

hack to baffle that exposure of the plots and fallacies of their unprincipled faction. The illogical editor of the *Globe*, incompetent to distinguish between principles and measures, accused me of political tergiversation, because with the same principles as I had ever professed I was not of opinion that in 1835 two particular measures were necessary which I deemed expedient in 1832. I stated my reasons why I no longer deemed those measures expedient. The editor of the *Globe* has never answered them, but if the editor of the *Globe* requires any further information on this subject, if he be still anxious to learn how it may be possible, without any forfeiture of political principles, to hold different opinions at different seasons respecting political measures, I refer him to his patron, Lord John Russell, the whilom supporter of triennial Parliaments; or his ancient master, Lord Spencer, the umquhile advocate of the ballot. If these right honourable personages cannot succeed in introducing a comprehension of this subject into the unparalleled skull of the editor of the *Globe*, why, then he must even have recourse to that Magnus Apollo of the Treasury Bench, Sir John Hobhouse, who will doubtless make it most lucidly obvious to him how a man who commences a political career, pledged to annual Parliaments and universal suffrage, may duly dwindle into a low Whig upholder of a senatorial existence of seven years, and a suffrage limited to the mystical boundary of a ten-pound franchise.