the bill, and which is most creditable to themselves. On the other hand, the Protestant Episcopal Church has been by no means behind in giving its support to this measure. In Ulster, indeed, the unanimity has been perfectly marvellous, and only yesterday I received a communication from there from which it appears that there is not only a decided and unanimous desire to see legislation such as this bill proposes, but that the other day there was a meeting of the Presbyterian body—the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, who came to a perfectly unanimous decision in favour of this bill. There is also another considerable body called the Reformed Presbyterians, and they recently had a meeting of their synod, and also unanimously expressed an opinion in favour of this bill. (Hear, hear.) Nor is this all: for the Wesleyan body in Ulster, in which is represented the feeling of all the provincial associations in different parts of Ireland, unanimously expressed their opinion in favour of this bill; and I may mention, as an illustration of this feeling, that I have had more applications requesting me to support this measure than I have had to support any other public measure that has been before the House, including even the Irish Land Bill. (Hear, hear.) I can assure the House that the letters of application I have received asking me to support this bill have been more numerous than those which I have received in reference to all the other bills before Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I think that what I have said will show that so far as Ireland is concerned, they, at least, are strongly impressed with the advantages that will result from this measure. Petitions have been received, I may say, from numerous places representing thousands of people, and which have been largely signed by the female portion of the community, and I can also assure the House that this feeling does not exist in one class or sect of the people, but that it is entirely unsectarian, and is a representation of all the united Christian communities in Ireland. It is with much gratification that I am able to state these facts, and I do trust, after the statement that we heard last year from the right honourable gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and after his acknowledgment that the most intelligent and industrious and thriving members of the working classes were in favour of legislation upon this subject, that Parliament will consider it its duty to legislate; and I trust the right hon. gentleman will this year be able to make a step forward and say that he will give his powerful influence and weight in favour of the bill. I do not wish to weary the House, because the time is exceedingly limited on this occasion, and other gentlemen wish to follow me, and therefore I do most earnestly entreat the House to listen to the prayer which comes up from so many thousands and tens of thousands of heads of families—chiefly of the humbler classes—who are deeply impressed with the evils of the liquor traffic, and I implore all sections and classes of members not to allow any political passions, or class feelings, or any opposition which they may feel toward the present system of licences, to lead them to turn a deaf ear to the cry of the humbler classes. No man in this House can deny the evils of intoxication, or the misery it causes to thousands of people, and therefore I do trust that we shall see an attempt made by Parliament to mitigate the evil. Sir, I beg to second the motion now before the House.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE: I have, sir, to move that this bill be read a second time this day three months. I think we might perhaps have been spared the observations made by the honourable baronet who introduced the bill, that somebody or other had spelt "piecemeal" erroneously. I trust, so far as this question is involved, there are far higher principles at stake than the orthography of any petition or petitioner whatever. Surely this little matter was not of sufficient importance to occupy the attention of Parliament for one moment. The question really is how far it is possible that the legislation proposed by this bill meets with the real and hearty support and concurrence of the people of this country. Something was said just now by the honourable baronet in reference to the petitions that have been presented to this House in favour of the measure. I can perfectly understand that an organisation such as we all well know exists throughout the country, whether by the name of the United Kingdom Alliance or by any other, having its branches scattered throughout all parts of the land, can get up petitions to any extent whatever, on almost any conceivable subject, and to tell me that petitions of that sort speak the opinions of the country on the case in question is to tell me that from which I humbly but most emphatically beg to differ. The real thing is to ascertain what is the true feeling of the people in the large towns and cities of the kingdom, and petitions like those which have been presented in favour of the bill can tell you nothing of the feeling of the country in general. Admit for a moment that petitions have been signed by 20,000 or 30,000 people, does any one believe for a moment that such signatures are the correct index of the views entertained by the 31,000,000 of my fellow-subjects? But ask the House to consider what it is desired should be done. To allow two-thirds of any town or parish in what is called public meeting assembled, but which may mean two-thirds of those who are gathered together in a small room, presided over by an officer who is himself a teetotaler, convened to decide whether the other third shall have a glass of ale or cider, is to my mind a most tyrannical and even preposterous proposition. Do those who bring forward or support such a motion never drink a glass of wine themselves? This is exceptional legislation, and of the worst sort. I ask for just legislation all round. If it were proposed to shut up the clubs in Pall Mall or the refreshment room in the House of Commons, the proposal would be scouted as ridiculous, and would not be listened to



for a moment. Why, then, do you apply a different principle to a working man from what you apply to members of Parliament? But I wish to point out to the House this anomaly. Any parish being able by a vote of two-thirds to introduce this bill, then in cases where the adjoining parishes do not, a line of demarcation would be created just as if that bench (pointing to the front opposition bench) should bound off a region where beer might be had from a region where it would be forbidden. What will be the result? The labourer on the confines of the parish where freedom still existed could get his glass of beer, but the labourer twenty miles off could not do so. (Hear, hear.) The act would lead to illicit evasion on all hands. The people of England are a very quiet, order-loving people, but I believe if the bill passed they, in common with some of the best-conducted members of the community, would refuse to submit to its tyrannical provisions, evading it here, and there resisting it. Certainly the question of compensation has been dealt with in a most extraordinary manner by this bill. All past rights, all vested interests were to be ignored. Would the hon. member for Cumberland think it right to have his own property dealt with in this fashion? Have the supporters of the bill never drank a glass of wine, or some brandy and water, or beer? I am indeed aware that there are some among them who say, "Give us not this bill, but give us the principle, and the Government will settle the details." Why? Because they want to get the thin edge of the wedge in and then get Parliament to drive it home. (Hear, hear.) Now I object to the thin edge of the wedge in most cases, but especially in such a case as this. Many of the promoters of this bill are free traders, but is it free trade to enable two-thirds of the people in a so-called public meeting to say to one-third of the inhabitants it may be of a large town, "you must not drink a glass of beer?" But I have noticed that there is a class of free traders who will allow of but one kind of free trade to exist, and that is, whatever they themselves approve of. If the operation of prohibition is so satisfactory as is represented, why do not those who admire it rush off to the estates in the north, where it is in force, until they become peopled like China or Japan? As the bill is drawn, according to clauses 8 and 9, the teetotalers are to have the power of asking the opinion of a parish or town once a year, while their opponents can only do so once every three years. Is that fair? Much has been done by the act of last year promoted by the hon. member for West Essex, and it ought to have a fair trial. It is idle to assert that no interference with the present system is intended, and I protest against an infinitesimal portion of the population setting aside these rights and ignoring compensation. I therefore ask the support of the House in the motion I have made.

Mr. O'REILLY DEASE: Sir, I will not occupy the time of the House at any great length. I must say that I do not believe you can make people virtuous by act of Parliament, and I think the advocates of coercive legislation use fallacious arguments. The licensed victuallers in Ireland are a body of men remarkable for liberality and toleration, and are full of enlightened ideas. They would gladly acquiesce in anything that would improve the people, for to whom could a "drunken customer"—(a laugh)—cause greater inconvenience? I beg to second the motion.

Mr. WHALLEY: Sir, the hon. member for Leeds, in moving the rejection of the bill, has argued the case as though for the first time some restriction was about to be imposed on the trade in liquor, whereas this trade has at all times been under legal restraint, and the only object of the present measure is to substitute for the existing licensing laws, which satisfy no one, a system which is in every respect more constitutional, more popular, and more efficient, namely, the authority of the ratepayers in parishes. It is by such persons that whatever may appear restrictive or harsh in the action of this permissive law will be voluntarily adopted, and I am at a loss to conceive how a trade that all agree must continue to be, as it ever has been, carried on under legal restrictions, can be entrusted to any tribunal that will have more regard to the just claims to consideration of all classes of the community. Again, the hon. member makes a great point of the coercion that may be exercised towards the one-third minority who may be overruled by the two-thirds to whom is given this power, and thinks fit to assume that they may be thereby debarred from the use of liquor; but the hon. gentleman has answered himself by his reference to the clubs of London. Assuming the most extreme case of privation of intoxicating liquor in any district, what is there to prevent the formation of working men's clubs where they can provide themselves on the co-operative principle with their own liquor, just as the London clubs do? And undoubtedly this system, in substitution of the old tavern habits of our ancestors, has had much to do with the improved habits of temperance amongst the class who use such clubs, it being obvious that one of the main causes of intemperance was formerly amongst all, and is still amongst the working classes, the obligation to drink for the sake of enjoying the pleasure of social intercourse. My hon. friend, in his admirable speech, may, perhaps, have conveyed into this question his own strong feelings as to the expediency of abstaining altogether from intoxicating liquor, and while urging the injustice, and, indeed, the cruelty, of forcing upon the people temptation to indulgence which is not less opposed to the spirit and intention of the law as it now stands than to morality and justice, may have left the impression that the operation of this bill would be to carry out a sort of compulsory abstinence at variance with the natural rights of every man to indulge within proper limits his own taste and inclination. Whatever may be the views of my hon. friend, or of the great association which he so ably represents, such is not the object—nor could it be effected by this bill, which is little more than to transfer to the ratepayers some of the power now exercised with so little satisfaction either to themselves or the public by the magistrates. Or if the bill does go too far in the direction of restriction, which I do not believe, this is but a question of detail, and nothing could be more easy than to amend it in committee. On this point I appeal to the experience of every magistrate who has had to deal with the recent act as to beerhouses. In many cases the magistrates, finding themselves unable to ascertain what were the wants of the districts as to beershops, adjourned their decision for the purpose of allowing the public to express their views either in meeting or by writing, and what in those cases was then done informally is the very thing that this bill provides an effective machinery for indicating. I ask whether there is any duty entrusted to magistrates in respect for



which they would more gladly be aided by the expression of public opinion than this of licensing liquor shops—or is there any duty in which they more require such assistance? At the present time they have no principle by which they can be guided in granting or withholding licences other than the public wants, and what can be more reasonable, or, in fact, necessary, than that the public should be enabled to express, in a formal and authentic manner, their own sentiments, the result of their own practical observation and experience? If by a large majority they say we do not want any liquor shops in this parish, why should they be forced upon them? and is it not contrary to the present law that it should be so? and do not the magistrates always do their best to discover, by indirect and haphazard means, just what this bill proposes to inform them upon by the most legitimate and conclusive of all methods, the votes of the ratepayers? And as to any injury inflicted on the minority, it will not be difficult to provide, either in the magistrates or otherwise, sufficient protection when such wrong and injury shall be found to arise. And then, again, as to what the hon. member for Leeds so much insists upon, the vested interests that may be injured by the operation of this bill, I am quite sure that my hon. friend will gladly accept any suggestions that can be offered for compensation or redress to any one who may be injured by the operation of this measure. The difficulty is that as a persons now hold licenses on the ground that it is for the benefit of the public that they should sell liquor, it is by this bill proposed to allow the public to say for themselves whether that is the fact or not. If it be so, no change occurs other than such as daily arises in the granting or withholding licences; but if it be not the fact, and the public themselves declare that they do not require such liquor shops, then, although there can no longer be any pretence for continuing such trade, it may perhaps be deemed somewhat hard upon those who, by reason of the bad laws now in operation, have been induced to invest their capital in such business, and in so far as they may be unable to derive equivalent profit from some mode of public entertainment other than the sale of liquor, it may be necessary to devise compensation, but in the meantime the very assertion of this claim assumes that they now carry on the liquor business under the false pretence of being required by the wants of the public, and is, in fact, a strong argument in favour of this measure. (Hear, hear.) Those who year by year, in increasing numbers and zeal, expend voluntarily thousands of pounds to reform the laws relating to the liquor traffic, are not likely to reject any reasonable plan that can be proposed for compensating those whose fair and just claims may stand in the way of their object. I am convinced that nothing is required but a candid consideration of the objects and operation of this bill to ensure its general acceptance by this House and the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. KENNAWAY: I think it is generally admitted that, owing to the exertions of the honourable baronet and the friends of temperance, this question stands upon an entirely different footing from that which it has occupied before. It is no answer whatever to the bill to say that you cannot make men temperate by Act of Parliament, for though you cannot make people sober by such means it is now thoroughly understood, I think, that Parliament can do, and if it can it ought to do, much to remove temptations out of the way of the people. Now, sir, we are asked to-day to give our assent to this measure, mainly on the ground, not that it is a perfect measure, but that it is the only practical measure which can be proposed to the country; and I think that is a sufficient ground for the agitation which has taken place in the country upon the subject, and for the vast number of petitions which have been presented in favour of this bill; but when we are called upon not to pass an abstract resolution in favour of temperance, but to look carefully at the principles and provisions of this bill, we must take care that we do not reason upon abstract principles, but ask ourselves this plain, straightforward and practical question: Is the bill a practical one, and if so, is it just? Now, sir, asking myself these questions, I am obliged most reluctantly to come to the conclusion that I cannot give my vote in favour of the bill. And I will give the reasons why I cannot do so. In the first place the power of absolute prohibition is given to the majority of the ratepayers, and remembering the fact which has been pointed out by the Home Secretary that a majority of the ratepayers may be a minority of the whole population, I think we ought to pause before we put into the hands of what may be the minority such a power as this. In point of fact I do not believe it would be submitted to, and it is more than probable that in the case of such a vote being come to the minority would not submit, and riots would ensue. Feelings of indignation would be raised and the last state of that district in which a thing of this kind was applied would be worse than the first. But it is said that this will not injure any class of persons in comparison with the good that it will do to the community, and it has been urged that private rights must give way to the convenience of the public. I do not think that we can argue from this analogy. It may be said that riots do not ensue upon private estates where prohibition is enforced, but we can no more reason from this analogy than we can argue from the action of a beneficent despotism, and predict a like result in the self-government of a free people. In the one case there would be no appeal against the edict, no hope of reversing it, and transgression would be summarily punished; in the other case there would be hope that renewed agitation and difficulty of conviction would restore the old state of things. And here I will say that I think we must consider a little more the licensed victuallers' interest. The honourable baronet professes himself willing to accede to any proposal of compensation which would obviate any injustice that might be done under this bill to the publican interest. But I think it is extremely dangerous to assent to the second reading of a bill in an uncertain hope that some change, and particularly one of this magnitude, may be made in committee. We have lately heard a good deal about damages for eviction, but if a bill like this passes is there not a claim for some sort of compensation for the closing of the houses of licensed victuallers? It is said that the only legal claim which the licensed victuallers have is that they shall continue for one year; but, sir, when a large amount of capital is invested under the sanction of the Legislature of a country, and moreover when the State derives a large amount of its income in consequence of that investment, is it not fair and right that a bill like this should not be allowed to come to a second reading that does not at least consider the question of compensa-



tion? Surely it is not a right thing to interfere with a large body like this without great consideration. Then, sir, I would also ask the House to bear with me for a few moments while I speak in reference to the statements which have been made regarding New England. The honourable baronet declared that the imposition of the prohibitory law on the sale of intoxicating liquors in that country had met with great success. Now, sir, I can only speak in reference to the State of Massachusetts; but the effect of the prohibitory law which was passed there ten years ago has been brought under my notice in two visits that I paid to America. The Prohibitory Liquor Traffic Act, passed about ten years ago, was allowed for a long time to remain totally in abeyance, and on the occasion of my first visit to America there was an absence of restriction of any sort upon the liquor traffic, and though the law existed it was entirely unenforced. But within two years "a change came o'er the spirit of the dream," and the majority of the Legislature elected on another platform determined to enforce the Liquor Traffic Act, and the result has been that although the liquor has not been sold openly in the streets, yet in the hotels its sale is not interfered with, and of the wholesale dealers liquor is always to be procured. Mr. G. A. Sala writes, "on one occasion when I asked for it the landlady said, 'Oh, we can give you nothing whatever to drink,' but the landlord said, 'You can get the stuff on the sly,' and so I found. When you enter you ask how the baby is, upon which you go into a cellar or back yard, and there you have an opportunity of drinking the health of the baby." Therefore it is plain that drinking goes on, and if not openly, yet there is plenty to be procured. I have lately been in communication with Gideon Haynes, the governor of the state prison in Boston, Massachusetts, a practical philanthropist, and he told me that his gaol had been fuller than before since the attempted enforcement of the law. Moreover, in offences against the Act, juries would not convict any man of good character, and there were in consequence 2,000 or 3,000 cases in abeyance. Surely, sir, it would be a most impolitic thing that any measure of this kind should be retained on the statute book when it is openly evaded. It is most unfavourable to the morals of the people that laws should be made which can be broken with impunity. It is quite evident, therefore, that in New England the prohibition does not give the effect which is desired, but that people can still obtain any drink they require. When Mr. G. Haynes left Massachusetts six months ago, a bill was being passed through the Legislature, and had received the sanction of the Lower House, which allowed the open sale of beer, ale, cider, and light wines, as it was felt to be impossible to maintain absolute prohibition. Sir, America has undoubtedly preceded us in the struggle against intemperance and ignorance, but in my opinion we are bound to improve upon her experience, and not blindly to follow her example. This is what, I trust, we are doing in the matter of education, and what, I trust, we shall do when we come to deal with this matter. But, sir, if we cannot support this bill, we are not allowed to stand by and do nothing. I say that it is our duty to make more and more strenuous efforts to grapple with what I do not hesitate to say is the most gigantic evil of the present age. The honourable baronet says that the licensing system has failed everywhere; and what we, on the other hand, allege is that it has never been fairly tried. Let us see it tried upon the principle of the Home Secretary, namely, that the manner in which those houses are conducted should be inquired into and restricted by the law. There would then be far more security for the well-conducted houses. I think, also, that there should be some power conferred upon the magistrates, or other local authorities, for the purpose of restricting the number of public-houses in any locality. (Cheers.) We must legislate on the principles of the bill which was introduced and passed last year by the honourable member for West Essex, the credit of passing which was claimed by the publicans as well as the promoters; and then, instead of arraying so formidable an interest against us, we may hope to see the holders of all well-conducted houses on the side of temperance. (Hear, hear.) I think I can better serve the cause of temperance by giving a strenuous support in Parliament and out of Parliament to any Government and any party that will boldly deal with the restriction of the traffic, so as to make it a blessing and not a curse, than by recording my vote in favour of the second reading of this bill.

Mr. BRUCE: I have listened with pleasure to the speech of the hon. member who has just spoken, which to some extent embodies my views, and I also listened with pleasure to the speech of the hon. baronet who moved the second reading, and the mildness of which contrasted strongly with the tone of the speeches outside the House in support of the bill. I do not think that the cause which the hon. gentleman has taken up will suffer in his hands. I am bound to say that in one part of my hon. friend's speech I agree entirely. I believe that the interest in this subject throughout the country, and especially among the working classes, is very deep and widespread. Of that I have no doubt. At the same time, while that should be a reason, and a very strong reason, for giving the most careful consideration to this subject or any other that has for its object the regulation of the supply of articles of general consumption, that does not preclude us from considering whether the mode suggested is the wisest and the best that could be devised. My hon. friend has dealt very fairly, and I may say very kindly, with me and the Government in reference to our conduct in not introducing a licensing bill this session. At the same time, he has called on the House not to listen to any promises from the Government—promises, he says, which have often been made and broken. My hon. friend admits that if the Irish Land Bill and the Education Bill were of more importance than the Licensing Bill, we were justified in taking the course we did; but I understood him to argue that a measure dealing with intoxicating drinks was more important than an Education Bill.

Sir W. LAWSON: I did not mean to argue that the Education Bill would have no effect at all upon temperance.

Mr. BRUCE: I am glad the honourable gentleman says that. But the honourable member, alluding to the education of the upper classes, said that knowing how to read and write did not prevent them in a past age from indulging in intoxicating liquors, and that when they did so indulge they could read and write as they can read and write now, from which I gather that my honourable friend is of opinion that the aim of education is reading and writing, and, if that be so, I grant that



education would have little effect with regard to drunkenness or any other crime. But those are not the principles on which I am a supporter of education, nor do I think that that is the reason why the House has devoted so much time and labour to that measure; but it is because they believe that education will not only expand the intellectual powers of the people, but also strengthen their moral powers and encourage in them habits of prudence and foresight, besides creating for them resources, the want of which, perhaps, more than anything else leads them into habits of drunkenness. One ground on which I should oppose the second reading of this bill is that I consider it a very imperfect measure. My hon. friend the member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) has said that he would support this bill because he considered it would supersede a very objectionable system of granting licences by justices of the peace. But I confess I do not see how the bill affects that question at all, because if this bill is in force there will be no licences to grant. But there are many places where it will not be in force, and there all the existing evils will continue. The measure is therefore in all respects an imperfect one. That, I grant, would be no reason for not supporting it if the country loudly demanded the passing of such a measure, but the country is not prepared for such a measure, and does not demand it. The Government has pledged itself to deal with the subject, and I am ready to undertake to bring in a measure dealing with the whole of this subject at the very earliest period next year. Perhaps Government were rash in introducing this session two measures of such magnitude as the Irish Land Bill and the Education Bill, for, to use a railway figure, ordinary trains have been shunted for those two expresses; they have been shunted into sidings, and many important measures remain to be dealt with next session. With regard to the principle of this bill I am bound to say it is one which deserves the utmost consideration. Up to this time we have had in operation two systems side by side; I mean since 1829. We have had first of all a system of arbitrary selection which relates to public-houses, and a system of free trade which relates to beerhouses. We have had the two together, the system of arbitrary selection by the magistrates has been neutralised by the free trade system, while on the other hand the free trade system has never had a fair trial. We have now got rid of the free trade system, and we have the system of what I may call authoritative selection. We have in that respect a considerable insurance against the wanton increase of these houses for the sale of liquors. I do not say that the security is a sufficient one. I think it might be possible to take other courses for the restriction of the number of public-houses, but I think, at any rate for the present, and while the public feeling is so strong against the great increase of public-houses, we are secure against any considerable increase of these houses. But when we come to deal with the existing public-houses, no doubt the number is in many cases inordinately great, and that is a matter requiring great consideration in any measure proposing to deal with this subject. We know as a matter of fact that beerhouses have been multiplied in great numbers, and we know how beneficial the act of last session has been, but its operation was necessarily restricted, inasmuch as the power of the magistrates to deprive public-houses or beerhouses of their licence had no reference to the number of such houses, but was limited to where there had been misconduct on the part of the keepers of such houses, and to cases where the houses had not been rated to the amount required by the Act of Parliament. I think, therefore, that some measure of restriction for the future must be devised, and it would be of very great advantage if in so restricting them we could give effect to the popular will expressed in a guarded and legitimate manner, and if without injury to existing interests we could secure the gradual reduction in the number of existing public-houses and beerhouses in places where, by common consent, they are too numerous. Although I quite admit that portion of the argument of my hon. friend that a licence is only granted for a year, still I think it would be in the highest degree unjust if you were by one act, by the act of my hon. friend or any other, to suppress public-houses and beerhouses without compensation. It is not the question that the licences are granted for a year only. As a matter of fact, we know that the vast majority of licences are not held by the original licensees, but they have been transferred, and frequently in consideration of large sums of money—in some cases as much as £1,000—and in many cases sums of money have been spent on them which could only be recouped by the prosecution of a successful trade for many years. While on the one hand I agree that the only method of preventing the increase of those houses would be to prevent the sale of them; on the other hand, I say it would be unjust to bring forward any measure which would destroy the property of persons who have been allowed, and, in fact, encouraged by Parliament to embark their capital in property of this kind. Now the bill of my hon. friend makes no provision for this compensation, and it is not sufficient to take the assurance of my hon. friend that this matter shall be considered. The bill ought to state the means by which the compensation shall be provided. These are the reasons why I cannot support the bill of my hon. friend. I think it a very imperfect measure. I believe that were it brought into operation it would be unjust. I believe that a measure giving greater security against the adulteration of liquors, which operates not only in a dishonest sense, but also operates most prejudicially to health—in fact, adulterated liquors are much more intoxicating than those which are unadulterated—a measure introducing better regulations for the management of public-houses, and the limitation of the hours of sale—a well considered measure of that kind would be much more efficient for the purpose than the incomplete, one-sided, and I must add unjust measure of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. M. A. BASS: I think I am justified in saying that we all desire to prevent an increase of intemperance and of excess. The course taken by the hon. member for Carlisle and those who agree with him is very intelligible, but I think it unworkable and unfair. He and those who agree with him are in favour of total prohibition of the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors, and not seeing an immediate prospect of attaining their desire, they introduce this bill, which is a covert attempt to get in the thin end of the wedge, in the hope that, as was recently said by an enthusiastic supporter of this measure, the time will come when, on returning from a dinner party, some one might say of his host, "That vulgar fellow had wine on the dinner-table." (Laughter.) I cannot



understand how those whose object is to place a restriction on excess and intemperance can advocate this bill. Surely what is right for one district must be right for another, and if it is right to sanction the use of intoxicating liquors in London it cannot be right to prohibit them in Birmingham. I do not think it is right to place in the hands of two-thirds or three-fourths or any other proportion of the ratepayers, or of any local body, the right to interfere with the comforts and enjoyments of the great mass of the people. And I would ask if this measure were carried, permitting as it does local legislation to override imperial legislation, whether it can be reconciled with the spirit of our present and contemplated commercial treaties with France and other wine-producing countries. This bill I look upon as only a feint, designed as far as possible to impress its principle upon the licensing act of next session. Suppose the bill were passed, does the right hon. gentleman suppose he could make people teetotalers by act of Parliament? It would encourage secret drinking. I remember a story of a gentleman who dined at a teetotaler's. He had nothing but water, at the dinner, but being equal to the occasion, he had taken a bottle of claret with him, which he drank in his bedroom, and so I believe the law would be systematically evaded. You might convert the people from a beer-drinking to a spirit-drinking people, but I very much doubt whether you would decrease intemperance. We are told that drunkenness is on the increase. I believe the contrary is the fact, as is clearly proved by statistics. In 1750 the consumption of beer in the United Kingdom was 72 gallons per head. In 1869 it was only 36 gallons; indeed I have gone through the figures very carefully and I only make it 34 gallons a head. I hope that legislation on this great and vexed subject, if we are to have legislation, will be imperial, compulsory, and for the whole country, not local, permissive, and parochial, as this bill is. I hope that next session the Government will introduce a comprehensive scheme, dealing with the whole question in such a way as to conciliate all moderate men, and to do away with that state of suspense in which the trade is kept. But I hope that no concession will be made to the permissive principle by giving a veto to local bodies, at any rate as far as regards existing interests, or that a reasonable amount of accommodation will be insisted upon. I hope also that a licensing tribunal may be established, which shall decide all cases on their own merits, unswayed by local prejudice or local politics. I hope that clear and well defined rules will be laid down for the guidance of this tribunal, rules fixing, it may be, the proportion of licensed public-houses to the population, regulating their management and their hours of closing, and giving ample powers of punishment for the wilful infringement of those rules. On the subject of compensation, what does this bill propose to do? I think many hon. gentlemen hardly understand what is the real scope of this bill. It proposes to give the power to a number of ratepayers annually to make an attack not only on the business of public-house and beer-shop-keepers, but on the business of every wholesale and retail dealer in intoxicating liquors, and by a majority of two-thirds, not of the whole body of ratepayers, but merely of those who vote to close all these houses, utterly to ruin their occupiers and absolutely and entirely to prohibit the sale of any sort or description of intoxicating liquors in that district, whether over the counter or in bulk. By which I mean not only will public-houses be closed, but no one will be able to deliver a cask of beer or a dozen of wine at any house in that district. I ask what have these people done that they should be treated in such a cruel and exceptional manner? They conduct their business as honestly as the majority of tradesmen. The licences contribute a large revenue to the State, and I ask what fairness or even common honesty could there be in refusing them ample compensation? My hon. friend who proposes this bill is, I am sure, most straightforward and honourable, and in his private capacity would shrink from inflicting such an injustice. The hon. gentleman the member for Denbighshire said last year *salus populi suprema lex*, by which I suppose he meant that it is fair to inflict any injustice on the minority so long as the majority are benefited. But I will give him another maxim equally sound—*fiat justitia ruat cælum*, which I may translate by the words, do justice whatever it costs; and I think that those who choose to indulge in the ruin of their neighbours are the proper persons to pay for that luxury. (Hear, hear.) The real truth is, that the question is too large and important a one for my hon. friend to grapple fairly with. If it were a question of a few millions of compensation, or a few hundred thousands of revenue, I have no doubt my hon. friend would bring in a bill providing a fair and honourable compensation. But this is a question of a trade with a capital of more than 100 millions sterling, and bringing in a revenue to the Government of more than 23 millions. I hope that next year the Government will bring in a comprehensive measure.

Sir W. LAWSON: I do not want to detain the House for more than a moment or two in reply. The Secretary for the Home Department said the people would abstain from drinking if they had more resources. I agree with him, but my point is that there are hundreds of thousands of persons in this country who, without any such resources, are exposed to the temptations set before them by the Government. It is to enable the people, if they wish it, to remove these temptations that I bring forward this bill. I know that it is an imperfect measure, but an imperfect measure is better than no measure at all. Surely, if it removes any portion of the evil which exists, it will so far do good. And, besides, as I said in my opening speech, it does not interfere one jot or one tittle with what the right hon. gentleman proposes to do next year. What is wanted is that the people should have a veto, and that they should not allow the magistrates to have this power over them, and if the people are not fit for such an extension of power as that, I for my part do not know what they are fit for. I for one can trust them, and I trust that this House can trust them.

The House then divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	90
Against it	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	121

Majority against the bill	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	31
---------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The announcement of the numbers was received with loud cheers by the supporters of the bill.



THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE  
AND THE  
**PERMISSIVE BILL DIVISION.**  
MANIFESTO OF THE EXECUTIVE, JULY, 1870.

For a third time the principle of the "Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill" has been submitted to the House of Commons, and with a result which equals, if it does not outstrip, our most sanguine expectation. The majority against the measure, which was 257 in 1864, and 106 in 1869, has been reduced to 31 in 1870. Discussion by the press, the platform, and the pulpit has been doing its expected work. Impressions, slow in appearing—too slow for the timidity of some and the impatience of others—have begun to reveal themselves in the most unquestionable of all forms, the division lists of the House of Commons. The debates in 1869 have been succeeded by those of 1870, and the expediency of so soon appealing to Parliament afresh has been vindicated by the only unerring criterion; for despite the entreaties of the Home Secretary, and the desire of many hon. members, to use the promises of the Government as the occasion for opposing the measure of any private member, the votes in favour of the Permissive Bill have steadily increased, and the votes against it have nearly fallen to a third of the number of 1864.

The cause of this difference is our strongest ground of encouragement. Members of the House of Commons know that the country is becoming more deeply convinced that the right of the community to protect itself against the evils of the liquor traffic, is a right that must become a reality, and further, that the simplest and surest means of making it such is to give to the people themselves the power of preventing the traffic in their midst. Men of penetration are perceiving that if (as many assume) the sale of intoxicating liquors can without injury be practised, the passing of a permissive prohibitory bill would be the most potent instrument of hastening this reform; while, on the other hand, if, as all experience attests, the drink traffic is beyond all efficient regulation, and cannot be made consistent with the social rights and liberties of the nation, the legal power of bringing it to an end is a concession demanded by every consideration of civil equity and constitutional justice.

That Parliament should deliberately propose to inflict needless taxation, disease, mortality, insanity, crime, and destitution upon any portion of the empire is not to be imagined; but the obtusest intellect is beginning to perceive that to forbid the inhabitants of the various parishes or districts of our country to take measures for the reduction of these evils, is virtually compelling them to suffer terrible calamities without hope or prospect of relief. Nor can it be pleaded that the experiment would certainly fail; for it is shown by copious and incontestible evidence that wherever prohibition has been adopted, relief has followed, alcoholic intemperance has ceased to be a social vice, and all its afflicting and oppressive effects have at once diminished and begun to disappear. Seeing, then, that the agitation of the Alliance has ever been one of moral influence and suasion, against a system of legalised temptation, we hail the prevalence of just conceptions of duty, the formation of a sound public opinion upon this question, and the recent evidence of Parliamentary favour, as constituting in the aggregate, a visible embodiment of success, and the index of an approaching consummation, most earnestly to be desired. Let it not be forgotten that all this has been gained by an inflexible adhesion to the simple principle—the right of the people to prohibit the traffic; and that only by the same persistency of purpose can present gains be multiplied and the Permissive Bill become one of the statutes of the land.

Let congratulation therefore lead to renewed and more vigorous exertion. Especially let the soul of enthusiasm animate a system of local agitation and electoral organisation, so that every member of Parliament, on this question of overwhelming moment, may be brought into closer contact with the increasing sympathy of his constituents. Thus will further delays be abridged, and delay to any extent will be but a preparation for the more ready exercise of the power of protection which the Permissive Bill, when enacted, will confer.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON has again given notice of the re-introduction of his measure early in the session of 1871; and if the Government Licensing Bill be then laid before Parliament, the faithful labours of our friends in the intervening months will supply the moral force to prevent the enactment of any licence law unless it gives to the people of localities full power to effect what has been the unvarying object of the Alliance—the suppression of the liquor traffic by legislative enactment. To that great end, as regards the United Kingdom, the Permissive Bill is the most practicable means hitherto devised; and, therefore, to secure that means, every available contribution of persistent effort and pecuniary aid should be cheerfully and promptly rendered.

July 26th, 1870.

THE EXECUTIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE.

**RESOLUTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE.**

*At the Meeting of the Executive of the United Kingdom Alliance, on Wednesday, July 20th, 1870, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—*

"That the Executive Council of the United Kingdom Alliance feel greatly encouraged by the decided progress of the movement, as shown by the result of the recent division in the House of Commons, on the motion for the second reading of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill."

"That the best thanks of the Executive Council are hereby respectfully tendered to Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P., Lord Claud Hamilton, M.P., Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P., Sir John Hanmer, Bart., M.P., Mr. John Miller, M.P., Mr. M. R. Dalway, M.P., and Mr. Macarthy Downing, M.P., for bringing forward and supporting the claims of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill; and also to the other members of the House of Commons who voted or paired in favour of the measure, and who have thus asserted the right of the people of Great Britain and Ireland to have the power to protect themselves from the ravages of the liquor traffic, whenever and wherever public opinion in any district may so determine."

"That the Executive Council present their congratulations and thanks to the various organisations, and to the many active friends of the cause throughout the kingdom, who have zealously aided them by public meetings, deputations, petitions, and otherwise promoting the agitation in support of the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, and through whose earnest exertions, gratuitously rendered, such an impression was produced upon the House of Commons, as to induce no less than one hundred and fifteen members to vote or pair in favour of the Bill."

"That the Home Secretary, having again distinctly pledged himself and the Government to bring in, early in the next session of Parliament, a comprehensive measure, dealing effectively with the whole licensing system, the Executive Council of the United Kingdom Alliance call earnestly upon the friends and supporters of the movement, in and out of Parliament, to urge upon Her Majesty's Government to redeem its pledges to the fullest possible extent, and to insert clauses in the projected licensing scheme giving to the ratepayers of each locality the power to prevent the liquor traffic, with all its evil consequences, being forced into their midst against the will of the community."

Manchester: United Kingdom Alliance.



# ANALYSIS OF THE VOTES FOR THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JULY 13TH, 1870.

An analysis of the division list and the pairs will show that 37 new names appear for the Bill, and that 78 of the 94 who voted and paired last year for the Bill, have again recorded themselves on the same side. Not one has gone over to the enemy. Of the sixteen members absent, several have retired or are deceased, some are away for the session, others were ill, and some who wished to pair could not find members willing to pair against the Bill.

The votes and pairs for the Bill this year amount to 115; and the votes and pairs against the Bill are 146, giving a majority of 31 against the measure.

Our gain therefore during the year's campaign is 21. The enemy's losses are 54, making virtually a total gain of 75 by reducing the hostile majority. Taking altogether the votes and pairs from Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, there were 53 for and only 30 against the Bill, giving a majority of 23 in favour of the measure. The Irish vote (with pairs) was 26 for and 13 against, exactly two to one in favour of the Bill. The Scotch vote was 16 for and 12 against; whilst the Welsh vote was 11 for and 5 only against, being more than two to one in favour of the Bill.

ONE constituency gave three votes for the Bill (A). TWELVE constituencies gave their full votes of two each for the Bill (B). FORTY constituencies gave their full vote of one each for the Bill (C). THIRTY-SEVEN constituencies voted one each for the Bill and none against it, their other votes being not given (D). TEN constituencies voted part for and part against the Bill, giving 11 votes on each side, the Leeds vote being two for and one against, whilst the Glasgow vote was one for and two against (E).

It will thus be seen that 53 constituencies gave full and clear votes for the Bill, whilst 37 gave clear though not full votes for the Bill; so that 90 constituencies are clearly ranged on the side of the Bill. This is an increase of 23 constituencies on the side of the Bill since 1869.

The 115 votes for the Bill represent constituencies embracing a population of upwards of NINE MILLIONS. The aggregate ELECTORAL VOTE represented by the 115 Members in favour of the Bill, is FIVE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THREE, a number only 2,209 short of the aggregate votes represented by the 146 Members opposed to the Bill!

In 1864 the votes and pairs for the Bill were 40; in 1869 the votes and pairs for the Bill were 94; and now in 1870 they are 115. From 1864 to 1869 the increase of votes and pairs in favour of the Bill was at the rate of 11 per annum, whilst the increase during the past year has been 21.

The votes and pairs against the Bill were 297 in 1864; reduced to 200 in 1869, and now cut down to 146. The rate of decrease in the hostile vote from 1864 to 1869 was 20 per annum, whilst during the past year the enemy's forces have been cut down to the extent of 54 votes and pairs.

The combined and full effect of these gains on the side of the Bill, and of the losses by the enemy, will be seen by a glance at the diminishing majorities against the measure. In 1864 the majority against the Bill was 257; this was reduced to 106 in 1869; and has now been diminished to 31. Thus the process of reducing the majority against the Bill went on between 1864 and 1869 at the rate of 30 votes per annum; but during the past year the reduction has been 75.

From every point of view, therefore, it will be seen that the forces for the Bill are rapidly increasing, while the forces arrayed against it in Parliament are being diminished even more rapidly. These facts and figures incontestably prove the advancing power of the agitation, and predict its certain and near triumph.

## (A) MANCHESTER (gave its three votes for the Bill.)

### (Full Votes of Two each for the Bill.)

(B)	Antrim, County	Devonport	Lincolnshire, N.	Sheffield
	Belfast	Edinburgh	Maestfield	Stoke
	Colchester	Grantham	Penryn and Falmouth	Sunderland

### (Full Votes of one each for the Bill.)

(C)	Aberdeenshire, East	Carrickfergus	Flint, etc.	Montgomery, District
	Aberdeenshire, West	Cockermouth	Greenock	Pembroke, District
	Anglesea	Darlington	Grimsby	Perth
	Ayrshire, North	Downpatrick	Guildford	Rochdale
	Ayrshire, South	Drogheda	Hawick	Stirling
	Berwickshire	Dundalk	Helston	St. Ives
	Burnley	Dungannon	Kendal	Tavistock
	Caithness	Edinburghshire	Kircudbrightshire	Warrington
	Cardiff	Ennis	Leith	Wednesbury
	Cardiganshire	Enniskillen	Merionethshire	Youghal

### (Voted one each for the Bill and none against.)

(D)	Arimagh, County	Donegal, County	Limerick	Stockport
	Bath	Dublin, County	Lincoln	Stroud
	Bradford	Essex, South	Londonderry, County	Tyrone, County
	Bristol	Finsbury	Longford, County	Wenlock
	Cavan, County	Galway	Merthyr	Westmeath, County
	Cheshire, West	Glamorganshire	Newcastle-on-Tyne	Yorkshire, North
	Cricklade	Hackney	Newcastle-under-Lyne	Yorkshire, W.S.D.
	Cork, County	Hereford	Northampton	
	Denbighshire	Lambeth	Peterborough	
	Derbyshire, North	Limerick, County	Salisbury	

### (Part for and Part Against.)

(E)	Carlisle	Cornwall, East	Marylebone	Tamworth
	Carmarthenshire	Glasgow	Mayo, County	
	Chelsea	Leeds	Queen's, County.	



# THE DIVISION LIST, HOUSE OF COMMONS, JULY 13, 1870.

**PERMISSIVE PROHIBITORY LIQUOR BILL.**—Order for second reading read, motion made, and question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time." Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the question to add the words "upon this day three months." (Mr. Wheelhouse.) Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question." The House divided: Ayes, 90; noes, 121.

## AYES.

Allen, W. S., Newcastle-under-Lyne  
Baines, Edward, Leeds  
Bazley, Sir Thomas, Manchester  
Birley, Hugh, Manchester  
Blennerhassett, Sir R., Galway  
Brewer, Dr., Colchester  
Bright, Jacob, Manchester  
Brookhurst, William C., Macclesfield  
Broden, Alexander, Wednesbury  
Brown, Alexander H., Wenlock  
Browne, George Eakins, Mayo co.  
Callan, Philip, Dundalk  
Campbell, Henry, Stirling  
Candlish, John, Sunderland  
Carter, Alderman, Leeds  
Cavendish, Lord G., Derbyshire N.  
Chawick, David, Macclesfield  
Chambers, Montague, Devonport  
Cholmeley, Capt., Grantham  
Cholmeley, Sir M., Lincolnshire N.  
Cowan, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
Crichton, Viscount, Eniskillen  
Davies, Richard, Anglesey  
Dawson, Robert Peel, Londonderry co.  
Dease, Edmund, Queen's co.  
Dickinson, Sebastian S., Stroud  
Dilke, Sir Charles, Chelsea  
Downing, M'Carthy, Cork co.  
Duncombe, Hon. Col., York N. R.  
Eastwick, E. B., Penryn and Falmouth  
Finnie, William, Ayrshire N.

Fletcher, Isaac, Cockermouth  
Fordyce, Wm. D., Aberdeenshire East  
Gavin, Major, Limerick  
Gilpin, Charles, Northampton  
Graham, William, Glasgow  
Grieve, James Johnstone, Greenock  
Hamilton, Marquis of, Donegal co.  
Holland, Samuel, Merionethshire  
Keown, William, Downpatrick  
Knox, Hon. Col. Stuart, Dungannon  
Lewis, John D., Devonport  
Lush, Dr., Salisbury  
M'Arthur, William, Lambeth  
M'Clure, Thomas, Belfast  
M'Combie, Wm., Aberdeenshire W.  
Macfie, Robert Andrew, Leith  
M'Laren, Duncan, Edinburgh  
Magniac, Charles, St. Ives  
Maxwell, Wellwood Herries, Kirkcudbrightshire  
Melly, George, Stoke  
Meyrick, Thomas, Pembroke  
Miall, Edward, Bradford  
Miller, John, Edinburgh  
Morgan, George Osborne, Denbighshire  
Morley, Samuel, Bristol  
Munella, Anthony John, Sheffield  
Neill, Hon. Edward, Antrim co.  
Palmer, John Hinde, Lincoln  
Pollard-Urquhart, William, Westmeath  
Potter T. Bayley, Rochdale

Reed, Charles, Hackney  
Rebow, John Gordon, Colchester  
Richard, Henry, Merthyr Tydvil  
Richards, Evan M., Cardigan co.  
Robertson, David, Berwickshire  
Roden, William S., Stoke  
Rylands, Peter, Warrington  
Sartoris, Edw. John, Carmarthenshire  
Seymour, Hugh de Grey, Antrim co.  
Shaw, Richard, Burnley  
Sinclair, Sir J. G., Tolemache, Caithness  
Smith, John Benjamin, Stockport  
Stackpole, William, Ennis  
Stuart, Colonel, Cardiff  
Synan, Edmund John, Limerick co.  
Taylor, Right Hon. Col., Dublin co.  
Tolemache, John, Cheshire W.  
Tolemache, Hon. Fred. J., Grantham  
Tracy, Hon. C. R. D., Hanbury, Montgomery District  
Trevelyan, G. Otto, Hawick  
Verner, William, Armagh co.  
Vivian, H. Hussey, Glamorganshire  
Wedderburn, Sir David, Ayrshire co.  
Whalley, G. Hammond, Peterborough  
Whitwell, John, Kendal  
Whitworth, Thomas, Drogheda  
Willyams, E. W. Brydges, Cornwall E.  
Winn, Rowland, Lincolnshire N.  
Young, Adolphus William, Helston

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir WILFRID LAWSON, Carlisle, and Lord CLAUD HAMILTON, Tyrone.

## PAIRED FOR.

Annesley, Lieut.-col. Hon. H., Cavan co.  
Backhouse, Edmund, Darlington  
Baumont, H. F., York West S.D.  
Bulwer, Right Hon. Sir H. L., Tamworth  
Cadogan, Hon. F. W., Crickade  
Chambers, Thomas, Marylebone  
Dalway, M. R., Carrickfergus  
Fowler, R. N., Penryn, &c.

Gourley, Edward T., Sunderland  
Guest, M. J., Youghal  
Hadfield, George, Sheffield  
Hammer, Sir John, Bart., Flint, &c.  
Hoskyns, C. Wren, Hereford  
Maitland, Sir A., Edinburghshire  
Lusk, Andrew, Finsbury  
Johnson, Andrew, South Essex

Johnston, William, Belfast  
Kinnaid, Arthur, Perth  
O'Reilly, Major, Longford  
Onslow, G. J. H., Guildford  
Russell, Arthur J. E., Tavistock  
Tite, Sir William, Bath  
Tomlin, George, Grimsby

## NOES.

Adair, Hugh Edward, Ipswich  
Amphlett, R. P., Worcester East  
Anderson, George, Glasgow  
Arkwright, Richard, Leominster  
Bass, Arthur, Staffordshire East  
Bass, Michael Thomas, Derby  
Biddulph, Michael, Herefordshire  
Bingham, Lord, Mayo co.  
Bouverie, Right Hon. Edward Playdell, Kilmarnock  
Brady, John, Leitrim county  
Brassey, Thomas, Hastings  
Bright, Richard, Somersetshire East  
Brinkman, Captain, Canterbury  
Bristol, Samuel B., Newark  
Broadley, Wm. H. Harrison, York E. R.  
Brooks, William Cunliffe, Cheshire E.  
Bruce, Right Hon. H. Austin, Renf.  
Bryan, George L., Kilkenny co.  
Cameron, Donald, Invernesshire  
Cave, Right Hon. S., New Shoreham  
Cavendish, Lord F. C., York W. R. N.D.  
Cawley, Charles E., Salford  
Child, Sir Smith, Staffordshire W.  
Clive, Col. Hon. G. Windsor, Ludlow  
Cole, Col. Hon. H. A., Fermanagh co.  
Colthurst, Sir G. Conway, Kinsale  
Corbett, Colonel, Salop N.  
Craufurd, Edward Henry J., Ayr  
Croft, Sir R. G. D., Herefordshire  
Dalziel, Robert, Glasgow  
D'Arymple, Charles, Rutshire  
D'Arcy, Matthew P., Wexford co.  
Denison, C. B., York W. R. E.D.  
Denman, Hon. George, Tiverton  
Digby, K. Thomas, Queen's co.  
Du Pre, C. George, Bucks  
Dyott, Colonel Richard, Lichfield  
Egerton, Hon. A. F., Lancashire S.  
Egerton, Captain Hon. F., Derby E.  
Elliott, George, Durham N.

Enfield, Viscount, Middlesex  
Ems, John James, Athlone  
Esmonde, Sir John, Waterford co.  
Fielden, Joshua, York W. R. E. D.  
Fellows, Edward, Hunts  
Figgins, James, Shrewsbury  
Floyer, John, Dorsetshire  
Foster, William Henry, Bridgnorth  
Garlies, Lord, Wigtonshire  
Glyn, Hon. George G., Shaftesbury  
Gower, Hon. E. F. L., Bodmin  
Graves, Samuel Robert, Liverpool  
Greaves, Edward, Warwick  
Greene, Edward, Bury St. Edmunds  
Grey, Right Hon. Sir George, Morpeth  
Grosvenor, Captain R. W., Westminster  
Hardcastle, J. A., Bury St. Edmunds  
Hay, Sir John C. D., Stamford  
Henley, Right Hon. J. W., Oxfordshire  
Hervey, Lord A. H. C., Suffolk W.  
Heygate, Wm. Unwin, Leicester S.  
Hick, John, Bolton  
Hildyard, T. B. Thornton, Notts  
Hoare, Sir H. Ainslie, Chelsea  
Hodgkinson, Grosvenor, Newark  
Hornby, Edward K., Blackburn  
Howard, Hon. C. W. G., Cumberland  
Hutt, Rt. Hon. Sir William, Gateshead  
Hutton, John, Northallerton  
Jones, John, Carmarthenshire  
Kekewich, Samuel T., Devon S.  
Kingscote, Col., Gloucester W.  
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E., Sandbach  
Lacoe, Sir E. H. K., Norfolk N.  
Laird, John, Birkenhead  
Lambert, N. Grace, Bucks  
Lawrence, William, London  
Lewis, J. Harvey, Marylebone  
Liddel, Hon. H. G., Northumberland S.  
Lloyd, Sir Thomas D., Cardigan  
Locke, John, Southwark

Lowther, Colonel, Cumberland West  
Lowther, James, York  
Lytleton, Hon. C. G., Worcester E.  
Mackintosh, E. William, Inverness  
Mellor, Thomas W., Ashton  
Mitchell, Thomas A., Bridport  
Montgomery, Sir G. G., Peeblesshire  
Morgan, C. Octavius, Monmouth  
Murphy, Nicholas Daniel, Cork  
Newdegate, Charles N., Warwick  
Noel, Hon. Gerald James, Rutland  
North, Colonel, Oxfordshire  
Ogilvy, Sir John, Dundee  
O'Loughlin, Rt. Hon. Sir C. M., Clare co.  
Patten, Rt. Hon. Col. Wilson, Lanc. N.  
Pell, Albert, Leicestershire S.  
Phipps, Charles Paul, Westbury  
Potter, Edmund, Carlisle  
Power, John T., Wexford co.  
Raikes, Henry Cecil, Chester  
Sackville, S. G. S., Northampton N.  
Salt, Thomas, Stafford  
Samuelson, Bernhard, Banbury  
Sandon, Viscount, Liverpool  
Sclater-Booth, George, Hants N.  
Scourfield, John Henry, Pembrokeshire  
Smith, Samuel George, Aylesbury  
Stanley, Hon. Fred., Lancashire N.  
Stapleton, John, Berwick-on-Tweed  
Stepney, Colonel, Carmarthen  
Stone, William Henry, Northmouth  
Taylor, Peter Alfred, Leicester  
Thynne, Lord Henry F., Wilts S.  
Trelawney, Sir John S., Cornwall E.  
Turner, Charles, Lancashire S. W.  
Walker, Major G. G., Dumfriesshire  
Weguelin, Thomas M., Wolverhampton  
Wilmot, Henry, Derbyshire S.  
Winfield, Sir Charles, Gravesend  
Wise, Henry Christopher, Warwick S.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. WHEELHOUSE, Leeds, and Mr. O'REILLY DEASE, Louth co.

## PAIRED AGAINST.

Barrington, Viscount, Eye  
Barttelot, Colonel W. B., Sussex West  
Beninck, G. A. F. C., Whitehaven  
Bury, Rt. Hon. Viscount, Berwick-on-Tweed  
Bonham-Carter, John, Winchester  
Brand, Henry R., Hertfordshire  
Cartwright, W. C., Oxfordshire  
Dimsdale, Robert, Hertford

Egerton, Hon. W., Cheshire Mid.  
Elphinstone, Sir James, Portsmouth  
Grosvenor, Lord Richard, Flintshire  
Gurney, Right Hon. R., Southampton  
Lindsay, Col. C. H., Abingdon  
M'Lean, J. Robinson, Staffordshire E.  
Miles, Hon. G. W., Kent E.  
Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R., Oxford University

Peel, Sir R., Tamworth  
Samuda, Joseph D., Tower Hamlets  
Sheridan, H. B., Dudley  
Starkie, John P. C., Lancashire N.E.  
Waterhouse, Major S., Pontefract  
Whitehead, Samuel, Bedford  
Wyndham, Hon. P. S., Cumberland W.