

London Jew houses, in taking foreign loans, we should have, on the statute book, a law which, by making gold and money synonymous, makes the export of gold equivalent to the export of our paper money, the withdrawal of all mercantile confidence, and the annihilation of our bank facilities.

If we do not assume that Sir R. Peel intends constitutional changes, we must hold his intellect in supreme contempt, and believe the Tory papers that, incapable of an original idea, he barely understands the borrowed principles of his own measures, and certainly has not the guilt of being able to foresee their result. Every one but himself knew (if he did not), that the existence of his money bill of 1810 was the great argument for the excessive restrictions retained upon imports. Peel's money bill prevented, and still prevents, our ability to increase our export trade, and till its repeal our only safe course was to restrict our imports, as thus alone we could retain our banking facilities, by preventing an export of gold. What, then, are we to think of Sir R. Peel's doing away with this breakwater, if he had no ulterior views? The act of a statesman, however, has no different effect whether done from imbecility or design, and revolutionary changes must assuredly flow from Peel's having in 1810, Judas like, betrayed with a kiss the cause of our native industry, which till then, he had professed, was the cause of his heart. Every one knew that patriotic selfishness or the fostering of British industry was the vital interest of the Colonies, and that the loss of these noble appendages of the British Crown must follow the admission of foreign produce on the same terms as Colonial as certainly as effect follows cause; so that Peel's much vaunted movement in 1840 amounted to the reduction of Great Britain from the lofty bearing of a great Empire, the mistress of the seas, to the position of a petty country. And even were such change shown (as it never could be), to be the interest of this country, why not have effected so important a transaction with the sanction of the constituencies? Why not let even the Colonists, who had ever been foremost in love to British rule, have some little say in a transaction which involved all their dearest affections and deepest rooted prejudices? Was there any proof that with the Colonists their material interests would have weighed in their minds as a feather? If these were found obstructing the great interests of their glorious fatherland? The following language of my own in the *Glasgow Reformers' Gazette* of 14th March, 1840 (which I sent at the time to every member of both Houses of Parliament), conveys I believe, the sentiments of the Colonists as a body:—"Do a former number it was shown that reciprocal trade must necessarily, in its very nature, lose us the colonies, because the principle of protection abandoned, the colonial system (which is a mere branch of it), falls also, or, what is to my mind far worse, and could only last a year or two, the colonies become a drag on the empire, having ceased to benefit the mother country in any way after they have thrown off the Imperial Parliament's right to legislate for their trade, and commenced free trade with all the world. BUT I ASK FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE COLONISTS ONLY, BECAUSE IT IS THEIR INTEREST OF EMERALD. I HOLD THAT IT WOULD ENTER FOR ENGLAND TO LOSE HER COLONIES, MAGNIFICENT THOUGH THEY BE, THAN TO FORNKEN DOING ANYTHING, WHICH IS SHOWN TO BE CLEARLY IN FAVOUR OF THE OPPRESSED POPULATION IN THIS COUNTRY. Though I before pointed out, that the adoption of free trade would necessarily lose the colonies (whose markets there is no reason for us going to the expense of defending, unless our manufactures are protected there), I do not pretend to assume that, to save the colonies, for their sake alone, should prevent us adopting free trade in England, if the greater and more immediate interests of the mother country would be advantaged thereby. Far, however, from this being the case, I view free trade as tending to reduce the extent of our own manufactures, to degrade the condition of our manufacturers; in fact, I consider that free trade is suicide on the part of Mr Cobden and the weavers. Well do the independent aristocracy see, that though the ordeal will be a fiery one to their neighbours whose lands are in debt, and a more fiery one still to the manufacturers, the final result will assuredly be, that the landowners will be the permanently predominant and popular or powerful interest, the weavers having been once-half driven back again to the fields by want of manufacturing employment. The effect, in fact, of Sir Robert Peel's measure will be to prevent all progress in manufacturing, and reduce the whole of the interests of the country into a narrower compass, in which, in the way I have pointed out, agriculture will loom the largest, not because large, but because all other interests have been made smaller in proportion by Sir Robert Peel's liberal measure." Corroboration of this, if wanted by any one, is found in the late address of the British American League, of which the following is the character:—"During a long period, enfeebled by adversity and prosperity, the people of this colony have, in war, rallied round the flag of their forefathers, and in peace have endeavoured to cement the union with their fatherland by the strongest ties of amity and interest. In return for this devotion, the British Government has long extended to the colony a commercial preference in her markets. The harmony which so long existed—interrupted by an abortive rebellion—was again restored at its close; and the progress of the colony became almost unexampled, under the fostering influence of a wise Imperial legislation. But unhappily for Great Britain, an empire whose colonies are the strong arm of her power—she has recently opened her ports to foreign nations, upon equal terms with her own immediately and cheaply accessible. In her promulgation of free trade principles, she has lost sight of the interests of her colonies with the (vain) view of obtaining from all nations reciprocal free trade, and thereby inundating the world with her manufactures. The new policy of the empire has recently produced its inevitable results. Unprotected by an adequate tariff, we have continued to consume a vast amount of British manufactures; while our produce—the principal source upon which we rely for their payment—has rarely entered the English markets, except at a sacrifice. The result has been a monetary pressure, extensive bankruptcy, and general distress."

Ireland, too, looks on Peel as a man with his throat cut* would do on the perpetrator who could unblushingly stop to apostrophise his motives; but, say Peel's friends, see the great statesman about to lead on a forlorn hope for Ireland! I see him, we reply, having killed the man getting the public to subscribe for his fatherless family! The *Times* comes to the aid of the bold men of Aberdeen, and by a *petitio principii*, suggests that a good act (reciprocal Free Trade to wit) cannot have a very bad motive, and we might feel able to hope that, by way of resuming the motive, Peel's still-born Irish Scheme may be cooked up into something better than a mere flourish of trumpets, were the whole thing not too manifestly intended only for effect. In fact, in nothing previously has Sir R. Peel come out so unmistakably in the character of a quack as in his Irish Plantation Scheme. In its preliminary concoction and banishment of the present proprietors, it is like the cholera, if, as has been said, it commences where natural diseases end—in death. In politics as in medicine, the quack professes to cure, while the profession of the regular practitioner is to no more than allaying the morbidity, so as to allow nature to work its own cure, which it always does (when once the morbid excitement is allayed) if sufficient stamina in the constitution remains; but Sir Robert's plan would remove whatever stamina remains in Ireland, leaving only the alien church as a GREAT TUMOUR on an emaciated LIFELESS TRUNK; and I never can believe that any ministry or man can have either the power or the will to raise Ireland out of the wretched condition it is in without first attempting to remove, and succeeding in removing, Ireland's ecclesiastical tumour. But even if the whole revenue of the Irish Church were devoted as I would wish to ragged schools (to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, and trades, leaving the religion of the children to their churches and guardians), I yet believe that prosperity would be impossible, AS THE WHOLE ASPECT OF LIFE OF BRITISH AND IRISH INDUSTRY HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN BY THE WITHDRAWAL OF PROTECTION TO NATIVE LABOUR. I therefore view Ireland as hopeless, if left in such hands as Peel's. More phrasemongers, and men who have to appeal beyond their measures for their motives, will no longer do for Ireland. It now becomes very apparent that if Ireland was Peel's chief difficulty, the Ex-premier has, in a far higher sense, been Ireland's chief difficulty; and as to his motives let us see what Lord Anglesey says. (See Lord Anglesey's letter to Lord Cloncurry, dated Rome, 28th January, 1835:—"I do not quite see into the state of affairs, but it appears to me that, take what view you will of them, they are frightful. Can the Peel and Wellington Government stand? I am sure it ought not; and if there be common honesty and fair dealing in man it will not. But can any one count upon honesty and fair dealing in these days? I think not. I strongly suspect what are called the moderate Whigs. I have no faith in them. I believe that in general they are frightened, and only show liberalism as long as the tide runs that way, and as it turns (if turn it do) they will float back with it. Neither have I any faith in the ultra-Tories. I suspect that a great part of them, with a view to office, or at all events to retaining in office men who, upon the whole, they like better, and believe themselves to be safer in the hands of than the honest Liberals; that with a view to preserving in power, I say, the present leaders, they will sacrifice all their principles, and eat all their words, and vote through thick and thin for reform—any, even for Church reform. Here, then, if I be right, will be a tolerable equipage of baseness, and thus Peel and Wellington will continue to hold the reins, and, with a bad grace, give all the reforms that were in contemplation by the last Government, and which, if my voice had been attended to, would, as far as the Irish Church is concerned, have been set smooth three years ago. I am sure I have no inducement to take any part whatever in public affairs. You, with your usual kindness and partiality, express a wish that I should, in the event of a change, again return to Ireland, or else go to the Horse Guards. But of what use could I be in either situation? It has been my fate to be unkindly and ungenerously treated, both by friends and foes, and I do not see why I should again allow myself to be made unhappy by either. The truth is, I have not the capacity for acting with men who have recourse to trick and duplicity. I have independent thought; and if I go I must go my own way. I could not consent to allow Ireland to be governed in Downing Street, and therefore I did not suit my employer and employers generally."

It is but too true that the British Government has been practically the worst possible government in Ireland and the Colonies, * With less than half Great Britain's population, Ireland has about as many souls dependent on agriculture; and the *Dublin Evening Mail* thus describes the condition of Ireland—"She is undone—her treble's undone. Free Trade, then, in corn and provisions, is progressive ruin to Great Britain—to Ireland it is sudden and untimely death."