

CHAPTER XVII.

Parliament opened.—Improved state of the kingdom.—Sir Robert Peel's New Tariff.—Opposition of the Country-Party.—Mr. Cobden's motion for inquiring into Agricultural Distress.—Grant to Maynooth College.—Queen's Colleges in Ireland.—Jews admitted to Municipal Offices.—Prorogation.—Apprehended failure of the Potato Crop in Ireland.—Proposal of Sir Robert Peel to the Cabinet.—Lord John Russell's Letter to the Electors of London.—Dissensions in the Cabinet.—Sir R. Peel resigns.—Failure of Lord John Russell to form a Ministry.—Sir R. Peel resumes power.—Parliament opened by the Queen.—Sir R. Peel asserts his determination to be unshackled as Minister.—The New Tariff and the Corn-Law Bills introduced by Sir R. Peel.—Debate of Twelve Nights in the Commons.—The Bills passed in both Houses.—Bill for the Protection of Life in Ireland, rejected by a majority against the Government.—Resignation of Sir R. Peel.—The Russell Administration.—The Oregon Question settled.—British Columbia.—India.—War with the Sikhs.—Battle of Moodkee.—Sir Henry Hardinge and Sir Hugh Gough.—Battle of Feroyeshah.—Battles of Alliwali and Sobraon.—Treaty of Peace.—List of the Russell Ministry.

WHEN Parliament was opened by the Queen on the 4th of February, 1845, "the improved condition of the country" was a fertile subject of her Majesty's congratulation. "Increased activity pervades almost every branch of Manufacture; trade and commerce have been extended at home and abroad." At this period the Income Tax was about to expire. Why then, with a certainty of improved revenue from imports, which had risen from sixty-five millions in 1842 to eighty-five millions in 1845, was it necessary for her Majesty to say, with reference to the Income Tax, that it might be expedient to continue its operation for a further period? The reason alleged for this recommendation was, "thus to obtain the means of adequately providing for the public service, and at the same time making a reduction in other taxation." Simple as were these words they were full of significance. The one object in 1842 of imposing an Income Tax was to repair the financial disorder of the country. That object had been accomplished. On the 5th of January, 1845, there had been an excess of income over expenditure of nearly three millions and a half. The Income Tax had produced something above five millions. It was in many respects an objectionable tax, and if not to be wholly abolished there was ample room to reduce the amount of the impost by one-half. But the minister had a great policy to carry into effect. His partial experiment on Free Trade had prepared him to make a bolder experiment, upon the doctrine that the surest way to improve

the condition of the great body of the people was to remove those taxes upon large branches of industry which not only interfered with their extension, but placed many of the comforts and conveniences of life beyond the reach of the humbler classes. M. Guizot has truly as well as eloquently said—"the greatest happiness of the greatest number of human beings as the supreme object of society and of government, was the superior power of which Sir Robert Peel had made himself the minister, and which swayed all his opponents; some of them governed like himself, others intimidated or paralyzed by this great idea, which was clearly or dimly present to their minds, either as an incontestable right, or as an irresistible fact."*

The financial statement of Sir Robert Peel was made on the 14th of February. Continuing the Income Tax, he estimated there would be a surplus of 3,400,000*l.* He said—laying down general principles which ought ever to be kept in mind by a British financial minister—"In the first place you have to consider the claims which may be urged in favour of a reduction of taxation on account of the heaviness with which certain imposts press on articles of general consumption. You are bound also to consider what taxes press on the raw materials which constitute the staple of the manufactures of the country. You are also bound to consider what taxes cause a great increase in the establishments necessary for their collection, and what are those taxes the remission of which will enable us to diminish those establishments, so as to reduce the expense of collection. You are bound also to consider what are those taxes the removal of which will give more scope to commercial enterprise, and occasion an increased demand for labour."† Broadly to state the minister's plans for obtaining such results as these, he proposed to abolish all duties on exports, including the duty on coal; he would abolish the import duties on four hundred and thirty raw materials used in manufactures, which, although yielding to the Treasury only 320,000*l.*, would still be a real and efficient relief; he would altogether remove the duties on cotton-wool, which yielded 680,000*l.*; the reduction to be effected on the sugar-duties would amount to 1,300,000*l.* More important, perhaps, than any of the imposts to be abolished or reduced was the repeal of the duty upon glass. That duty, upon the value of the manufactured article, was not less than from 200 to 300 per cent.; there was no duty which required such a system of perpetual and vexatious interference with the manufacturer. In France, in Bel-

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 232.
 † Hansard, vol. lxvii. col. 473.

gium, and in Bohemia, there was no excise duty on glass. In Bohemia, in particular, the manufacture had been brought to a state of admirable perfection. We had peculiar facilities for obtaining the same results, and yet we could not compete with foreigners in the manufacture of glass. "If you permit," said sir Robert, "this article to be free of duty, it is difficult to foresee, in the first place, to what perfection this beautiful fabric may not be brought, and secondly, it is impossible to say to what new purposes glass manufactured by our own skill and capital, may not be applied." Seven years only had elapsed after the sagacious minister had made this confident anticipation, when we saw a wondrous fabric arise constructed almost wholly of glass, in which the British manufacturer was not ashamed to exhibit his glass wares by the side of his foreign rivals, not perhaps reaching the perfection of some glass fabrics but very nearly approaching their beauty of form and colour. Eleven more years elapsed, and then, in the more extended competition of a second International Exhibition, the British manufacture of glass for domestic use stood at the head of every European production. But, more than all this, it is only necessary to look with a rapid glance at the architecture of our public buildings, of our shops, of our mansions and villas, and even of our humblest cottages, to see how, in conjunction with the subsequent repeal of the window tax, the removal of the duty on glass had enabled every building to be erected with a regard to convenience and comfort, to health and cleanliness, which the existence of those imposts to a great extent prevented. It was the merit of sir Robert Peel rarely to forget the effect of taxation upon the condition of the poor. He had in view the quarry of the cottage window, rarely mended when broken, but patched with paper or stuffed with rag, when he said—"If the House sanction the removal of the duty upon glass, you will thereby confer on the poorer classes a most extensive benefit." It is unnecessary now to follow the discussion upon sir Robert Peel's financial measures, beyond noticing a few points in which the jealousy of free-trade principles occasionally broke out in objections almost ludicrous. One member complained of the removal of the duty on grease, as he judged it would lead to a great importation of foreign butter; another moved the omission of lard from the list of articles to be admitted free of duty. Mr. Cobden, upon such objections, besought the landed interest not to make a pitiable exhibition of themselves; lord John Russell advised them either to surrender the principle of protection to native industry altogether, or resolutely to stand by it in and out of Parliament. Bolder than the parliamentary free-traders was

Mr. W. J. Fox, who, at one of the meetings of the League in Covent Garden Theatre, said of those who were horrified at the notion of repealing the duties on butter, bacon, and cheese, "they keep a great chandler's shop, and they look to every minute article in their store, how they can pervert the power of legislation to make the community pay more for the benefit of the aristocracy. There was a time when trading at all was thought inconsistent with the possession of that dignity. Your feudal baron did not mind robbing by the strong hand, but he turned away with contempt from robbing by the short weight of a protective duty." The time was approaching when as strong things would be said in and out of Parliament against the minister who had sufficiently manifested his indisposition to support the chandler's shop. The course which sir Robert Peel was pursuing, of asserting the principles of free-trade cautiously and yet successfully, by enlisting the Opposition, for their support against the imperfectly concealed hostility or indifference of his own supporters, was gradually preparing for him an amount of rebellion and insubordination of which he was too experienced a party leader not accurately to contemplate the final result—his own deposition.

Upon the opening of parliament lord John Russell endeavoured to produce some ministerial declaration on the subject of the Corn-Laws, by affirming that Protection was the bane of agriculture. He obtained no contradiction from sir Robert Peel; but he was asked by Mr. Miles, one of the most sturdy of the Protectionists, whether he had found it convenient to make a compact alliance with the Corn Law League? Protectionists and Free-traders equally sought support for their arguments at this time in the distress which was said to exist amongst the agriculturists. On the 13th of March Mr. Cobden moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the causes and extent of this alleged agricultural distress, and into "the effects of legislative protection upon the interests of land-owners, tenant-farmers, and farm labourers." His motion was rejected by a majority of ninety-two. But his speech produced a great impression upon the country; and it has been said that upon the prime minister himself it had a marked influence. On this occasion Mr. Cobden came forth with a spirit-stirring and impassioned eloquence which few had considered within the range of his oratorical powers. To the Country party he said—"You live in a mercantile age, when the whole wealth of the world is poured into your lap. You cannot have the advantages of commercial rents and feudal privileges, but you may be what you always have been, if you will identify yourselves with the spirit of the age. The Eng-

lish people look to the gentry and the aristocracy of this country as their leaders. I, who am not one of you, have no hesitation in telling you, that there is a deep-rooted, an hereditary prejudice, if I may so call it, in your favour in this country. But you never got it, and you will not keep it, by obstructing the spirit of the age. If you are indifferent to enlightened means of finding employment for your own peasantry; if you are found obstructing that advance which is calculated to knit nations more together in the bonds of peace, by means of commercial intercourse; if you are found fighting against the discoveries which have almost given breath and life to material nature, and setting up yourselves as obstructives of that which destiny has decreed shall go on—why, then, you will be the gentry of England no longer, and others will be found to take your place.”

The speech of Mr. Cobden on his motion for a Committee was replied to by Mr. Sidney Herbert; but that reply was more damaging to the cause of agricultural protection than the arguments of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, or the agitation of the League. It was the incaution of a young man of remarkable candour, and somewhat inexperienced in parliamentary tactics, when he said, as the representative of an agricultural constituency, that it would be distasteful to the agriculturists to come whining to parliament at every period of temporary distress. Parliament had awarded to the agriculturists a certain amount of protection; with that they were content; and in adverse circumstances, such as failure of crop, they would meet them manfully and put their shoulders to the wheel.* Agriculturists were indignant at being represented as content with the protection they enjoyed;—the assumption (which was meant for advice) that they would put their shoulders to the wheel, instead of crying out for help to Hercules, was something different from the zealous friendship upon which they had calculated so long and reposed so confidently. The rejection of Mr. Cobden's motion did not calm their anger. On the 17th of March, Mr. W. Miles moved that in the reduction of taxation “due regard should be had to the necessity of affording relief to the agricultural interest.” It was then that Mr. Disraeli pronounced unmistakably that sentence of open war against sir Robert Peel, which, whether in its skirmishes or pitched battles, for a year or two was admired by many as the daring of a noble courage in its insults to the first statesman of his time. Sir Robert Peel sometimes winced at these attacks, but in most cases he shook off the reckless words, “like dew-drops from the lion's mane.” “I remember,”

* Hansard, vol. lxxviii. col. 818.

said Mr. Disraeli, “to have heard the right honourable baronet at the head of the government say, he would sooner be the leader of the gentlemen of England than possess the confidence of sovereigns. . . . They were the right honourable baronet's first love, and though he may not kneel to them now as in the hour of passion, still they can recall the past. He does what he can to keep them quiet; sometimes he takes refuge in arrogant silence, and sometimes he treats them with haughty frigidity; and if they knew anything of human nature, they would take the hint and shut their mouths. But they won't. And what then happens? The right honourable baronet, being compelled to interfere, sends down his valet, who says in the genteelést manner, We can have no whining here.” Describing sir Robert Peel as one who, by skilful parliamentary manœuvres, had tampered with the generous confidence of a great people, he addressed these words to the Treasury bench—“Dissolve, if you please, the parliament you have betrayed, and appeal to the people who I believe mistrust you; for me there remains this at least—the opportunity of expressing thus publicly my belief, that a Conservative government is an Organized Hypocrisy.”

In this speech of Mr. Disraeli there was a skilful allusion to that former desertion of the principle of ultra-Toryism which many yet remembered with the bitterness of intolerance; “Protection appears to be in about the same condition that Protestantism was in 1828. The country will draw its moral.” Protestantism was now to have a new cause of offence. On the 3rd of April sir Robert Peel brought forward the plans of the government respecting the improvement of the College of Maynooth, proposing a grant of 30,000*l.* a year, to be secured by act of parliament. On the 11th, when the Bill was to be read a second time, the table of the House was covered with petitions. There had been meetings throughout the country, in which Churchmen and Dissenters had been equally conspicuous in denouncing the measure as a renunciation of the Protestantism under which the empire had flourished. An annual vote had been taken for many years for the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. It was the object of the government, to use the words of sir Robert Peel, “to adopt in a friendly and generous spirit the institution provided for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood—to extend the parliamentary provision for that purpose, and to attempt, not by interference with the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, but by a more liberal provision to improve the system of education, and to elevate the tone and character of that institution.” During six

nights of debate in the Commons there was not a shaft in the quiver of bigotry, still replenished however scantily, which was not then discharged against the government, and especially against sir Robert Peel. Sir Robert Inglis, the most moderate and rational of his theological opponents, declared that although shattered and torn the flag of Protestantism still remained at the mast-head, and he would fight for it as unflinchingly as when in better days it waved untorn and unbent over our empire. Mr. Plumptre would not say that the religion of Rome was exclusively that of Antichrist but he believed that it was so, completely and prominently; and he was further of opinion that it would be a fearful and national sin to endow such a religion. Mr. Ferrand solemnly believed that if the government could induce her Majesty to attach her signature to this bill she would sign away her title to the British crown. Colonel Sibthorp was the loudest in the chorus, "Really, if I had not seen the First Lord of the Treasury take the oaths at the table of this House, I should have doubted whether he were a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, or a Mahometan; nor should I be surprised if the time should yet come when we shall see him sitting cross-legged as a Mahometan, or embracing a Pope. I must say that I have lost all confidence in that man." Leaving the question of Maynooth untouched, Mr. Disraeli embraced the occasion for another personal assault upon the Prime Minister: "There is now no longer any constitutional opposition, because there is no government formed on definite principles. Something has risen up in this country as fatal in the political world as it has been in the landed world in Ireland; we have a great parliamentary middleman. It is well known what a middleman is: he is a man who bamboozles one party and plunders the other, till having obtained a position to which he is not entitled, he cries out, 'Let us have no party questions, but fixity of tenure.'" In spite of the unmitigated opposition in both Houses the Maynooth Bill was carried by considerable majorities. So also was the ministerial measure introduced by sir James Graham for establishing three purely secular colleges in Ireland, wholly independent of religious tests or creeds for the education of the middle classes. On the first debate on the measure sir Robert Inglis termed it a great scheme "of godless education." The measure was carried by a large majority in the Commons upon the third reading, and was passed without a division in the Lords. But the faint cry of "godless education" raised by sir Robert Inglis was echoed with far greater vehemence by the Roman Catholic clergy, whose prelates declared, through Mr. O'Connell, in the House of Commons, that this was a bad

scheme of education, and the Bill a penal and revolting measure. The "godless colleges" of Cork, Galway, and Belfast, nevertheless have flourished, unharmed under the constant attempts of a bigoted priesthood to oppose in this case, as well as in the National Schools of Ireland, that system of instruction without religious teaching which the soundest statesmen have constantly regarded as one of the best means of softening the religious animosities and abating the injurious jealousies between Catholic and Protestant. There was another measure carried this session in the spirit of religious liberality—that of the admission of Jews to municipal offices.

The Session of Parliament was terminated by the prorogation by the Queen on the 9th of August. In the usual Address to her Majesty the Speaker, in addition to his notice of the great financial measures of the session; the endowment of Maynooth; and the provision of the means of academical instruction in Ireland; adverted to two other labours in which the Commons had been engaged. The Session had been rendered unusually laborious by the rapid development of private enterprise in extending the railway communications of the kingdom; anticipating the most beneficial results from the facilities thus afforded to the internal trade of the country, they had devoted much time and labour to the legislation requisite for the construction and regulation of those important works. The condition of the destitute poor of Scotland was the other subject of general legislation which the Speaker recapitulated: "Assisted by the information which your Majesty has directed to be laid before us, we have made such amendments in the law as will provide for the more effectual relief of the poor, and for a better system of parochial management, under the control of a general Board of Supervision."

Parliamentary warfare was for a season at an end. The Queen and Prince Albert, on the day of prorogation, embarked at Woolwich on a visit to Germany. The prime minister gladly sought the retreat of Drayton-Manor, where the murmurs of his once devoted partisans could scarcely reach him. An observer of London fashionable life at this time has written—"The language of the Tory party is more bitter and violent against him [sir R. Peel] than ever I heard in society of the olden time from disappointed Whigs against Mr. Pitt. But I do not imagine this to be traced to a no-popery cry. If sir Robert had left the Corn-Laws untouched, he would have carried the Maynooth question by a triumphant majority without a schism. His inattention to what the landed interest call their agricultural distress, their apprehen-

sions that he will ultimately repeal those laws, and also his notorious neglect of those who, in good report and ill report, had stuck to his skirts till they had brought him through the battle, and then found that his patronage was lavished on their opponents—all these things have so embittered their minds that they have seized with readiness the first opportunity to stick their teeth in his flanks, and have rallied all the sectarian interests to take part in the *curée*.*

On the 31st of October, the Cabinet having been called together by sir Robert Peel, a meeting took place at his house, and on the following day the Cabinet again assembled. The "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," which were published by his executors in 1857, enable us now to trace with a distinctness which could not previously be derived from other sources, the beginning of that train of events which led to the repeal of the Corn-Laws. The documents which these Memoirs contain, relate to the information received by sir Robert Peel on the probable failure of the potato crop, and exhibit his correspondence on the subject with other members of the government. With something like an apology for giving these documents at length, he describes them as "the materials from which the future historian will extract that which is worthy of permanent record, and from which, with the aid of other contemporary evidence, he will pronounce his judgment on the motives and conduct of public men."†

There were three members of the government who, from their official station, were chiefly responsible at this time for instituting inquiries into the probability of a sudden and extensive defalcation in the ordinary supply of food, with a view to the adoption of measures calculated to mitigate the evil consequences of such a defalcation. These ministers were, the First Lord of the Treasury, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The correspondence between sir Robert Peel and sir James Graham goes on from the 12th of August to the 15th of October amidst alternations of hope and alarm. On the 15th, the official reports having assumed a very serious aspect, sir Robert writes—"My letter on the awful state of the potato crop in Ireland crossed yours to me. . . . Interference with the due course of the laws respecting the supply of food is so momentous and so lasting in its consequences, that we must not act without the most accurate information. I fear the worst." To obtain the most accurate information the prime minister dis-

* Raikes's "Diary," vol. iv. pp. 423-424.

† "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel" p. 107.

patched to Ireland two men eminent in their respective departments of science—Professor Lindley and Dr. Lyon Playfair. The reports of the Botanist and the Chemist were not calculated to mitigate the apprehensions of official and other observers in Ireland. The Secretary of the Irish Agricultural Improvement Society had obtained proofs that the entire potato crop was more or less affected in every part of the country; and he says that a panic had seized all parties to a greater extent than he ever remembered since the cholera. The alarm in Scotland was also great and rapidly increasing. Sir James Graham clearly sees what is at hand. "The Anti-Corn-Law pressure is about to commence, and it will be the most formidable movement in modern times."

Such was the information which sir Robert Peel had to lay before the Cabinet on the 31st of October. He told his colleagues in a Cabinet memorandum that "inaction—the letting things take their own course—seems to me impossible. . . . Inaction and indifference might involve the country in serious danger, and the government in the heaviest responsibility." It is unnecessary here to go through the various suggestions of the memorandum. The prime minister found few inclined to deal boldly with the danger: "It became evident that very serious differences of opinion existed, as to the necessity of adopting any extraordinary measures, and as to the character of the measures which it might be advisable to adopt."* The Cabinet separated, fixing another meeting for the 6th of November. The accounts received in the interim were not of a nature to allay the apprehensions of the week before. At that Cabinet sir Robert Peel proposed to issue immediately an Order in Council, remitting the duty on grain in bond to one shilling; opening the ports to the temporary admission of all grain at a smaller rate of duty. He further proposed to call parliament together on the 27th to ask for indemnity, and to declare an intention of submitting immediately after the recess a modification of the existing Corn-Laws. Three only of his colleagues gave their support to the First Lord of the Treasury—the earl of Aberdeen, sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert. On the 2nd of November lord Stanley wrote to sir Robert Peel to express the regret with which he saw how widely he differed in opinion with sir James Graham and himself, as to the necessity of proposing to parliament a repeal of the Corn-Laws. Sir Robert Peel replied that he had not proposed to the Cabinet that they should recommend to Parliament a repeal of the Corn-Laws; still less that they should offer

* "Memoirs," p. 148.

their advice to the Queen that the Corn-Laws ought to be abandoned.

On the 22nd of November lord John Russell addressed a public letter to the electors of the city of London, which began with stating precisely the same truth which sir Robert Peel had endeavoured to impress upon his Cabinet. "The present state of the country in regard to its supply of food cannot be viewed without apprehension. Forethought and bold precautions may avert any serious evils—indecision and procrastination may produce a state of suffering which it is frightful to contemplate." He complains that the queen's ministers had met and separated without affording any promise of seasonable relief. He points out that the duties on the importations of corn were so contrived, that "the corn barometer points to fair while the ship is bending under a storm." Then comes a declaration from the leader of the Whig party which forbids all further advocacy of "fixed duty" in opposition to "sliding scale." "I confess that on the general subject my views have in the course of twenty years undergone a great alteration. I used to be of opinion that corn was an exception to the general rules of political economy; but observation and experience have convinced me that we ought to abstain from all interference with the supply of food. Neither a Government nor a Legislature can ever regulate the corn market with the beneficial effects which the entire freedom of sale and purchase are sure of themselves to produce." It was no longer worth while, he said, to contend for a fixed duty; the imposition at present of any duty without a provision for its speedy extinction, would only prolong a contest already sufficiently fruitful of animosity and discontent. "Let us then unite to put an end to a system which has been proved to be the blight of commerce, the bane of agriculture, the source of bitter division among classes, the cause of penury, fever, mortality, and crime among the people." Sir Robert Peel prints this letter in his *Memoirs* with this observation:—"It was asserted by many who were careless about the foundation of their assertions, that I had been influenced in the advice which I offered to the Cabinet by the appearance of this letter. A simple reference to dates will prove that this could not have been the case."*

On the 25th and 26th of November the Cabinet was occupied in the discussion of instructions to be given to the Commission which had been appointed, for the consideration and adoption of such measures as might tend to mitigate the evil consequences of

* "Memoirs," p. 179.

the apprehended scarcity. These instructions were unanimously approved of by the Cabinet. Sir Robert Peel felt that the danger to be apprehended was so fully admitted and was set forth in such strong terms in the letter of the Secretary of State to the Lord Lieutenant, that it was "difficult to reconcile the issue of this letter with passiveness and inaction in respect to the means of increasing the supply of food." Before the instructions, therefore, contained in the letter were finally assented to by the Cabinet, he read to them a memorandum, of which the opening sentence was quite sufficient to indicate the final tendency of his opinions: "I cannot consent to the issue of these instructions, and undertake at the same time to maintain the existing Corn-Laws." On the 29th of November he put in circulation amongst his colleagues a memorandum, addressed in the first instance to the duke of Wellington, in which "are contained the reasons which induce me to advise the suspension of the existing Corn-Laws for a limited period." The answer of the duke of Wellington is very characteristic. He was of opinion that the government should avoid to break down the Corn-Laws till that measure should appear to be absolutely necessary. "But of this I do not entertain a doubt—if it is necessary to suspend the Corn-Laws to avoid real evils resulting from scarcity of food, we ought not to hesitate." The duke then comes to the Party View of the question which sir Robert Peel had not discussed—could he carry on a government for the Queen, supposing that the support of the landed interest were withdrawn from him? The duke was afraid that sir Robert Peel must reckon upon its being withdrawn from him, unless he should be able to show clearly the necessity of the measure in question. "In respect to my own course, my only object in public life is to support sir Robert Peel's administration of the government for the Queen." The duke, if sir Robert Peel thought that his position in parliament and in the public view required that the course should be taken which he recommended, had no hesitation in saying, "I earnestly recommend that the Cabinet should support him, and I for one declare that I will do so." Others of the Cabinet took a very different view. Mr. Goulburn writes to sir Robert Peel,—“an abandonment of your former opinions now would, I think, prejudice your and our characters as public men, and would be fraught with fatal results to the country's best interests. . . . In my opinion the Party of which you are the head is the only barrier which remains against the revolutionary effects of the Reform Bill.” Lord Wharncliffe was of opinion "that the Queen's speech, if it should ultimately be decided to recommend any modification or a tem-