that out of the petty attempts at mutual over-reaching which grew up out of a protective system have mainly arisen those discontents and antipathies which rent both from Spain and from England their continental dominions in America. *The free traders rely upon just and affectionate dealings with the Colonies as the means of perpetuating their connection with Great Britain. They would extend to the Colonists the same immunities as to the residents of the old country. They would emancipate them from the vexatious and ignorant meddling of the Colonial-office in their local affairs.* They would emancipate them from the incubus of incapable and supercilious tools of ministers and members of Parliament sent out to fill every lucrative office in the Colonies, because they have been serviceable to the state jobbers here. *They would leave the industry and enterprise of the Colonists free. And treating them thus as equals and beloved fellow countrymen, they would rely upon natural affection and a liberal and enlightened self-interest to ensure their loyal adherence to the Empire.*

THE REFORM MOVEMENT.

We give below extracts from the very able speech of Mr. Osborne, member for Middlesex, on Mr. Hume's Resolution for a reform of the Representation. Witty, eloquent, and argumentative throuhgout, the hon. member's address was frequntly interrupted by cheers.

After congratulating Lord John Russell upon having abandoned his 'finality' ideas, he ridiculed his Lordship's expression that 'this was not the time for reform,' an objection which Mr. Osborne described as a sort of 'stage property, kept in Downing Street, to be used as occasion might require.'

'In 1785, when Mr. Pitt introduced his reform measure, he was answered by Lord North that it was not the proper time; and in 1790, when Mr. Flood proposed his reform, Mr. Pitt then on the Treasury Bench, got up and told Mr. Flood that it was not the proper time; and one hon. member remarked, that so far from it being the proper time, he recommended the hon. mover, (Mr. Flood) to postpone his motion for a century. (Laughter.) Even in later days, he (Mr. Osborne) found that the same objection had been resorted to, and that when in 1822, in 1828, and in 1831, the noble lord himself propounded his schemes of parliamentary reform, the ministers of those days adopted the same cuckoo note, 'This is not the proper time.' (Hear, hear.) For his (Mr. Osborne's) own part, he thought there could be no more proper or fitting time for these resolutions than the present. (Hear, hear.) When there were indication in the horizon of a coming storm, then was the proper time to put their houses in order.'

Mr. Osborne reminded the House that they had passed several measures of extreme severity and coercion, under the pretext of securing the Crown and Government, but the danger having been averted, Ministers should come forward with measures of a healing nature, and he asked the government to lay on the table a measure for amending the national representation. Mr. O. looks upon Parliamentary Reform as a means to an end —reduced expenditure and diminished taxation.

'If there had been seen an effective check kept on the public purse by the present house, then some good reason might be given for an immediate change in the national representation not being necessary. But when they remembered the enormous amount of taxation—when they saw all the resources of the country were failing—when ministers were pressed to a degree which it would be rude to press a private gentleman—when such a state of things was apparent, an argument was afforded for reforming the constitution of that house.'

The hon. member showed that, notwithstanding England has been at peace with all the world, the National expenditure has gone on steadily increasing, and that the estimates for the Army, Navy, Ordinance, and Miscellaneous Services, which in 1836 were £14.120.000, have grown in 1848 to £23,315,000. Mr. O. furnishes statistics of taxation in different countries:

'In the United States taxation amounted to 9s. 7d. per head; in Russia to 9s. 9d. her head; in Austria to 11s. 6d. per head; in Prussia to 12s 4d. per head; in France to 24s. and in England to £2 12s. 6d. per head, exclusive of poor-rates, borough rates, and other charges of that nature.'

The following will give some idea of the taxes paid by the working classes in England upon articles within the reach of the poorest of our population.

'For every 20s. worth of tea purchased he paid 10s. tax; of coffee, 8s. tax; of sugar, 6s. tax; of soap, 5s. tax; of tobacco, 16s. tax; and of spirits, 14s. tax; and yet the hon. member said the people were well off, and that taxation had not increased since 1828. Would the people believe such an argument?—(hear, hear)—or would it be believed by anybody, except some of those within the walls of the house? (Hear.) In this country there was now raised, with the sanction of parliament, more than ever any despotic monarch of any nation wrung from his subjects.'

The hon. member, after defending that part of the motion which referred to shortening the duration of Parliament, described the Septennial act as one of the 'Whig jobs of the day,' 'a fraud from the commencement,' and admirably turned the tables upon Lord John, who previously denied that the tendencies of the House were aristocratic.

'I should have stopped here, had not the noble lord thrown out a challenge and denied that the government of this country was carried on for the benefit of the aristocracy—and he quoted Tacitus. (Laughter.) The hon. member of Surry also, (Mr. H. Drummond) quoted Dodd's Parliamentary Companion, to show how many vulgar fellows without grandfathers, were members of Parliament. (Much laughter.) Well, I consulted Dodd, (laughter) and here are the results. I find, according to Dodd, that there are forty-two boroughs still subject to local influence; thirty three are under the direct influence of peers. Eighteen members in this House represent eleven whig peers, and thirty three represent twenty two Tory peers. (Hear, hear.) And these forty two boroughs have as much influence in the House as the cities of London, Dublin, Edinburgh, Liverpool and Glasgow. But when the noble lord says that government is not carried on for the benefit of the aristocracy, here is my answer—again according to Dodd.—(Laughter.) There are 6 marquises in this house, 8 earls, 25 viscounts, 36 lords, 61 baronets, and 10 hon. misters. There are altogether 274 persons connected with peers and the aristocracy in the house, besides 44 officers of the army, 8 of the navy, and those who are officially connected with the government, making in the whole 334 members who are under the direct influence of the aristocracy. Let it not be supposed that I am attacking the individuals; I am attacking the system, not the men; and I say that the power of the aristocracy has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.'

Mr. Osborne thus met the Premier's objections to the Ballot, which Mr. Cobbett subsequently described as 'the strongest question in the House, and in the Country, particulanly with the Farmers and middle classes.'

By granting the protection of the ballot the house would do much towards proving the sincerity of its desire to put a stop to bribery. All the arguments yet used in opposition to the ballot were founded more on sentiment than on reason. The noble lord (J. Russell) had referred to America, and said every man's vote was known there, though they had the ballot. This was a proof that the ballot did away with intimidation and bribery, and hence a man was careless whether his vote was known or not. (Hear, hear.) The noble lord had also referred to the election of the National Assembly in France, where the ballot was resorted to; and this he seemed to think a clinching argument, which was to fright the isle from its propriety. But under the former dynasty in France, out of a population of 84,000,000, not 200,000 men had voted for the deputies; and it was owing to the ballot alone that any independent men found their way into the chamber. The superiority of the ballot had been proved in the recent elections, for it was only by its protection that any men of conservative principles could have been returned. (Hear, hear.) The usual argument against the ballot was a sort of hustings declamation,—that it was un-English; but was it not more un-English to traffic in notes, and make a poor trader vote against his conscience? (Cheers.) Probably many members were aware that the committee of four who sat on the Reform Bill in 1831, consisting of Lord Grey, Lord John Russell, Lord Duncannon, and Lord Durham, recommended that the ballot should be introduced, and that the duration of parliaments should be shortened. This could not be denied. And when the Chandos clause was introduced in that house, Lord Althorp had declared that it would be a great step towards rendering the ballot necessary; and Lord Grey had used the same argument in the other house. He would ask those twenty gentlemen who voted for the ballot in 1842, some of whom had used some very hard language towards the noble lord at the head of the government, whether any of them would be swayed for an instant by the arguments with which the noble lord opposed the ballot in 1848. Twenty supporters of the government, and two cabinet ministers voted for the ballot then; he hoped they would be true to their colours, and vote for it now. (Hear, hear.)

Our readers will remember the discredit brought upon the Chartist movement, in consequence of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of fictitious names being attached to their petition. The leaders of the new Reform movement, acting upon the principle that honesty in politics, like honesty in morals, is the best policy, refused to receive any but *bona fide* signatures to their petitions, and adopted the precaution of placing the occupation and residence of every petitioner opposite his name. These petitions were very numerous—and some of them, in consequence of being signed by a limited number of persons, were termed 'Family Petitions.' The ridicule heaped upon these Family Petitions by the anti-reformers elicited the following happy rejoinder from Mr. Osborne:—

We have heard somewhat of family petitions in this house. Why, what is the whole foundation of the present government in this country? Its foundation rests upon family arrangements. *The whole cabinet are related to each other by ties of birth or marriage.* (Hear, hear.) *They form a snug family party.* (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And they so far differ from another exhibition called the 'Happy Family'—(laughter)—that, whereas in the one case all the animals are distinct by birth; in the other, whilst admitting the great knowledge and talents of individuals, *you can only account for their ricketty offspring in legislation by knowing that the parents are all related.*—(Much laughter and cheers.) For the sake of decency it was chequered perhaps by some liberal statistical members. (Laughter.) Some member of a large constituency, which he would not be likely to represent again, may be caught and cribbed for his whig consistency and firmness. (Laughter.) But even these members became so altered when they get on that bench, that like Sheridan's old joke about the gipsies' children, you seem to have disfigured them to make them pass for your own. (Great laughter.) The noble lord asked, if we would prevent the Howards and Stanleys from having places.'

Lord John Russell said, he had never said any thing of the kind.

'Mr. Osborne—I can assure the noble lord that I did not mean to hurt his feelings.—(Laughter.) I say that the Howards and Stanleys have as good a right (and no more) as others to have places. (Hear, hear.) And it is somewhat singular that few of the Howards and less of the Stanleys are in public places. There are others there who have not such good claims, and who make a good thing of them. (Laughter.) We do not complain that men of the name of Howard and Stanley have places, but we complain that 'Lord Tom noddies' are pushed into office, while other men of equal, and perhaps better pretensions, tho' not of such high birth, are excluded. (Hear)'

Mr. Osborne cannot see why a relative of Mr. Hume, or any other person, belonging to the middle classes, should not get a place in the Mint, when qualified for it, without danger to the Constitution, as well as if he had been the son of a Peer of the Realm.

'The present government is a government of great families merely. Are the members of that government remarkable for any great or overpowering talents? (Laughter.) *Is the colonial office so well administered? Is the finanical department so well attended to?* (Hear, hear.) *Are you keeping your promises when out of office to Ireland?* (Hear, hear.) Are these the reasons why you are keeping your places? No, you are keeping them because none of the great families are prepared to take your places. (Hear, hear.) You are keeping the government because the people cannot make *lords of the bedchamber*, or get lords in the other house to thump the red box. The people of this country only want government of practical men; and my conscientious belief is, that the hon. member for Sunderland and others, can manage railway boards equally well, and are as well qualified to conduct the government as the noble lords who now form such a select family compact.'

The hon. member ably vindicated the middle classes, and reminded Mr. Disraeli, that those very classes a few weeks before, saved the Country from revolution.

'When his hon. friend talked so sneeringly of the middle classes he seemed to forget the day, not long since passed, when the middle classes rallied round the small numbers with large properties, and saved them from revolution. (cheers.) I would have my hon. friend recollect that the safety of this country depends on the intelligence, the probity, and wealth of its middle class —(hear, hear)—and that their numbers, surrounding the more ornamental and polished portions of the constitution, form the solid basement which preserves the institutions of this noble conntry. (Cheers.)'

Mr. Osborne denies the assumption of Mr. Disraeli that the aristocracy—'the gentlemen of England'—were ever the leaders of public opinion, or ever truly sympathized with the masses.

'Take Hampden for instance. He was cut by the gentlemen of that day, and if he were alive he would scarcely be asked out to dinner in the present day (Laughter.) 'The gentlemen' resisted catholic emancipation and the Reform Bill formerly, and in the present day it was they who threw out the measure for destroying the last links of intolerance which had oppressed a long suffering race. I deprecate the placing of class against class—(hear,)—and he is no true friend to his country who looks down on the gentry, the middle class, or the working class. (Hear, hear.) I believe that the participation of numbers in the government, and that the taking away of all restrictions on education, religion, and liberty, is the best of safeguard of the state; and entertaining these opinions, I cannot hesitate to support the motion of my hon. friend. (Loud cheers.)'

LATER AND MORE IMPORTANT NEWS FROM EUROPE.

The Mail Packet arrived from Pictou on Friday evening last, furnishing us with files of English, Irish and Scotch papers, brought by the Steamship 'America,' which reached Halifax on Wednesday last. The intelligence from Ireland is of the most important character—Martial Law has been proclaimed in several Counties and Towns,—many more arrests have been made, and, altogether, the agitation for Repeal has taken a firmer hold upon the public mind of Ireland, than it has been known to have at any former day. But we will not anticipate our readers. We give below the details as far as our space will permit us to insert them.

A letter from Dublin, dated July 17, states that the club organization is daily assuming a more alarming aspect—more secret in the mode of proceeding, but more concentrated and systematised, while branch clubs are extending far and wide in the rural districts.