

From the Examiner.

[Few reasonable people will refuse their assent to the proposition that the *Tory* Dukes and Barons and the *Bishops* are more dangerous enemies to the State than all the *Rokites* and *Whiteboys* of Ireland ever were or can be. This view of the matter is pleasantly taken by our contemporary, in the course of the following article.]—*Bell's Messenger.*

THE MINISTRY, THE PRESS, AND THE PEERS.

"When Isaac Walton directs the method of passing the hook through the body of a frog, he says—'Use him as your friend'; with this amicable spirit the *Times* has been handling His Majesty's Ministers, formerly known by the style and addition of 'our excellent Ministers,' but now bearing no better name than that of His Majesty's.—Among the many handsome things said by the *Times*, 'more,' as it explains, 'in shame and sorrow than in anger,' is the following:—'These helpless gentlemen require every thing to be done for them, but have scarcely ever the courage to face an enemy, or the gratitude or generosity to assist a friend.' We may stop with this citation; it is short, but comprehensive as Isaac Walton's hook. It may be observed of the politics of the *Times* and *Chronicle*, that they are like two buckets in a well, when one goes down the other goes up, and so on, by contraries; when the *Times* is ministerial, the *Chronicle* is radical; when the *Times* grows, the *Chronicle* excuses. The *Chronicle* of Friday, taking up Ministers as the *Times* has thrown them down, and endeavouring to wipe the dirt off them, and put them on their legs, says—'Our readers will do us the justice to admit that at an early period we predicted the difficulties in which Ministers would be placed, between the Conservatives and the Radicals.' We are attentive readers of the *Chronicle*, but we cannot say that we remember its prediction of the difficulties in which Ministers would be placed between the Conservatives and the Radicals; we have however, a perfect recollection of the *Chronicle's* prediction of the difficulties in which Ministers would place themselves between the Conservatives and the Radicals. There is all the difference in the world between the active and the passive of the verb in these circumstances. Ministers pursuing a shabby policy, have run themselves into a false position. To borrow a homely proverb, 'As they made their bed they must lie in it.'—It has all been their doing. They have no stars to lay it to or destiny. The whole game was in their own hands, and they would finesse the knave. * * * The *Chronicle* says—'Ministers are honest and determined to proceed as far as they can, with the existing Constitution, in the course of amelioration.' Why does the *Chronicle* limit Ministers to the existing Constitution,

which is as wax in their hands? In the case of Ireland they have shown us that they will not scruple to violate the Constitution for a course of promised amelioration. They have furnished us with all appropriate arguments. They have said that when institutions esteemed the most valuable become inapplicable or antagonist to their objects, they must be set aside or suspended. The Lords are now intimidating the State, the Duke of Wellington is Captain Rock, the Bishops are the Whiteboys. The necessary improvement of the country is at a stand because every good measure is sure, in proportion to its virtue, of the hostility of these prelatary bands. Can such a state of things be submitted to? is it not imperative that something must be done to protect the public interests against this perversion of a power intended for their promotion? This is not the case of a district, a province, a country, but the case of an Empire. The intimidation deterring the servants of the Crown from measures just and requisite for the good of the people must be grappled with, if needs be, by a violation of the form of the Constitution to preserve its spirit, (as ministers phrased it a few days ago in Parliament,) and we can show by the high authorities of the Lords Brougham, Grey and Althorp, that the greater the invasion of the Constitution the safer; and as we have got our hands in for suspending institutions, a great one may easily, and in perfect consistency with the newest principles of safety, be suspended upon the appearance of the necessity, the proof of which however, may by present precedent, be rested on notoriety. Not that we have any occasion for a suspension of the institution, except as it accords with the fashionable doctrine of the safety of extreme derangements of the Constitution, for the House which holds the purse, holds the forge of all the authorities, and may melt, solder, and hammer out any forms at pleasure. Again we repeat, Lord Grey has shown us a short and easy way with Constitutions, and where good government is concerned, as he himself observes, what should be suffered to stand in its way? Certainly not the institutions whose purpose is to serve to good government.

From the Dispatch.

[The increase of pauperism during the last five or six years, is, indeed, "frightful": and at present we see no prospect of a more cheerful scene: the government is determined to exact "tithes and taxes" to the uttermost farthing, and to drive thereby the honest man to the workhouse or the gallows.]—*Bell's Messenger.*

FRIGHTFUL PROGRESS OF PAUPERISM.

"From Returns made to Parliament of the sums levied and expended for the relief of the poor of England, it appears that, in 1827, they amounted to
1828, to 7,807,968l
1829, to 7,670,433
1830, to 7,612,739
1831, to 8,161,280

1831, to 8,339,700
1832, (ending 25th March) 8,684,460
Is not this truly appalling? The amount, as the rate of increase, alike unexampled? Nearly nine millions required to sustain the destitute poor of by far the richest and still most productive country in the world! A sum more sufficient to defray the entire cost of the whole of the public services of the country (were a proper economy exercised)—the Court, the Parliament, the Tribunals, the Army, the Navy—nay, and even the Church-boat. Well may the English boast of being a matchless people! For extremes of every sort, we will match them against the world. There is no people so wealthy that we could not count ducats with them twice over; none so beggarly that we could not in one week show more papers than they could do in a whole twelvemonth. Free we are to a proverb, "glorious and free;" yet such slaves as to be, at the same time, that no man can leave the place of his birth to escape the shame of pauperism, except at the risk of being proclaimed a rogue and a vagabond. In many places the pressure of the poor's rates has been such as already to force large portions of land out of cultivation; in others, it has caused land to be abandoned altogether. In the parish of Cholesbury, Bucks for instance, where sixty years ago there was but one person who received parish relief, nearly three-fourths of the inhabitants are now paupers; the rates greatly exceed the rents, and the land with the exception of some sixteen acres, is wholly abandoned. No more difference of management could, of course, have brought about such a change as this; it must have been produced by some deep- seated cause which is preying more or less on the vitals of the entire community. We are well convinced that what has happened at Cholesbury is but a type of what will happen every where, if things go on much longer in the way they have been doing for the last six years; the poor's rates will ultimately swallow up the whole landed rental of England; all the movable wealth of the country will be transferred to other and happier lands; and Old England will be reduced from its once "high and palmy" condition to a state of universal desolation and ruin. Now, what we complain of, in common with many reflecting persons, is that neither this poor-Law Inquiry, nor any one of the Inquiries, which the present Ministers have set on foot, offers any promise of going to the root of this overwhelming evil. Each is something very good in its way, but the whole together do not make up that comprehensive and thorough investigation of the whole system of society in England, which is so imperatively demanded, by our present Mr. Huskisson is initiated, very clearly (he was out of office then), the kind of inquiry that was wanted, when, in calling for a revision of the taxation, he observed: "The more general considerations which now claim the attention of the House, are these: First—That no other country in Europe has so large a proportion of its taxation bearing directly upon the income of labor, and productive capital; Secondly—That in no other country of the same extent, I think I might say, in no one of five times the extent of this kingdom—is there so large a mass of income belonging to classes who do not directly employ it in bringing forth the produce of labour: Thirdly—That no other country has so large a proportion of its taxation mortgaged; and Fourthly—That from no other country in the world does so large a proportion of the class not engaged in production (including many of the wealthy) spend their incomes in foreign parts." Mr. Huskisson thought as we do, that you