

CHAPTER VI.

Opening of the New Parliament.—Election of the Speaker.—The King's Speech.—Mr. O'Connell's Amendment.—Declaration of Sir Robert Peel.—Coercion Bill for Ireland passed by the Lords.—Public Health.—Observance of the Sabbath.—Coercion Bill in the House of Commons.—The Coercion Bill passed.—Financial Measures.—Cobbett's Motion against Sir Robert Peel.—Bill for the Reform of the Irish Church.—Abolition of Slavery in the British Colonies.—Effects of the Abolition.—Limitation of Labour in Factories.—Bank Charter.—East India Company's Charter.—Prorogation.

ON the 29th of January, 1833, the new Parliament was opened by Commission. The Act for abolishing the oaths to be taken before the Lord Steward had come into operation; and a House of Commons was at once formed. The attendance of members was very large. One of the new representatives of Ireland, Mr. John O'Connell, has described some of the circumstances of that first meeting. His father, Daniel O'Connell, he says, led what might have been called his "household brigade," namely, his three sons and two sons-in-law, down to the House. In the passages they met and were introduced to Cobbett, habited in a kind of pepper-and-salt garb, in fashion something between that of a quaker and of a comfortable farmer, and wearing a broad-brimmed white hat, thrown back so as to give the fullest view of his shrewd though bluff countenance, and his keen cold-looking eye. The "household brigade" proceeded to take their seats upon the second bench on the opposition side, somewhat indignant at a long quizzing from Mr. Stanley's eye-glass. The great Irish orator was more modest in selecting his seat than others of the Radical party, who boldly ranged themselves upon the front bench, as if to awe the Ministerial Whigs, who were immediately opposite. According to the Irish member's "Recollections," William Cobbett was amongst the most conspicuous of those who took this post of honour.* One who four days afterwards records what he saw, says, "On our entering the House, and turning our eyes to the Treasury bench, the first person we saw, in the place of the black-whiskered, bluff, yeomanlike lord Althorp, was the white-headed veteran of the Radicals, William Cobbett, who had taken his seat above the

* "Recollections and Experiences," by John O'Connell, Esq., M. P., 1849, vol. i. chap. 1.

minister, and thus, as it were, installed himself as Leader of the Reformed House of Commons."*

The first business of the Lower House was the election of a Speaker. Mr. Hume, asserting the principle that it was necessary to have a Speaker who should represent the opinions of the majority of the House, and believing that the majority were Reformers, proposed Mr. E. J. Littleton, the member for the southern division of Staffordshire. He was seconded by Mr. O'Connell. Lord Morpeth, upon the principle of looking to the change which had taken place in the constitution of parliament, considered that it was most advisable to have all possible assistance to their proceedings from a gentleman of long practical experience and tried ability. He proposed the right hon. Charles Manners Sutton. The debate went on with little variation from the usual forms of parliamentary courtesy, when the broad-brimmed white hat of the singular man on the foremost place of the Treasury bench was taken off, and up rose the author of the "Register," who had written that he was born "to be one of the greatest terrors to one of the greatest and most powerful bodies of knaves and fools that ever were permitted to afflict this or any other country."† Out of that most powerful body of which he now formed a part some of the especial objects of his wrath had been withdrawn. But many objects of his old hatred still remained—many a country gentleman whose class he had denounced as unfeeling tyrants who squeezed the labourer for gain's sake; many "lords of the loom," who had been designated as "rich ruffians;" many of the "education-canters," who did not follow out his theory that nothing could "be good with regard to the labouring classes unless it made an addition to their victuals, drink, or clothing." Cobbett's style of speaking was as strange to the House of Commons as his habits. In supporting Mr. Hume's nomination of a Speaker, he began with these very plain words:—"It appears to me that since I have been sitting here I have heard a great deal of vain and unprofitable conversation." He objected to placing a man in the chair who had already received large sums of the public money. The right honourable gentleman had been for sixteen years in the office of Speaker; he had received every year a salary of six thousand pounds, taken from the starving people of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Mr. Hume's motion was rejected by a majority of two hundred and ten, and Mr. Manners Sutton again became Speaker. On the 5th of February the King opened the Parliament for "the despatch of business," according to the formal expression of

* "Spectator," February 2.

† "Rural Rides," p. 18.

what is the duty expected from parliament. The despatch of business in that one session is recorded in six volumes of Hansard, containing seven thousand seven hundred and forty-four columns of debate. Great measures were indeed discussed in both Houses during that session, which lasted till the 29th of August. During this time the House of Commons had sat a hundred and forty-two days, upon an average of nine hours daily. The usual average had been four and a half or five hours.* The chief objects upon which the members of that House had thus vied with factory workers were suggested in the King's Speech: the approaching termination of the charters of the Bank of England and the East India Company; the state of the Church, more particularly regarding its temporalities; the Church of Ireland; the necessity of entrusting the Crown with greater powers for controlling and punishing the spirit of insubordination and violence in Ireland, which had greatly increased, and for preserving and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries. There were two other great measures, not indicated at the commencement of the session, that occupied the further attention of Parliament—the regulation of infant labour in Factories, and the abolition of Slavery in the West-India colonies. To the task of dealing with many of these important subjects, both Houses applied themselves with a sedate and earnest spirit. But there was one topic in the King's Speech which instantly called up a host of turbulent feelings, little in accordance with that spirit of brotherhood which some enthusiasts believed would in future render the House of Commons an assembly altogether labouring for the national good, and redeem it from its old character of the cockpit of party. The Irish members who followed the leadership of O'Connell came away "with hearts full of bitterness," after listening to the royal speech, believing that the only part of it which the King's infirmities or his inclinations allowed him to deliver with any distinctness was that in which he threatened Ireland. † The amendment was moved by Mr. O'Connell. Never, since on his own Irish ground of agitation he designated Mr. Stanley a "shave-beggar," had he ventured upon such coarseness as he now thrust upon the House of Commons. He described the echo of the King's speech as "a bloody and brutal Address;" "a bloody, brutal, and unconstitutional Address." Pity it was that the remarkable powers of O'Connell, the "Demonic directness and vehemence," as Jeffrey described the oratory

* Hansard, 3rd series, vol. xx. col. 907: Statement of sir Robert Inglis, upon information derived from Mr. Rickman, an officer of the House.

† John O'Connell, vol. i. p. 9.

of this great artist, were so often degraded into the utterance of a copious vocabulary of scurrility. Mr. Stanley replied to what he called "the eloquent and forcible invective" of the honourable and learned member for Dublin. The speech of the Secretary for Ireland was something far more telling than invective, although it contained sufficient bitterness to make lasting enemies. He set forth the system of outrages which prevailed in a land where the law was a dead letter; where the law was insufficient to meet the exigencies of insurrectionary crime,—where no witness could afford to give evidence, where no jury could dare to convict, though the guilt of the culprit were as notorious as the sun at noon-day. "No government could apply itself efficiently to the remedying of grievances, unless it also possessed the power to make the laws respected."* The opening of Mr. Stanley's speech was received with cries of "Bravo" in the House, and even with applause in the strangers' gallery. He taunted Mr. O'Connell with the declaration that he would relieve Ireland "from the yoke of the Sassenach." The Government now told him that his panacea of Repeal "should be resisted to the death." Such was the spirit of courageous defiance that won for Mr. Stanley the name of "the Rupert of debate." Mr. O'Connell's amendment was finally rejected by a majority of three hundred and eighty-eight in a House of four hundred and sixty-eight; ayes, 40; noes, 428. Of his forty supporters, six were members for England, two for Scotland, and thirty-two for Ireland.

The debates upon the Address occupied five nights. It certainly was a national benefit that much of the eloquence which had been expended, both in England and Ireland, for the excitement of popular assemblies, now harmlessly exploded in a place where the freedom of debate was indeed unlimited, but where no demagogue could make extravagant statements without receiving an immediate contradiction. It was curious that the great Irish Agitator in his eloquent invective said no single word tending to raise a discussion about Repeal. "He keeps it, and prudently keeps it," said Mr. Macaulay, "for audiences of a very different kind." O'Connell and Cobbett might in their hearts aspire to be the Danton and Marat of a new National Assembly. But the House of Commons, with all its renovated spirit of democracy, was not so favourable a theatre for their coarser harangues as the Hall of the Catholic Association or the farmer's table of a country town on market-day. There was some voice of the past in that old Chapel of St. Stephen, which proclaimed that liberty had there been won by the gentlemen

* Hansard, vol. xv. col. 196.

of England, and that if it ceased to be a place where the habits of gentlemen could be preserved, it would cease to be a place worthy of the efforts which had been made by the people to renovate and exalt its character.

Looking beyond the almost solitary attempts of the English demagogue to speak in Parliament so as to set the poor against the rich,—hearing something more harmonious than the war-trump of the Irish leader to call his followers to skirmishes or pitched-battles in which the reward of victory would be the repeal of the union,—there were important lessons to be gathered from those five nights of debate introductory to the practical business of the session. They pretty conclusively showed, in the first place, that the expectations of the ultra-Tory party that the Reform Bill would be repealed—that another Restoration, more joyful than the royal triumph of Charles the Second, would terminate the execrated career of the Revolution of 1832*—were sanguine hopes which would be quickly dispersed even by the breath of him who had most consistently opposed a Reform in parliament. On the third night of the debate on the Address, sir Robert Peel thus declared himself:—"The King's Government had abstained from all unseemly triumph in the King's speech respecting the measure of Reform. He would profit by their example, and would say nothing upon that head; but consider that question as finally and irrevocably disposed of. He was now determined to look forward to the future alone, and considering the Constitution as it existed, to take his stand on main and essential matters—to join in resisting every attempt at new measures which could not be stirred without unsettling the public mind, and endangering public prosperity. . . . He was for reforming every institution that really required reform; but he was for doing it gradually, dispassionately and deliberately, in order that the reform might be lasting." † Further, the apprehensions of many who in common with lord Eldon thought they saw that monarchy, peerage, property, would inevitably sink under the rule and domination of democrats, were as signally disappointed. ‡ Sir Robert Peel, indeed, correctly describes the notices in the Order-book as promising motions for new laws on every imaginable subject; for simultaneous change in everything that was established. But the Order-book remains the principal historical record of schemes which were in great part the wind-bubbles of new members who thought that the spirit of innovation

* See "Quarterly Review," vol. xlvii. p. 589.

† Hansard, 3rd series, vol. xv. col. 385. Given also verbatim from Hansard, in sir R. Peel's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 69.

‡ Twiss, vol. iii. p. 216.

would best recommend them to the constituencies by which they had been chosen. Although upon great political questions the disposition to force extreme opinions was very small, yet a vast mass of crude notions was evidently afloat upon social questions, which many with their strong prejudices and small knowledge thought themselves qualified to discuss. The complaint that the new parliamentary system did not work well was not confined to the remnants of the anti-Reform party. Jeffrey very frankly and truly wrote, after the House of Commons had risen for the Easter holidays:—"The friction in the working of the machine, and the consequent obstruction of its movements, has been much greater than was ever known; and though this may grow less when it has been longer in use, as is the case with all new machines, I am afraid part of it is owing to the increased number of independent movements, and part, perhaps, to the want of the old oiling which can no longer be afforded." *

The House of Commons having endured for six nights the incessant labour and excitement of the debates on the Address, had now a short interval of relaxation and calm, whilst in the Upper House the question of coercive measures for the repression of Irish disturbances was discussed with the judicial temper of that assembly. On the fifteenth of February lord Grey introduced the Bill for the more effectual suppression of local disturbances and dangerous Associations in Ireland. He stated that between the 1st of January and the end of December, 1832, there had been committed a total of nine thousand and two crimes,—homicides, 242; robberies, 1179; burglaries, 401; burnings, 568; houghing cattle, 290; serious assaults, 161; riots, 203; illegal rescues, 353; illegal notices, 2,094; illegal meetings, 427; injuries to property, 796; attacks on houses, 723; firing with intent to kill, 328; robbery of arms, 117; administering unlawful oaths, 163; resistance to legal process, 8; turning up land, 20; resistance to tithes, 50; taking forcible possession, 2. This enumeration sufficiently shows how large a proportion of the offences were out of the ordinary course of criminal acts. The proposition of the government was, to give the Lord Lieutenant power to forbid objectionable public meetings, and to introduce martial law into districts proclaimed to be in a state of disturbance. The Bill was read a third time in the House of Lords and passed on the 22nd of February. It was not till the 27th that the subject was introduced to the House of Commons. Meanwhile lighter topics might there be dealt with, by which personal hostility would not be so easily provoked. Joseph Pease,

* Cockburn, "Life of Jeffrey," vol. i. p. 346.

having been elected for the southern division of the county of Durham, appeared on the 8th of February to take his seat in the House. He objected to the oath tendered to him, and prayed to be allowed to make his solemn affirmation. The Speaker having stated that without the sanction of the House he dared not allow this course, the subject was referred to a Select Committee. Although some members might have dreaded that the sturdy Quaker would refuse to take off his hat when he passed the Speaker's chair, upon the Report of the Committee the affirmation was allowed to be substituted for the oath, the resolution being carried amidst the cheers of the House. One of the greatest of social questions, the Health of the People, was now brought into view by Mr. Slaney,—a gentleman who has never ceased for thirty years to promote some sound measure of real popular advantage. He proposed that a Committee be appointed to consider the best means of securing open places in the neighbourhood of great towns for the healthful exercise of the population. Mr. Lamb, the Secretary of State, regretted that too little attention had been paid to this subject at the passing of Enclosure Bills. On this occasion the expediency was suggested of throwing open the grounds of the Regent's Park, which had been kept so long closed to the public.* The table of the House had been covered with petitions praying for the better observance of the Sabbath, the greater part being presented by sir Andrew Agnew. Upon the presentation of one of these petitions, it was explained that the proposed alteration of the law was to prevent the tyranny by which individuals who followed certain trades on that day were compelled by their masters to violate their consciences by working on the Sabbath. Mr. Cobbett brought his strong common sense and plain English to deal with this point. A measure to prevent masters working men-servants on Sunday would be perfectly nugatory, unless it went into private families: "Were gentlemen backward in employing their coachmen, their grooms, and their footmen on Sundays? Why, these were a set of workmen who laboured very hard, in Hyde Park, for instance. They were well dressed up, and looked very fine with their gold-headed canes, but he would be bound to say, that if they had their choice they would much rather be at home with the maids."† The Bill of sir Andrew Agnew, which was truly described by Mr. M. D. Hill, the member for Hull, as "a Bill for the desecration of the Sabbath by

* The Regent's Park was laid out in 1812. The admission of the public was confined to its outer roads for twenty-six years, they being entirely excluded from the inside of the park till 1838.

† Hansard, vol. xv., col. 1191.

the rich, and for the observance of it by the poor;"—which was termed by lord Althorp, "a Bill of pains and penalties uncalled for and impolitic, not desired by the public, and not deserved by them;"—was rejected on the 17th of May. We may lastly mention, before we proceed to notice the greater legislative measures of this Session, that although there had been some mitigation of the Criminal Code so as to render capital punishments less frequent, there was yet much to be accomplished before the great truth was recognized by the legislature, "that laws which cannot be carried into execution without shocking the feelings of society and exciting sympathy for the offender, are contrary to reason, inconsistent with morality, and opposed to the interests of justice." These were the words of a petition signed by five thousand inhabitants of the metropolis. On the debate upon this petition a hope was expressed that the Session would not pass without a more general application of secondary punishments. Mr. Lamb said, that the subject was under the consideration of government; that a gentleman had been sent out to America to investigate the system of secondary punishments, and the state of prison discipline established in that country. Thus, then, thirty years ago we were only preparing to inquire into one of the most complicated social questions of more recent times. The difficulties of the question—difficulties which have become far greater since the growth of the Colonies has rendered the system of transportation almost impossible—seem principally to have induced lord Eldon to maintain the doctrine, now happily obsolete,—that the fear of death prevented the commission of those crimes against which it was directed. In a debate on the 25th of June, 1832, the ex-Chancellor said, that after the experience of half a century he had never known a lawyer or a politician who was able to point out to him what to his mind was a satisfactory secondary punishment. The legal or the legislative mind had scarcely then associated, in the smallest degree, the notion of reformation with secondary punishment.

On the 27th of February, in the House of Commons, lord Althorp moved the second reading of the Bill for the Suppression of Disturbance in Ireland. His speech was a temperate statement of facts, concluding with a forcible and almost eloquent inference from those facts: "We shall, doubtless, have divers declamations in praise of liberty, which no man wishes to gainsay; but the question is, is it from a state of liberty that Ireland is to be rescued? Is she not to be rescued from a state of great and severe tyranny? Is she not to be rescued from a state of anarchy, where life has no safety, and property no security? Liberty is some-

thing more than a name, and the benefits of liberty are the protection of life and property—the protection of every man in doing that which pleases himself, and is not detrimental to society.”* Very different in tone was the speech of Mr. Stanley on the same night. The terrific outrages which he detailed supplied the strongest arguments for the measure advocated by the government. But there was an object beyond the passing of this immediate measure which the Secretary for Ireland steadily kept in view in his fervid denunciations. He would put down, if possible, the “political domination” which prevented the free expression of public opinion in Ireland. In his hands the great Agitator experienced no mercy. He quoted the words of a ballad which had been sung in the streets of Kilkenny, in which the Sassenach tyrants—“those cursed demons”—must quit the land, and poor Irish captives be liberated, “all by the means of our noble Dan.” Mr. Stanley asked, with bitter emphasis, “Who was it that furnished to the ignorant people these topics of declamation, and then condemned the outrages which has been caused by the hatred and discontent which he had himself excited.”† Mr. Stanley brought down a storm of indignation upon the head of Mr. O’Connell by referring to a speech made by him only a few days before at a meeting of the working classes, in which he had termed the members of the House “six hundred robbers or scoundrels.” Henceforth it was “war to the knife” between these two great parliamentary orators. Whether it was politic to render peace impossible between the government and the astute leader of the Irish Repealers, may perhaps be doubted. Some of his followers might have wavered under a milder treatment. Very few now disbelieve that the charge against the chief of Mr. O’Connell’s lieutenants, that he privately said that ministers ought not to abate an atom of the bill, was substantially true. The cowardice of some who knew its truth, and had not the courage to support the member who, with more honesty than discretion, proclaimed it, permitted the allegation to be disposed of in the next session of Parliament as “founded upon information that was erroneous.” On the adjourned debate on the 1st of March, sir Robert Peel supported the government in a speech of extraordinary power. He referred to the catalogue of crime in one province, in which were included one hundred and ninety-six murders and murderous attempts—crimes of insurrectionary violence. “One hundred and ninety-six murders!—why, you have

* Hansard, vol. xv. col. 1226.

† *Ibid.*, col. 1282.

fought great battles, and achieved famous victories, at a less cost of English blood! [An Hon. Member: No, no!] No! but I say emphatically, Yes. The battle of St. Vincent cost you less. The terrible bombardment of Algiers cost you less. With less profusion of English blood you rolled back the fiery tide which the exulting valour of France poured upon the heights of Busaco. But why do I talk of battles? Oh, how tame and feeble the comparison between death on the field of honour, and that death which is inflicted by the hand of Irish assassins.”* The debate on the first reading of the Coercion Bill was carried on during five sittings. On the last night Mr. O’Connell spoke with his accustomed force. The Bill was read a first time by a majority of three hundred and seventy-seven. It was read a second time by a majority of two hundred and seventy-nine. But it was in Committee that the great Agitator, who could there speak as often as he pleased, was most effective. “He was free,” says his son, “to meet every charge, answer every argument, throw back every taunt, and crush with overpowering ridicule every puny assailant.”† The Bill was read a third time on the 29th of March. It was sent back to the Lords for their approval of the alterations in some enactments which ministers had thought it prudent to make, and being quickly passed, it received the royal assent on the 2nd of April. During this conflict the opinions of Mr. Stanley had been so strongly expressed, and the mutual hostility of the agitators and the Irish Secretary had become so personal, that he removed to the office of Secretary for the Colonies (vacated by viscount Goderich, who became Lord Privy Seal, by the title of earl of Ripon), and was succeeded by sir John Cam Hobhouse.

The difficulties of the government during the first session of the Reformed Parliament did not arise out of the affairs of England or Scotland. Their financial measures were not very strong; they were compromises, for the most part, of large demands for the abolition of taxes, made by the independent members of the Reform party. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, for example, thought the tax upon newspapers a bad tax, but he did not consider its repeal would confer a benefit equivalent to the loss the revenue would sustain. He would reduce the duty on advertisements; he would repeal the taxes on particular classes of servants, such as shopmen and bailiff’s; he would reduce the duties on soap; altogether he would afford relief to the amount of more than a million and a quarter. This peddling mode of

* Hansard, vol. xvi. col. 95. † John O’Connell, “Recollections,” vol. i. p. 17.

looking at the operation of taxes long continued to prevail, for neither the legislature nor the people yet understood that the most oppressive of all taxation was that which interfered with the free march of industry; that any partial reduction, without sweeping away the fiscal regulations which hampered the operations of commerce or manufactures, was comparatively worthless. A motion was made, on the 26th of March, by Mr. George Robinson, for a Select Committee to revise the existing system of taxation with a view to the repeal of those burdens which pressed most heavily upon productive industry, and to substitute an equitable tax on property in lieu thereof. The motion, opposed by the government, was negatived. One of the objects contemplated by a certain class of reformers was the return to a paper currency, they contending that the distress of the country—a distress which was always assumed rather than proved—was produced by our existing monetary system. Mr. Attwood, the member for Birmingham, moved for a Select Committee on this subject on the 22nd of April, and after a debate of three nights, an Amendment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was carried by a very large majority. Connected with this intricate subject, which of all others demanded the calmest consideration, was a violent motion of Mr. Cobbett on the 16th of May, calling for an address praying his majesty to dismiss sir Robert Peel from the Privy Council, as the author of the Currency Bill of 1819. The debate upon a proposition so utterly unreasonable and absurd was remarkable for a speech of sir Robert Peel, in which, replying to the taunts of his present assailant and of others, that he was the son of a cotton weaver, he said—"they taunted him with the obscurity of his birth, as if they were themselves the descendants of the Courtenays and the Montmorencies. . . . So far from that taunt causing him any shame, he felt only proud." Cobbett, in rising to reply, was received with the strongest manifestations of disapprobation. Upon the division on his motion the ayes were four, the noes two hundred and ninety-eight. Lord Althorp then proposed that the resolution should not be entered on the minutes. The Speaker explained that every proposition is entered upon the minutes the moment it is moved and seconded, and that therefore he must put the question, "that the proceedings be expunged." The House divided, ayes, two hundred and ninety-five; noes, four. There were two Irish members who voted with the minority. We record this to notice the mode in which a member of parliament, whether Irish, English, or Scotch, not absolutely devoid of the commonest principles of honesty, may be led by the violence of partisanship into a really

dishonest action. Mr. John O'Connell says, "I was one of four unfortunates who, amid the laughter and jeers of the House, went out in favour of the motion when the division came. I did so, not for Cobbett's reasons but my own—namely, the mischiefs done to Ireland by the object of his wrath."* The government was not less successful in supporting a measure in the House of Commons for the relief of the Jews from civil disabilities. That Bill, however, was lost in the Upper House. The Lord Chancellor was unsuccessful in carrying a Bill for establishing Courts of Local Jurisdiction in certain parts of the kingdom. It was introduced by him on the 28th of March. In the debate on the 24th of June it was opposed by all the law lords. They were most probably moved thereto by lord Eldon, who denounced it as "a most abominable Law Bill of the Chancellor's, one of the most objectionable I have ever seen proposed to parliament."* The Bill was finally negatived by 134 to 122. In these minor questions success or defeat was not important to the stability of the government. The great questions of the session which followed the Irish Coercion Bill involved a real trial of strength.

The King, in his speech, in calling attention to the state of the Church, and more particularly to the Church of Ireland, foreshadowed a contest that would last through his own reign and not be perfectly settled in another reign. Within a week after the meeting of Parliament, the Chancellor of the Exchequer obtained leave to bring in a Bill, to alter and amend the laws relative to the Church Establishment in Ireland. On the 11th of March the bill was read a first time. It was brought forward during the heat of the debates on the bill for the repression of Irish disturbances. This bill for the reform of the Irish Church was considered by the ministers to be "a healing measure," necessary to be immediately passed. There were various delays which prevented the preliminary resolutions being debated till the 2nd of April. The details of the measure of reform thus contemplated may be very briefly stated. The total revenues of the Irish Church were about £800,000 per annum. Upon these it was intended, after abolishing first-fruits, to impose a tax, varying according to the value of livings and bishoprics, exempting, however, all livings under £2000 per annum. The sum thus obtained was to be applied under Commissioners to the abolition of church-cess, the augmentation of poor livings, and the building of glebe-houses. Deans and chapters were to be abolished wherever they were unconnected with the cure of souls, and ten bishoprics were to be merged in those that

* "Recollections," vol. i. p. 39.

† Twiss, vol. iii. p. 201.