

favourite wine—but only with the young gentlemen from Cambridge, Sir.

“And your claret?”
“My good, wholesome port again, Sir. Three wines out, three waters in, one pinch of tartaric acid, two ditto orris powder. For a fuller claret, a little brandy—for a lighter claret, more water.”

“But how did you contrive about Burgundy?”
“That was MY CLARET, Sir, with from three to six drops of bergamot, according as gentlemen liked a full flavour or a delicate flavour. As for champagne Sir, that, OF COURSE, I made myself.”

“How do you mean of course, Burley?”
“Lord, Sir,” said he, with an innocent yet waggish look; “surely every body makes his own champagne—else what can become of all the gooseberries?”

GEORGE III. AND BENTHAM.—The first writings Mr Bentham committed to the press, were letters in a newspaper, on the affairs of Europe, somewhere about the close of the American war, which had the singular distinction of being answered by George III. The King published his letter in a Hague journal; it was replied to by Mr Bentham, and most unmercifully dissected; probably in that manner in which we know he afterwards so much excelled—the application of the test of analysis. The King learned who the writer was and never forgot him. Mr Bentham's bill for the establishment of a Panopticon prison for the reform of criminals, had passed the two Houses of Parliament, and the King had the pen in his hand to sign it, when he asked Lord Shelburne who it was that had undertaken this scheme. The answer was, “Mr Bentham, of Lincoln's-inn.” “Bentham!” said the King, and put down his pen. The bill never received the royal assent; the scheme was obliged to be given up, and Mr Bentham was saddled with a large pecuniary loss—a thing he cared little for in comparison to the defeat of his benevolent project. This story Mr Bentham had from the lips of Lord Shelburne himself.—*New Monthly Magazine for July.*

FACETIE.

HOW TO BE REVENGED ON A HACKNEY COACHMAN—It is of little use to call him “a rascal, a scoundrel, a thief, an imposter, a blackguard, a villain, a ragamuffin, a-what you please;” all that he is used to—it is his mother-tongue, and probably, his mother's. But look him steadily and quietly in the face, and say, “Upon my word, I think you are the ugliest fellow ever I saw in my life,” and he will instantly roll forth the brazen thunders of the charioteer Salomeus as follows:—“Hugly! what the hell are you? You a gentleman! Wly—!” So much easier it is to provoke, and therefore to vindicate, (for passion punishes him who feels it more than those whom the passionate would execrate) by a few quiet words, the aggressor, than by retorting violently. The “coals of fire” of the Scripture are benefits; but they are not the less “coals of fire.”—*Moore's Life of Byron.*

A poor country hawker being detected in the act of shooting a butcher bird, was taken before a justice. “So, fellow,” cried Mitimus, “you think fit to shoot without a license, do you?” “Oh, no, your honour,” cried the offender, “I have a license for *hawking*,” so saying, he handed him his pedlar's license, and the bird shot being proved a *hawk*, the man was discharged.

The Metropolitan attributes the following *jeu d'esprit* to Yates, of the Adelphi “When does an Alderman look like a ghost?”—Answer, “When he's a *gobbling*.”

Captain Munday in his visit to Longwood, Saint Helena, states, that Napoleon's parlour is turned into a receptacle for a thrashing-machine. There is nothing incongruous in this as it was previously occupied by one who directed in his day more human thrashing machines than any one on record.

A DIVING BELLE.—A certain lady, whose Paul-Pry propensities led her to be always diving into other people's affairs, has got the appropriate name of the “Diving-Belle.”

ROOT AND BRANCH.—Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, was accustomed to make an annual feast, to which she invited all her relations. At one of these family meetings she drank their health, adding “What a glorious sight it is to see such a number of branches flourishing from one root!” but observing Jack Spencer laugh, insisted on knowing what occasioned his mirth, promising to forgive him, be it what it would. “Why then, madame, said he, I was thinking how much more the branches would flourish if the root was under ground.”

A physician, the other day, meandering on the bank

of the canal in St. James's park, was amusing himself with throwing pieces of bread to the ducks, when a friend coming by, suddenly tapped him on the shoulder, and asked him how long he had encouraged *quackery*.

SPIRIT OF THE BRITISH JOURNALS.

COBBETT'S REGISTER.

Pledges from Members of Parliament.—This is really vital matter! I shall first make a few remarks on the objections which the crafty knaves are making to pledges generally. In all the concerns of life, when we are engaging a person to do any thing for us, whether he be servant, clerk, attorney, steward, or agent of any sort, we tell him what we want him to do for us, and he engages to do that thing. A Member of Parliament is called the Representative, and those who choose him are called his constituents. They constitute, or make him their representative; he is to act for them; he is to do that in his single person which it would be impracticable for them in a body to do for themselves; and of course they are to give him instructions what to do, and he is to promise, or to pledge himself, to obey those instructions. They do not choose him to do his own will, and not their will; and if he think it beneath him to be considered as their mere delegate to act for them, he ought not to undertake the task; to say to a body of persons, choose me to do what I like, is at once nonsense and impudence.

What says our experience in common matters? How often have great mischiefs happened from there not being a clear understanding between the parties serving another, and the parties to be served? When a house or farm is to be put into occupation of one who is not the owner, how careful we are about the covenant? Why, these high-spirited knaves who are railing against pledges, would, I suppose, scorn to be parties to the covenants of a lease, they would scorn to be parties to a contract for furnishing this righteous Government with horses or clothing for the army, in which specific pledges are given with regard to the age and size of the horse, and with regard to the quality of the cloth. Their high blood would boil at the idea of pledging themselves to perform the specific things required of them in the ordination of priests, and in the consecration of bishops! In short, persons so very high-blooded as to deem it a degradation to give any pledge to those who entrust them with affairs of any sort, are far too high blooded to be entrusted by any body who has not the mind to be the slave of his agent.

So much for the principle of pledges; so much for the result of common sense and of reason applied to the case. And now for experience; and for our own recent experience as applicable to this very matter. The Reform Bill had to pass through two houses; a pledged house and a non-pledged house. Through the pledged house it went very glibly; but we all recollect that a non-pledged house actually threw it out the first time, and passed it the second time, only because something was applied to it quite as efficacious as a pledge! Then the house which was pledged the last time, was not pledged the first time; and it was obliged to be dissolved, in order that we might have an opportunity of pledging it. In short, we all know that if the House of Commons had not been pledged, we should have had no Reform Bill.

The base reptiles in the city of London; these sneaking, tax hunting knaves, who are now clamouring against the pledges put forth by the committee of electors of London, and who are crying out, that no gentleman will give a pledge; these dirty wretches seem to forget that they actually rejected Mr Ward, solely because he would not give the pledge they tendered to him; and the reptiles forget too, that they called upon Mr Alderman Thompson to resign his seat, because he had acted contrary to their wishes, and in violation of what they deemed his pledge. Yet these base reptiles are perfectly consistent: their sole object is to obtain a share of the public plunder for themselves; the surest way of getting at a share of that plunder is to be the tools of men in power. When, therefore, pledges were desired by the Ministers, these reptiles demanded pledges; but now that the Ministers want to prevent pledges from being given, these gluttonous devourers of our substance cry out against pledges.

One very good principle whereon for men to act is this, to discover that which your enemy dislikes most, and to conclude that that thing must be good for you. Keeping this principle steadily in view, look at what is now passing. All the boroughmongers, all the placemen, all the pensioners, all the dead-weight, all the sinecure and retired-allowance people, all the parsons, all the tax and tithe-eaters, whether in possession or expectancy; all the whole band of guttlers, who are keeping the people of Portsoken-ward out of the enjoyment of their undoubted rights; every soul of all these

is now crying aloud against pledges. The conclusion in the mind of every sane man is, that pledges are good for those who have to pay the taxes, and who receive none.

We want cheap Government: there is hardly any fellow who has the brass to put himself forward as a candidate, who will not confess that cheap government is necessary; and knowing that the government of the United States of America is beyond all measure the cheapest, in proportion to the resources and population of the country, that ever was heard of in the world; knowing this, it is worth while for us to be a little particular in ascertaining whether the Americans take pledges from the persons whom they choose to be their representatives. I could, from my own knowledge of the fact, assert, that they always demand pledges; and that they never elect a man who will not distinctly pledge himself to do that which they wish and instruct him to do. I could assert this from my own knowledge of the fact; but if I had no such knowledge, I have the proof at hand, as will appear from the following document, relative to the breaking of a pledge by a Mr George Poindexter, a Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Mississippi:

Williamsburg, Miss., March 26, 1832.

Political Meeting.—At a Public Meeting of the citizens of Covington county, agreeably to public notice previously given,

Resolved, That the conduct of the said Poindexter has been insincere and highly censurable.

And be it further resolved, That said Senator Poindexter has disregarded the wishes and disappointed the expectations of his constituents; and disregarded his pledge.

There, my friends, that is the way the Americans do to secure cheap government: that is the way that they go to work to keep themselves from paying pensions, sinecures, retired allowances and dead weights: that is the way that they go to work to secure religion to the country without tithes, to secure peace and tranquillity without a standing army in the time of peace: that is the way that they go to work to enable the working man to live upon pork and beef instead of potatoes; that is the way; in short, which they go to work to be truly represented in the Congress, to have their will faithfully obeyed, and to provide for the liberty and the happiness of this country; and every man of them now says to every man of us, “Go thou and do likewise!”

Thus, then, nothing but an impudent tax-hunter or tax-eater will pretend to question the propriety or the policy of demanding pledges from representatives. That question must be now set at rest in the minds of all men of sense; and now, let me notice what is passing in different parts of the country as regards these pledges. Everywhere, they operate upon the shifty men who are putting themselves forward; they operate like hot lime or salt, upon the back of a slug, they make them twist and twirl about, and endeavour to get off by some means or other. But in other cases they work well.

LONDON TIMES.

A LAMENT FOR OLD SARUM.

Farewell to thee, Sarum! for thousands I bought thee,
And hop'd that an heir-loom thou long should'st remain
A provision for sons and for nephews I thought thee,
A fountain unfauling of honours and gain.
But the voice of the ‘Spoiler’ was heard to denounce thee
A loud cry for ‘Plunder’ arose in the land;
As a vote-giving mount I at last must renounce thee,
And yield to the torrents I cannot withstand.

Dream not then, my sons, of the lawn or the ermine,
Relinquish your hopes of Colonial fame;
Other titles will now such preferments determine,
And merit more valid be deemed than a name;
For lost is the sceptre of borough dominion,
That by-way to honor is closed to your feet,
And, in future, not mine, but the people's opinion,
Must decide on your fitness for filling a seat.

Once, talents were needless to gain you admission,
No knowledge you wanted to sit and debate;
Your pass to St. Stephen's alone my permission,
No mobs to lament you—no voters to prate.
But will Birmingham choose you so gifted to serve her?
To Leeds can you go unacquainted with trade?
No. Fortune will smile but on those who deserve her,
And statesmen no longer be born ready-made.

WEST-INDIES.

From the Port of Spain Gazette, July 4.

TRINIDAD.—The fact of upwards of one hundred houses, besides other property, which were taken in execution by the Provost Marshal, for non-payment of taxes, having been put up for sale on Saturday last, without a single purchaser offering, speaks more for the confirmation of the ruin that has been brought on this devoted Colony than if we were to write volumes on