

no knowing what next he may offer at.—*Monthly Magazine.*

MODESTY.—Modesty is a kind of shame or bashfulness, proceeding from the sense a man has of his own defects, compared with the perfections of him whom he comes before. And that which is modesty towards men, is worship towards God. It is a virtue that makes a man unwilling to be seen, and fearful to be heard; and yet, for that very cause, never fails to make him both seen with favour and heard with attention. It loves not many words, nor, indeed, needs them; for modesty addressing any one of a generous worth and honour, is sure to have that man's honour for its advocate and his generosity for its intercessor. And how then is it possible for such a virtue to run into words? Loquacity storms the ear, but modesty takes the heart; that is troublesome; this gentle, but irresistible.—*South.*

DISTANCES OF THE PLANETS FROM THE SUN.—The vast extent of the solar system is but vaguely to be conceived from the ordinary mode of stating it in millions of miles. To demonstrate it in a more striking and impressive manner, a continental astronomer has proposed, or rather renewed, the proposal, that the computed distances of the planets be measured by comparison with the velocity of a cannon ball, rated at 11.2 German miles per minute. With this velocity a cannon ball, fired from the sun, would reach the planet Mercury in nine years and six months; Venus, in 18 years; the Earth, in 25; Mars, in 38; Jupiter, in 130; Saturn, in 238; and Uranus, (Merschell,) in 439 years. With the same velocity a shot would reach the Moon from the Earth in 25 days, little more than three weeks.

HONOUR.—Princes may confer honours, or, rather names and titles of honour. But they are a man's and woman's own actions which must make him or her truly honourable; and every man's life is the herald's office, from whence he must derive and fetch that which must blazon him to the world; honour being but the reflection of a man's own actions, shining bright in the face of all about him, and from thence rebounding upon himself.—*South.*

COMBINATION OF PRODIGES.—The old Duke of Norfolk was a prodigious profligate, a prodigious politician, and a prodigious eater. He had the art of throwing three dinners into one; 'I first take fish and my bottle of claret,' said he, 'and then I go to dinner.' All idlers and idle nations are great eaters. The Italian will eat macaroni as a horse eats grass, every hour in the day, and, perhaps, in the night too. The French gourmand will begin his dinner by eating a dinner of oysters. The Russian noble gets drunk with brandy before he gets drunk with wine; and, having finished his wine, gets drunk with brandy again.

POLISH PROVERB.—'You may strip a Pole to his shirt—but if you attempt to take his shirt, he will regain all.'

POLITICAL EXTRACTS

FROM THE LIVERPOOL ALBION.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

It cannot but have been remarked, that, of late, both within and without the walls of Parliament, men's minds have, in an unusual degree, been directed to the consideration of the established church of this country; and, from the indications of feeling on this subject amongst the community generally, and the admission of several influential churchmen themselves, we think it evident, that, ere long, the principle of reform will be applied to our ecclesiastical establishment, as well as to other existing institutions.

We are not among those who think that such interference with the constitution of the Church of England will take place as the result of the contemplated reform in our representative system, but rather as the necessary consequence of that spirit of inquiry and improvement which has, within the last few years, been so widely diffused in this country. Even the reform bill itself is the offspring, not the parent, of this sifting, scrutinizing principle, which is, we believe, destined to work most important (we wish they may all be beneficial) changes in the policy of the empire.

That the established church needs renovation in several points of its economy is past all dispute, and is, indeed, acknowledged by not a few of its own writers. We need only refer to the evils arising from the existence of pluralities, the inequality of

the church livings, non-residence, and the system of patronage as at present exercised in the church, as in themselves rendering an alteration in these respects imperative and inevitable. But, perhaps, among the causes which have contributed to render the establishment unpopular, by much the most influential has been the system of tithes. We have no intention to call in question the right of the clergy to the provision which has, from time immemorial, been allotted to them by the state. As a body of men set apart for the religious instruction of the community, they are, doubtless, clearly entitled to a competent provision, as much as any class of men can be. The objection therefore, to the tithe system does not lie so much to the amount thereby raised for the support of the clergy, as to the obnoxious mode by which it is derived; and we have no hesitation in saying, that, as a tax on the agricultural interests of the country, it must always be productive of dissension and animosity between those who, of all men, ought to be connected by the kindest and most endearing ties; in order that the one party may derive the greatest possible benefit from the spiritual instructions of the other.

Actuated ourselves by friendly feelings towards the establishment, which, from its antiquity, the venerableness of its character, as the parent from whom the various denominations of professing Christians now existing in our country have sprung, and its having served as the depository of those important principles of scriptural truth, for the maintenance and transmission of which to posterity our fathers suffered and bled, is entitled, at least, to the respect of every Englishman, we cannot but hope, that churchmen themselves will be among the first to originate measures for the removal of the abuses existing in their church, and at some of which we have merely glanced. Such a voluntary procedure, emanating from within the establishment itself, would tend much to allay the prejudice now felt by many against it, and, in all probability, prevent the adoption of measures which, being originated from without, might, while they professed to aim at its reformation, actually tend to undermine and lay prostrate the whole fabric, or, at least, so cripple its energies, as to render it unable any longer to operate beneficially on the mass of the people.

The adoption by the House of Lords of a bill for regulating pluralities, and that at the instance of the highest dignitary of the church, gives ground for thinking, that such a hope of reformation in the establishment, by means of the parties immediately concerned, has some prospect of being realized, and we trust this incipient step is but the precursor of other and more decisive measures for the removal of nuisances connected with the Church of England, and which have already gone very far to weaken the ties of affection and attachment subsisting between that church and not a few of its own professed members, while they have served to furnish those who are unfriendly to all religion with a handle for misrepresentation and abuse, which it is, on all accounts, desirable should be obviated by any concession not involving the sacrifice of principle.

The following extracts we take from a Pamphlet recently published by Mr Ridgway, entitled—'WHAT WILL THE LORDS DO?'

'The House of Lords is composed chiefly of men of a certain age, who have led an easy inactive life; of men of large hereditary possessions, and high undisputed hereditary rank; of men who have been placed at what is termed the head of their families; and who, having married early, have generally large families, and domestic habits. Such men, having met with few sturdy obstacles in their course, are prone, on the one hand, to an exaggerated confidence in their own powers, and on the other, liable to a decreasing resolution, as they meet with an increasing and enduring opposition. Such men, too, enjoying the rich bounties conferred on them by the law of the land, are likely to attach a peculiar importance to legal rights and prescriptive usages, and to view, with a strong and natural antipathy, any line of reform that questions ancient privileges. The centres, also, of small circles, these dispensers of patronage and favour are liable to become men of flattered vanity; impatient of contradiction; fond of power, practisers and enforcers of obedience; men of small enterprise; averse from exhibition; prompt to command, willing to enforce, but slow and lax to execute. Such seem to be the general characteristics of the lords. They are qualities which may easily commit them to the strife, but will not assuredly carry them through the long and arduous struggle they may provoke. In social life, as landlords, magistrates, and lieutenants, they are generally respected and praised. Those who are within the sphere of their acquaintance consider themselves honoured by their notice, and those who are their dependants are often proud of their connexion; but yet how small are the diverging ripples of this influence in comparison to the vast ocean of British society. In a few remote districts, the large territorial peer may have some weight; but, in the living fact of our towns, markets, and ports, he is as nothing. The wide and compact chain of middle life runs its circle through the shipping, banking, manufacturing, mining, trading ranks, with scarce a connecting, much less an influential link between itself and the peerage. In the army and in the navy, the church, and the higher law, the influence of the lords is considerable, but the two first of those professions have happily small political weight; the third is at this moment in a state to require rather than to afford aid; and the stirring talent of the poorer followers of the law is more than a match for the well patronized and well-paid occupants of the higher seats.'

It would, indeed, be strange, if men who are placed by fortune beyond the necessity of exertion, should not be weaker and more irresolute than their less fortunate neighbours. The merits of the founders of the families enable the descendants to dispense with merit.

There have been (says the writer) and are many bright exceptions, men of grateful dispositions and philosophic minds, who, in the midst of every means of indulgence, have, with a wise industry, lived as if they believed that the tenure by which they held their proud station in the world was the attainment and diffusion of knowledge, the promotion of happiness, and the guardianship of the people; men, who considered that the law, which constituted them hereditary legislators, called upon them, under an awful responsibility, carefully to qualify themselves for their high and arduous functions. But such exceptions render more

glaring the general rule of those who seem to think pleasure and amusement the sole fit object of their lives, and that industry would derogate from their nobility.

'This lagging behind the intellect of the day has alienated much of the affections and respect of a large portion of the community, while the place-hunting propensities of some noble families, who have addicted themselves to politics, have fearfully detracted from a belief in public honour and patriotism. Now, while such has been the conduct of individual peers, the enactments of their collective wisdom have not been of a nature to call forth love and honour. The lords have sedulously obeyed every minister, and harshly adopted every coercive act of each successive cabinet. No one liberal, reforming, popular measure has originated in their house; many of such a nature which the commons have sent up have been by them rejected or defeated, while they have carefully abstained from exercising their restrictive privilege, by softening the rigour, abating the extravagance, or enlarging the policy of any one of those unpopular acts in which the commons have too frequently indulged. Once, and once only, did the peers give way, and wisely; for they retrieved, as far as in them lay, the evil of their previous opposition, regained credit with all good men, and saved Ireland from a convulsion. May they now, when the question at issue is the peace of the whole empire, go and do likewise. Still this one wise act of grace is a solitary exception to their favourite pursuit of a restrictive policy, which, however irritating, has hitherto proved not the less vain; for the people have gained ground, and the peers now witness the consequences of thwarting opposition, coupled with niggard and reluctant concession. They see on the part of the people, an appetite for reforms, heightened by delay, and they acknowledge, while they complain of, a daily decay of respect towards themselves as individuals, and of public influence as a body.'

Having thus described the qualities of the body, the writer proceeds to consider their inclinations with regard to the reform bill, and he does not disguise his opinion, that they are either openly or secretly hostile to it. 'At the outset I am prepared (he says) to grant the general, though partially concealed, hatred of a vast majority of the House of Lords to the Reform Bill, indeed to all Parliamentary Reform. The practices to which it tends to put an end, have been precisely those illegal means by which the peers have endeavoured to supply that hold on the state which they have loosened by their unpopular acts as a body, and their lack of industry and attainments as individuals. And yet in truth, not a small portion of this loss of real power is attributable to the practice of these very means, and the false confidence it has inspired.' We fear there is but too much foundation for this opinion of the hatred of a vast majority of the House of Lords to all Parliamentary Reform. But will they reject the bill? The writer thinks they will not, because their object object can be obtained as effectually and with less danger by the measure.

'I cannot believe that a body of staid, sober, wealthy, elderly gentlemen; fathers, too, of large and affectionate families, should, for the sake of an opinion, meditate a proceeding so nearly approaching to a political *felo-de-se*. And I am the more inclined to this charitable opinion of their discretion, when I see that their object, if their object be to defeat the bill, can be as effectually gained by side winds, and flank movements, as by direct opposition. Half measures will here, for once, be as effectual as whole; and, from their nature, are as peculiarly fitted for the affections and exigencies of weak bodies. To these, then, I fear they will have recourse; willingly would I believe that they would, with a manly courage and patriotic ardour, accede to the honest demands of their countrymen: that they would, magnanimously, place themselves within the circle of the interests and the affections of their native land. But I much fear, that without a struggle, they will not do so; and I more fear, that after a struggle, it will no longer be in their power to do so.'

The writer then proceeds to state the manner in which they will most probably proceed;

'I pass over the consequences of positive rejection; because, though they might be more sudden and severe in their operation, they would not be different in their nature. I assume then, that we shall hear of motions for adjournment till after Christmas, and for various essential modifications and perversion of the bill. There will be no doubt as to the covert intention of such proceedings, however much disguised by outward protestations. They will be received and met by the country and ministers as direct attacks on the bill itself. The day of trial will come. The speeches will have been made, the votes given. Who have it? The eyes!—joy, reconciliation, peace! the noise!—a dead silence! At that moment some peer may wish he had voted otherwise; but too late the struggle has begun: the first blow struck, Lord Grey (and in his name I include the whole cabinet) must resign or acquiesce. He resigns. Who will take his place? Will you, my Lords Mansfield and Whinchelsea? Will Sir Robert Peel? Will the Duke of Wellington? Will my Lord Londonderry or his Highness of Cumberland? Who will be the British Polignac? He must be a bold man; for, with a small declared majority in the weakest fraction of the state, whose construction is essentially defensive, he must be prepared for a contest with the offensive vigour and growing energies of the Commons, fresh from their elections; he must be prepared to find them backed by the angry enthusiasm of the people, supported by the mighty efforts of the press, and sanctioned by the approval of the most popular Monarch that