

genuine humour are well enough content with the old in nature and man—old time, old feelings, old thoughts, are with them for ever fresh and living; and, in short, as it is observed by Coleridge, 'their moral accompaniment and actuating principle consists in the carrying on of the freshness and feelings of childhood into the powers of manhood.' Genius and humour are for ever children—unsophisticated children, for whom Nature ever blows her bubbles. Talent and wit on the other hand, affect a more manly gait—they claim to have arrived at maturity, and profess a knowledge of the world as it is. Whatever qualities are new and fleeting in the state or manners of society, they are ambitious of catching, 'living as they rise,' and give up the eternal life within for the fugitive life without. Thus it is, that novelty and originality stand in opposition and contrast, instead of being one and the same. Thus Shakspeare is more original than Pope, and will for ever remain so, though the material of his divine work is as old as the creation of God, and that of Pope's is as new as the state of society in the reign of Queen Anne.

The following cursory remarks on HOPE, we copy from the 'Noctes' in the April No. of Blackwood's Magazine:

NORTH.—In this view of human life, the nature of hope may be said to be this—that man is dependent for all issues, partly on himself, and partly on uncommanded events; he has, therefore, in his own true and good exertion a ground of trust, and in the uncertainty of all human events a ground of fear, hence his always fluctuating, yet still rising hope—like the flow of the tide, where every wave that advances falls back, and yet the waters still swell on the shore.

Young Gentleman.—Sometimes, sir, the soul seems to itself like the sea sand, cold, bleak, and desolate; but in a few hours it overflows with joy, just as does that bay, when the tide has again reached the shell-wreaths on the silvery shore, and on the merry music of the breaking billows the sunny sails of long-absent ships are seen coming homewards from the main.

NORTH.—Yes—just so, my young poet. And as thou art a young Poet, though I have seen none of thy verses, what sayest thou of that Hope which is more airy and illusive; that visionary Hope which adorns the distance of life, filling the mind with bright imagery of unattainable good, promising gratification to desires which cannot be realized?

Young Gentleman.—I fear to speak—I love to listen.

NORTH.—And I, Hal, am on the verge—I know—I feel it—of garrulous old age.

Tickler.—Which verge?

NORTH.—The mind, my son, cannot rest, for it was not made to rest, in realities. It lives on the future even more than on the present. It lives by hope more than enjoyment. How then shall reason confine that spirit which is to live in the future, to the unknown realities even of the future? It cannot—we must hope beyond the truth.

SPIRIT OF THE BRITISH JOURNALS.

MORNING HERALD.

The sufferings of the poor and oppressed factory children are not likely to be soon alleviated. Though Mr. Sadler's Bill to emancipate them from a state of bondage as painful and degrading as negro slavery was carried through a second reading in the House of Commons, its further progress has been stopped, at least for a long time, if not defeated, by being referred to a Select Committee, instead of a Committee of the whole House. The only ground for sending a Bill before a Select Committee is to collect evidence to enable the House to legislate upon an accurate knowledge of facts. We should have thought that so much of Mr. Sadler's statements as was indisputed would have been sufficient to warrant the House of Commons, without further inquiry, in adopting the provisions of his Bill. It is not—it cannot be denied that children of a tender age are worked in our factories 12, 14, and 15, and sometimes 16 and 18 hours a day. Let us take the smallest number of hours—namely, 12, and we may say this alone, as an admitted fact, forms a groundwork for legislation. God and nature never intended that half the period of existence of a child of tender years should be consumed in constant drudgery in unwholesome air. We care not how light the labour may be, in one sense of the word—that is, how little muscular power it may require; the constant attendance upon it for such a length of time deprives childhood of the necessary hours of recreation, without which disease and infirmity must take possession of the human frame at the very time when it ought to be braced and invigorated by open air and healthful pastime. It also deprives it of the hours necessary for instruction, whether moral or intellectual; and thus, whether the human being be regarded as a mere animal, or as a being of higher powers and destinies, it is, by this cruel system, in the first years of life, cut off from the attainment of the physical energies of the one and the moral improvement of the other. Besides the number of hours in the twenty-four to which it is obviously requisite to restrict the labour of children, it is equally imperative on the Legislature not to allow children of a certain age to be worked in the factories at all. In regard to both these points what does Mr. Sadler's Bill propose? It goes to enact that children under nine years of age shall not be employed in the factories, and that the labour of children above that age shall be limited to ten hours in the day. Now it is not denied that children under nine years are at present employed in the factories, and that children are, in general, worked considerably more than ten hours a day. To know these two facts was all that Parliament needed to prove the existing necessity for passing Mr. Sadler's Bill. What sort of a House of Commons is it, either for intelligence or humanity, which requires specific evidence to show that it is improper and inhuman to place children under nine years of age in the harness of fatiguing and unwholesome labour, and that it is equally improper and inhuman to condemn children above that age to a continuance of toil beyond ten hours in the day?—a duration of labour which has been considered too oppressive even in regard

to adult felons. The production of evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons is attended with great expense. How can the poverty of the poor workmen contend in such a place against the resources of the rich masters? It is with pleasure we refer to an advertisement in our Paper of to-day, from a society which has just been formed to meet the difficulties of this case, of which his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex is Patron, and the philanthropic William Allen the Chairman. That society proposes to collect funds necessary to prosecute this great contest, to advocate the cause of the helpless children, and to remove the reproach of infant slavery from this Christian land.

FROM THE LONDON SUN.

In point of candour the House of Lords stands in a very fair position with the country. No man can accuse the noble enemies of Reform of manoeuvre, intrigue, or tergiversation. The opponents of the Bill honourably state that they cordially detest every principle of Reform, and that if they concede any principle whatever, it is only upon compulsion. They openly declare that they abhor the Bill in principle, and if they cannot grind it to suit their antipathies in the Committee (which Heaven forbid!) they will do their utmost to throw it out on the third reading. If, after this, the public should place any reliance upon aught but the creation of Peers, the Anti-Patriot Lords may justly taunt John Bull with being the most insipid of Mock-calves that ever suffered themselves to be buffeted and rolled in the mire. If Lord Grey were to create his Peers at the extreme of necessity, he may say to the people, "I have achieved your salvation;" but though England may hail him with reverence as a deliverer, she could not in future trust a Statesman inclined to such a neck or nothing policy—to put every thing dear to a nation upon the hazard of a die. Lord Grey may wish to say to the Peers, "you must acknowledge that I did not increase the Peerage but with reluctance, and at the eleventh hour, when you drove me to this last and hard necessity;"—but should the measure be too late, how will the Minister answer to his Sovereign? May not the KING reproach him in these words?—"I have placed unbounded confidence in you; I have supported you at every risk and at every sacrifice; my people have upheld you with a vigour and an unanimity unprecedented in history; and how have you requited our generous confidence? You have betrayed my country to its worst of foes, and you leave me the scorn, the derision, the mere puppet of a faction the most weak in numbers, the most contemptible in talents, and the most base in spirit, that ever destroyed a nation, or triumphed over a Monarch."

Now that the almost eternal harangues of Sir Charles Wetherell and his co-partners have been stifled, our Legislators have the opportunity of ameliorating those laws which militate against the best interests of society, by a severity which, in outraging the moral sense, renders the law a dead letter, and gives almost an impunity to crime. Mr. Ewart last night moved for leave to bring in a Bill to abolish the punishment of death which Sir Robert Peel's code enacts against horse-stealing, sheep-stealing and stealing in a dwelling-house. Of all nations, ancient or modern, the English are acknowledged to be the most thoroughly deficient in the science of jurisprudence. Our only idea of preventing crime is the shedding of blood, until the law becomes a more sanguinary criminal than the individual it punishes. So constitutionally averse are our countrymen to any study of jurisprudence or legislation as a science, that when the Vinerian professorship was established at Oxford, and the chair bestowed upon Blackstone, the authorities and influential members of the University derided the *innovation* as useless, and likely to draw the young men from their studies. Blackstone has produced little more than a Tory defence of every existing perversion of law, and his Commentaries have shed the lustre of science, and the lucid order of a system, over the most barbarous polity and code that can afflict a nation. Whilst he wrote, criminals were burnt alive for offences, and mangled heads and reeking limbs were exposed upon our city gates; and yet what did this writer do to rescue the country from such atrocious barbarity? Like the insane Lear, our laws cry "kill, kill, kill!" they are insatiable of blood, and yell like the Ogre for human gore. No existing power in any part of the earth could carry our laws into execution, and yet within the last few years, they have been much purified. Bad as they are, the Tory party still cling to them. They watch the disappointment of every blood-spot, with the fond regret with which the executioner contemplated

the loss of his perquisite of the criminal's clothes, and the half-crown gently pressed into his palm, by his victim, that he might let him "die easy." The following statements are curious. Of 334 persons sentenced to death in 1830, only one was executed. These were cases of horse-stealing, sheep-stealing, and stealing in dwelling-houses. In the same year 1,108 persons were sentenced to death for offences (many of them very trivial) against property, and of these eight were hanged, the ratio being eight to one hundred and thirty-eight. The total convictions and executions in England, Scotland, and France, in 1830, were as follows:—

	Convicted.	Executed.
England	1,400	40
Scotland	90	3
France	92	3
In the year 1825 the ratio between France and England was—		
England	1,000	50
France	150	110

If the relative population of France and England be considered, the ratio of discrepancy will be nearly doubled. The French code decrees the loss of life for only murder, forgery, and extreme cases of burglary. The Code Napoleon made only six capital offences, whilst our code contained sixty odd. The law of Ireland, in sanguinary vengeance, is to that of England, what the law of England is to the law of France. At the last Assizes, the cases of murder in Clare were eighty, and they were thought nothing of, whilst in Northampton four cases of murder were considered a most extraordinary number. All our minor laws, from perpetual transportation to the week's imprisonment, partake of this complexion of severity. The laudable reluctance of country Juries to condemn, renders criminal indictments almost nugatory, and individuals suffer injuries rather than enforce laws at which humanity revolts. Sir Robert Peel plausibly opposed, or plausibly assented to, Mr. Ewart's motion—for the Honourable Baronet's speeches very commonly suit either side of the question. The Government will soon attend to the subject, and above all to the unspeakable horrors that result from our mode of execution—one man dies of suffocation—one of apoplexy—one of dislocation of the vertebrae—one man expires instantaneously, and without suffering—another writhes for five minutes in torture, to the horror of the spectators. To this subject the attention of the last Government was called, but ineffectually.

LONDON TIMES.

PROSPECTS OF THE COUNTRY.—Few men we suspect, have had the courage to ask themselves what will be the real state of this kingdom generally, if the Reform Bill be ruined in the Lords committee. We have already more than hinted our apprehension that a spirit more than insurrectionary will display itself in every part of England,—that is to say, that the people will throw off the restraint of the laws. But what will be the state of the legislative power itself? Why, it is threatened with nothing short of dissolution. This is not the case of a turnpike bill, or even of Catholic emancipation, where if the House of Lords suppressed the vote of the Commons, yet the great bulk of the Protestant nation was a fortress upon which their anti-Catholic Lordships could fall back, and enjoy repose and impunity. What can they now retreat upon? Protestant and Catholic are equally roused upon this great reform principle. With regard to it they look upon the Lords as a sort of estraneous and intrusive power, which, so far as popular feeling goes, has no business to meddle with the representatives of the people at all, much less to decide against the recorded sentiments of both the nation and the House of Commons, in what manner and on what conditions, the one shall delegate the important trust of guarding the national property, and the other shall except and execute it. We say that here, on such a vital question, any direct contradiction of policy between the two branches of the Legislature, would amount to a dissolution of the Government, and that the Minister with the King's prerogative at his disposal, offering a natural and easy mode of averting so dreadful a calamity, would be a direct party to the overthrow of the State, should he refuse to put in force that lawful and effective instrument of political salvation. Suppose that public