

tered by profane adoration; revered to-day, discarded to-morrow; always jostled out of the place which nature and society would assign her, by sensuality or contempt; admired, but not esteemed; ruling by passion, not affection; imparting her weakness, not her constancy, to the sex she would exalt; the source and mirror of vanity—we see her as a wife, partaking the cares and cheering the anxiety of a husband; dividing his toils, by her domestic diligence; spreading cheerfulness around her, for his sake; sharing the decent refinements of the world, without being vain of them; placing all her joys and all her happiness in the man she loves. As a mother, we find her affectionate, the ardent instructor of the children, whom she has tended from their infancy; training them up to thought and virtue; to piety and benevolence; addressing them as rational beings, and preparing them to become men and women, in their turn. Mechanics' daughters should make the best wives in the world."

THE NO-CONFIDENCE DEBATE.—SIR ROBERT PEELE'S SPEECH.—LORD WORSLEY AND HIS COLLEAGUES—TORY TACTICS—THE SLIDING SCALE FOR THE AGRICULTURISTS, AND A LOW FIXED DUTY FOR THE TOWNS—BOTH CANNOT BE TRUE—WHICH IS?

Sir Robert Peel gave notice, on Monday last, of a Motion framed with characteristic cunning in the art of vote-catching, in the hope that, if carried by a majority, however small, and coupled with a similar expression of feeling in the House of Lords, it would compel the Government to have recourse to a Dissolution, without venturing to await the issue of the Corn-Law Debate.

We have expressed elsewhere our opinion of the impolicy of this step (as a Party move), and of its probable results; and we know that many Conservatives concur in our views. As to the motion itself, our Readers shall judge for themselves; but if they can draw from it any clear idea of the future course of the Peel Cabinet, they have much more penetration than we can boast of, and can see further into a mill-stone than the rest of the world.

"That her Majesty's ministers do not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry through the house measures which they deem of essential importance to the public welfare; and that their continuance in office, under such circumstances, is at variance with the spirit of the constitution."

These propositions Sir R. Peel worked out, on Thursday night, in a speech so tame, so spiritless, and so apologetic in many parts, that we doubt whether Lord Stanley will ever speak again of "the admirable ingenuity with which his Right Honourable Friend can dress up a statement for the House of Commons;" a quality which no one denies to him when his heart is in it, and his opinions coincide with the course which circumstances compel him to take.

The first half of his argument consisted in a labouring attempt to prove what no man doubts, that a Government is never respected, or respectable, if weak, and that the attempt to maintain a Minority in power, under a Representative system, by the favour of the Crown, neither can, or ought to, succeed.

He pleaded his own conduct in 1835, and that of the Duke of Wellington in 1830, as an illustration of this;—the Duke having thought it his duty to resign when left in a Minority of Five upon the Civil list, and he himself having given up the Government in 1835, the moment the House of Commons had declared against him upon a measure so important as the Irish Church. There was no analogy whatsoever between existing circumstances, and the case of Mr. Pitt in 1784. Mr. Pitt indeed held the Government in spite of a majority of the House of Commons, but upon the plea that the opposition of that majority to him was personal;—that the Resolutions, which it passed against him, were not founded upon any disapprobation of his measures,—for he had brought none forward,—but were a direct attack upon the right of the Crown to choose its own Ministers;—and that the King, in dissolving, appealed from a Faction to the Country.

Now, begging Sir R. Peel's pardon, there is some analogy here. The address of the majority of the House of Commons in 1784 against a Dissolution, was conceived in the same spirit that animates the majority now. The object in both cases is to secure a power concentrated in certain hands, against the consequences of a Popular Appeal. If Pitt had been forced to give up the Dissolution, which he contemplated as a last resource when he took office, he must have given up office too, and succumbed to that majority, whose tenure he consented to affirm. Just so, Lord Melbourne now. He never could in reason expect to carry the extensive changes proposed, in the present House of Commons, and he must give up those changes, or break up the majority which is opposed to them and him.

Sir Robert Peel does not deny the Constitutional right to do this, or dispute the fact that Parliaments have been dissolved upon lighter grounds. Under Mr. Perceval a dissolution took place because Ministers had only a majority of 46,—the ne plus ultra, we should imagine, of the most sanguine man's hopes on either side, in these degenerate days! But it is argued that a weak Government has no right to appeal from the Representative body to the Constituent body, because it has failed in carrying certain measures;—and weakness is a sin which Sir Robert Peel conceived he had brought home to the Government by a reference to its conduct upon the Appropriation Clause, the Jamaica Bill, and the present Budget.—Mr. Baring having submitted on Monday last, to the degradation of bringing in a Bill for the regulation of the Sugar Duties, upon the basis forced upon him by the Opposition, without one word of explanation, or apology.

Now, to us Mr. Baring's silence was remarkably significant. Lord Darlington understood it, if Sir Robert Peel did not; for as no man believes that the Government intends to continue in office in a minority, the means by which this minority was to be rectified, were sufficiently clear. We may admit, therefore, without scruple, that the attempt to govern permanently by the aid of a minority, "would be subversive of the authority both of the House of Commons, and of the Crown;"—that there are no "special circumstances," that can justify such a determination on the part of any Ministers, still less of a Government which, if it has not the Commons to sustain it, certainly has not the Lords;—and that if we admitted Ministers to be fit judges of those cases, in which an exception might be made to ordinary rules, we should have nothing but exceptions, and no rules at all.

All this is undeniable,—but it leaves the question of the appeal to the country untouched; and when Sir Robert Peel warns us of the perils of Agitation, and denounces the attempt to excite the public mind by the charms of a Duty of 1 Shilling per Bushel on wheat, we ask in return, whether, to avoid this excitement, we

must leave things for ever as they are? May not peace be too dearly bought, if national ruin is to be its price? And are we to submit to see the withering up of our resources, and the inevitable decay of our trade, in order to avoid that temporary suspension of business, and interference with the Retail Trade in wheat, (we use the Right Hon. Baronet's own words,) to which the agitation of the Corn Law Question may give rise?

Why, what a peddling pitiful argument, is this! If good for any thing it is good against all change under any circumstances, or at any time. Does Sir Robert Peel mean this? If so, why hold out a prospect of modifying the Sliding Scale, when he and his friends are in power. But nothing can be more disingenuous, more slippery,—(as Lord Palmerston called it,) than the conduct of the Conservatives upon this subject; for while Sir Robert Peel catches his agricultural gulls in the House of Commons by affecting to sneer at Lord Worsley's supposition that no one knew precisely the extent to which modifications might be carried in his hands, we are credibly informed that Sir George Murray, in Manchester, has been affecting to consider the Ministerial Duty as too high, and making a handsome bid of Six Shillings a Quarter, instead of Eight, as the Duty which he and his Party are prepared to support!

Now, this, if true, is most disingenuous; if not true, most disgraceful both to the party and the man. We believe it, because it is precisely the line taken by the Conservatives upon the Catholic question last year, when the rampant fanaticism of their Hastings orators was atoned for by a disgusting affectation of liberality in the House. But the trick is stale. It will not bear repetition. The Country demands not solemn plausibilities, but tangible facts;—and when Sir Robert Peel, at the close of his most insipid harangue, claimed credit for his frankness except in matters of Finance, we could not help thinking how few would care for declarations, in which the one essential, and indispensable thing was left out.

It is upon Finance that the question between the two parties now exclusively turns. We shall ask nothing about the Ballot, or Short Parliaments, or the Suffrage itself, at the coming Election, but simply whether a man means to give us Cheap Bread, and Free Trade? If he do he will serve our turn, for we prefer Mr. Baring's Budget, with all its uncertainties, to the certainty of a Loan to cover the Deficit of this year, and the total impossibility of speculating upon what next year may produce, which is all that is vouchsafed to us by Sir Robert Peel's exquisite caution in Finance.

Lord Worsley, who spoke after Sir Robert Peel, wiped out with a single remark, a large portion of his speech, for he said, (and very justly,) that if Votes of Confidence were worth any thing, the untoward remembrances of the appropriation Clause, and the Jamaica Bill, which the Member for Tamworth had invoked, were effaced by the Majority upon Sir John Yarde Bulwer's Motion last year. He should himself support the Government upon the present occasion, not conceiving that, because he differed with them upon one point, it was incumbent upon him to vote against them upon all.

This declaration drew down upon Lord Worsley a fierce attack from Mr. Christopher, who declared that no man had left the Lincolnshire County Meeting on Friday last, without a full conviction that he had withdrawn his confidence from the Ministry, in lieu of which he now headed the Renegade band, by which the Anti-Corn-Law Cabinet was to be saved! But Lord Worsley proved, by a reference to the report of his speech, that he had said nothing to warrant this impression, having expressed, in the strongest terms, his distrust of Sir Robert Peel, and expressly guarded himself against the supposition that he would either bring forward a vote of want of confidence, or concur in it if proposed.

Of Sir John Cam Hobhouse, and other intermediate speakers, Mr. D'Israeli, Sir Hesketh Fleetwood, and Mr. Walter, our limits do not permit us to say much; but Mr. Macaulay's speech, which ended the first night's Debate, deserves most honourable mention, for it was rich in matter, vigorous in tone, and striking both by the frankness of its admissions, and the manliness of its closing appeal.—Mr. Macaulay's argument was divided into two parts. In the first of which he proved that there was nothing in the practice, or spirit, of the Constitution, that rendered it incumbent upon a Government to resign because unable to carry new measures through Parliament. Mr. Pitt had not resigned when defeated upon the Fortification Bill, though his resolution declared it to be essential to the safety of the country. Lord Castlereagh had been beaten upon the Income Tax, yet remained in office; and Lord Stanhope, in earlier times, had continued Minister though the Peerage Limitation Bill was lost, to which the greatest importance was attached by the Government of that day.

But if occasional concessions to opinion were necessary before the passing of the Reform Bill, how was it possible to dispense with them now, when the power of sending members to the House of Commons had been transferred from Rotten Boroughs to large Constituencies, each of which expected to exercise some influence, if not control over the opinions of its Representative? The consequences of this were foreseen by the Duke of Wellington, who said, in 1831, that we should never have what was termed a strong Government again; and if the principle of the Constitution were rightly laid down by Sir Robert Peel,—if a Government was never to propose a measure in Parliament without carrying it, or resigning if it did not succeed,—the Resolution if adopted would establish a rule, that would inevitably prove fatal to his own Administration, sitting six months after it had raised him to power.

The Debate of Friday began with Mr. Milnes, of whom we fear that we can only say that he is too good a poet ever to make a good speaker on ordinary matters amongst practical men. His great gun proved to be loaded with Snipe-shot; and Mr. Darby, who followed him, had no shot at all;—so that unless it be determined by some overruling power that the Government shall die a violent death at the hands of Sir Robert Peel, there was nothing on the part of the Tory orators to inspire the slightest anxiety as to its fate.

Lord Teignmouth, indeed, affirmed that, to his certain knowledge, Ministers had lost the confidence of at least three hundred Chartists in Marylebone; but as his lordship admitted, with praiseworthy modesty, that it was very doubtful whether he should himself represent that Borough again, we may leave its opinion to be expressed, six weeks hence, upon somewhat better grounds, (as we have not the least doubt that it will be,) by Sir Charles Napier.

Lord Sandon argued that, Trade being bad, it was very imprudent, (we wonder he did not say very uncon-

stitutional,) to attempt anything for its relief; but, as Lord Morpeth justly remarked, if Trade were flourishing, nobody would wish to interfere. The motive for change consists in the universality of the distress; and change there must be, if this is ever to be relieved.

This was the feeling also of Mr. Hutt, and Mr. Sandford; while Mr. Grattan, whose wild and vehement eloquence is generally interspersed with many forcible truths, devoted himself to the task of proving that in Ireland, at all events, confidence could never be given to the Tories, although the House of Commons might choose to refuse it to the Whigs.

Lord Morpeth's speech was not equal to Mr. Macaulay's in power, but it announced unequivocally the intention of the Government not to resign until its measures had been submitted to a new Parliament, convened for the express purpose of determining their fate. The Country, in choosing those, who were to form this Parliament, would recollect that it knew everything on the one side, and nothing on the other; for Sir Robert Peel, as was usually the case when he promised peculiar frankness, had made it his study to leave the world particularly in the dark. The only point, upon which he had been explicit, was in vowing eternal adhesion to the Sliding Scale, and the people of England must determine whether this singular devotion to so slippery a path, should prove, or not, a passport to their confidence and to power.

As to the weakness of the Government, the proofs of it were singular. The name of England had never stood higher abroad than under that weak Government, which was now attacked; and at home the most alarming agitation that had appeared since 1793 had been put down, without any demand for extraordinary powers. There had been no suspension of the Habeas Corpus,—no Six Acts,—no Gagging Bills,—yet complete tranquillity was restored. The only proofs of weakness, therefore, were in the nicely balanced state of parties in that House; but was this an evil that a change of Government would remove? He saw no signs of it in the only measures that the Conservatives had tried themselves, for nothing could equal the contempt with which the resolution upon the sugar duties had been received. The country had been disgusted by its hypocrisy, and it had been literally scouted out of Exeter Hall. There was, therefore, no security that a Conservative Government would be better able to carry its measures than the Government that we had now; but there were measures which no Government could bring forward without being prepared to stand or fall by them. This was the case with the financial changes recently proposed. They were a change of system, not of particular taxes. The Government had seen the possibility of supplying the deficiency in the Revenue, not merely without detriment, but with advantage to the people. The Treasury would be enriched, yet the people relieved,—and when it recommended this change of system, it was fully prepared to abide the issue, and not to bow to any decision short of that of the country itself. To the country the matter would now be referred. If the deep feelings of 1831 were revived, the people would triumph over the class interests with which they had to contend. If the people were indifferent, the ministers would have the consolation of having done their duty honestly, and, after handing over the government to their opponents, would endeavour to advance, as private individuals, those principles which, as public men, they had done their utmost to promote.

Sir James Graham answered Lord Morpeth in the most slashing speech that has yet been made on the Tory side. This is natural. The Ex-Member for Cumberland speaks with the proverbial fervour of a Renegade; and he has, moreover, some personal objects in India, which sharpen, at the present moment, both his wits, and his appetite for power. We will not be induced, however by any dislike of the tone and temper of Sir J. Graham's speech, to deny its ability, which was unquestionable. It was well delivered, and skillfully conceived. The point about the Poor Laws was admirably made, for there can be no doubt that it would have been infinitely better to ask, in the first instance, for the minimum of power, and then to carry the Law unchanged, than to ask for everything, and then to give up so much, that no one can now foresee in what the measure will end.

But it is in his personalities that Sir James Graham stands unrivalled. His bitter sarcasm upon "Whigs crouching under the prerogative of the Crown," (he would have said *petticoat*, had he dared, for that is the usual Tory phrase,) "and pleading the precedent of Mr. Pitt,"—drew cheers from the Tory benches louder, and longer, far, than any that had greeted Sir Robert Peel;—but even the most enthusiastic of his admirers were astounded at the cool impudence of the man, whom they follow, yet dislike, and despise, when, turning to the Treasury Bench, he said,—"I abide by Mr. Fox!"

He then reprobated all delay in dissolving. It was an *interregnum*. The Dissolution should be instant. A beaten Ministry had no right to ask the House to proceed with the Supplies; and if they delayed that appeal to the Country, with which they presumed to threaten the House, he hoped and predicted, that, in a new Parliament, Avengers would be found of the insulted dignity of the old.

But the Dissolution itself was unjustifiable. The advice to dissolve was *Revolutionary*. (Here, Lord John Russell whispered across the table the word "1831," when the same advice tendered by Sir James Graham, and acted upon by the Crown, was designated as *Revolutionary* by Sir H. Hardinge, who now sits by his side.) Mr. Tierney, in 1807, had said that nothing but the malice of the Devil himself could have recommended the Dissolution at a moment when the cry of "the Church in danger" was raised;—and was there less danger in the cry of cheap bread? Had not agitation begun in high places? Did not Lord Morpeth say last year that Religion itself prescribed an alteration in the Corn Laws?—(great cheers from the Ministerial side)—and had not Lord John Russell himself affirmed that "the beneficent designs of Providence were counteracted by the short-sighted policy of man?" (Immense cheers.) The men, who held this language, yet disclaimed agitation, were like Sampson sending out 300 Foxes into the corn fields of the Egyptians, with firebrands tied to their tails. They were Pirates firing the Magazine. The Eight Shilling Duty was a desperate plunge of desperate men. But their reign was over—their power gone;—and Entreaty with which she had ever been cursed!

There is power in this, but neither justice, nor decency, when we recollect that no man dipped deeper in the ham in 1831.—What he did then he now decries! He was the Prince of Agitators—the most daring of Pirates—the largest Fox-preserver, (for incendiary purposes,) in the three kingdoms;—and if he have not some reminiscences upon this subject brought home to him by Lord John Russell, not easily to be reconciled with the prin-

ciples, of which he now professes to be the champion, we are much mistaken in our man. Our only regret is, that so unblushing a censor should be left one hour unexposed; but as Sir James Graham took care to exceed considerably in his own speech the limits, within which it is usual to confine an Adjourned Debate, we must wait until after the Whitsuntide Recess before we can hope to see the chastisement inflicted, which no man more richly deserves.

TRUE USES OF A FALLING REVENUE. (From the London Examiner.)

"It is a melancholy reflection," says Dean Tucker, in one of his many admirable tracts on commercial subjects, "but for the most part it is too true, that nations, as nations, never can learn Wisdom till necessity becomes their School mistress." Perhaps the best criterion of the truth of the remark is to be found in the shifts and expedients of Chancellors of the Exchequer. But as the present necessities of Mr. Baring are great, we would fain hope that he may profit by the lessons of his perhaps unwelcome teacher. Her authority just now must be acknowledged. Not only a Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the whole nation, is her pupil. Whether either the one or the other will imbibe wisdom from her teaching remains to be seen. If Mr. Baring however do but expound the lessons of wisdom, he may learn at her hands, clearly and firmly, we venture to predict, that the nation, if not the House of Commons, will not only profit by, but adopt them.

The revenue is declining. The expenditure of the country is increasing. The per centage patchwork of last year, which was restored to for the purpose of raising our income to the level of our expenditure, has failed, as we predicted when the experiment was made.

The income we were to derive from the additional ten per cent. upon our Customs, Excise, and Taxes, had scarcely yielded a paltry five per cent. The country looked on and smiled at beholding another Chancellor of the Exchequer attempting to resist the financial axiom, that in taxation two and two do not make four. The effort, indeed, was only worthy of a disciple of the school of Vansittart; and the result was about as abortive as the financial schemes of the Master.

But though the attempt to increase the revenue, by directly augmenting the tax upon every raw material and necessary of life failed, as it ought always to fail, the object aimed at, the placing of our income and expenditure on a level, must be accomplished.

It is a question as earnestly as universally asked, by every one, who knows the perilous nature of the pressure upon our trade and our population at home at the present moment, and upon our widely scattered interests abroad;—what will the Chancellor of the Exchequer do? We are by no means in that thriving and contented state at home which a statesman, either in or out of place, would desire to contemplate. There is a strong sense gaining ground of the injurious tendency of our system of taxation. It has recently manifested itself in many large and respectable public meetings, both in England and Scotland, held in several of our most important commercial cities and towns. Free trade, as far as the just necessities of our revenue will permit, and a revision of the tariff, have been loudly called for and most ably advocated. Not by interested partisans or mischievous demagogues; the subject is one far too practically useful for them; but by men of all parties, and by some of the ablest and most experienced authorities in matters of this kind amongst us. Hence any renewal of *Vansittartism* would be scouted with derision through the country. The country fully admits the necessity of meeting all necessary expenditure, but demands, not clamorously but resolutely, that this object shall be attained justly and honestly.

The people, if Mr. Baring will do his duty, have been sufficiently ground down by unjust and selfish taxation, to appreciate his difficulties and sustain him in his conflicts with interested prejudice and short-sighted selfishness, if he will but be bold enough to recast and distribute fairly, the burdens of taxation. He may remove the pressure upon our trade, and our customs will decline no longer. *Le mal* lighten the weight of taxation and allay every unreasonable murmur against it. He may render trade more profitable and more productive of benefits and blessings to every class of the community.

There is but one rule to adopt, and once adopted resolutely to follow. *Abolish every protective duty, strictly such, and impose duties only for the purposes of revenue.* Protective duties are taxes for private advantage. Revenue duties are necessary taxes for private and national objects.

"The duties upon the importation of foreign raw materials," says Dean Tucker again, as long ago as 1787, "to be employed in our own manufactures, are so many fetters and chains to prevent the progress of labour and cultivation of wealth. These imposts were first laid on under a notion of promoting the landed interest; but happy would it have been for those kingdoms if the landed gentlemen had understood their interests before they attempted to show their zeal in promoting it." We incline to the hope, then, that Mr. Baring will turn his adversities to account; that he will fix his eye steadily upon the interests of the people, and disdain to heed the merely temporary interests of a party.

The Colonial Resolutions and the East India Rum Bill are but an earnest of what we trust will be done on a more extended scale, to ameliorate the condition of our commercial and manufacturing interests at home.

"Taxation and representation ought to be co-extensive" is a political deposit, increasing and consolidating in the public mind by reason of the unrepresented being taxed in a larger proportion than the represented. Thus "buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest" is an economical truth acquiring solidity and form, because almost all have long laboured to prove its efficacy in that branch of trade in which they are engaged.

The manufacturers say, naturally, if you maintain it as a practical truth for yourselves, that selling in the dearest market and buying in the cheapest is best for you, why compel us to buy in the dearest market and sell in the cheapest? Allow us to try your own maxim. We have always more cloth to sell than you want to buy; you have never come us at competition prices, and you compel us to buy of you at the price of monopoly.

The truth, however, is precipitating gradually among us, and unless our rulers are wise enough to gather it up and turn it to account in time, others will, who may use it much as an empiric uses those medicines which are of undoubted efficacy in competent hands, but in his more likely to engender than to cure disease.

But then those truths involve a reduction of duties, and a time when our existing duties yield a reluctant and declining income. They do. "The surrender of revenue for the great commercial purposes," said Mr. Pitt, in his speech on the commercial treaty with France, "was a policy by no means unknown in the History of Great Britain."—"Taking this evil at the worst, a surrender of revenue for great commercial purposes was not contradictory to sound policy, nor to established practice." But a surrender of revenue for great commercial purposes is not synonymous with a surrender of income. Fact after fact, measure after measure, attest the difference. The whole course of Mr. Huskisson's policy proved it.

In Mr. Pitt's time, moreover, what was the revenue derived from corn, sugar, timber, &c.? a revenue as unjust as it is impolitic; the offspring of war and of self interest only; and striking at the root of the health, the peace, and prosperity of the country. A surrender of revenue in these cases would be an augmentation of income. Justice and policy would both command it.

It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it marble. It would be a nobler boast, and of infinitely greater importance to mankind, if our Sovereign should be able to say that she found the tariff of her kingdom oppressive and unjust, and she left it just; that she found it framed to benefit the rich; she left it framed to benefit all; that she found it framed to restrict the supply

of food, removed, ment can. This is the Sovereign's duty, to improve the civilization. BARRIS assemble, Exeter I man; an Lord M. Gichfield the Bishop. The state issued du the establish issues in as been inguig, re no, near war. The at, in held, the Cl, pring it, the platf, ionally, nately, receipts of £90,18 ng, toget 238,916 set-off which te GRANT, just issu amount to. A han been circ month of Rear A. he new i, Sir W, ke the upper. CEYLON, th of Ap that Islan embarked arrived of Account and gone. THE UN present wo. BOSTON, east of P, aft Boston, mined 4, ead, an PIRACY, extract fro, net of pira, sailed from, number of, discovered, no one n. THE LAT, The peo, Admral S, nscript, unity wit, before, so, exercise, hind and, lives have, but the ne, looked-for, feelings of, generated i, ed—requir, pleasure o, with prof, community, tributed so, With the, possessed, virtue. Fr, we can o, public car, Harvey, K, He was n, out in Lo, raised to, commande, the Price, year. He, Surinam, and Swed, passage o, the rank of, 10th Janu, White. He, get in the, Stations, in, sons and f, mand of t, was the Ad, 37th year.— SCANDAL, alous repo, generally b, the ill-fate, taken from, rounds of t, We recei, Stage to-ni, which cont. We recei, Eastport, Capt. He, reports, on Sat, the Steame, what place, One rep, Edward Is, berg and in, on board R, three or fo, carried in, Captain J, St. John, regarding, the above r, We need, such news.