

the Economiser; a body which the landowners, if true to themselves, and in concert with the people, cannot fail to distrust."—Sir James Graham's Pamphlet on Corn and Currency, published in 1827.

"He begged the house would pay particular attention to the petition which he held in his hand. It was of no common character, but that of a great and important body, all of the first respectability, praying that those resolutions which were intended to be submitted to the house might not be carried into effect. He begged leave to state his opinion, that the petitioners were the best judges of such a measure. He would add also, that although they were intimately connected with all that concerned the welfare of the country, the most experienced men, and the best qualified, that before a measure so destructive of the commercial interests of the country was passed, (and when he said that, honourable members would conclude every other interest to be combined with those, and to go along with them,) the house would pause awhile, in order to collect that information which they so particularly wanted. In looking at the reports which had been published on the subject, he must say, that the witnesses were not men likely to give any information to government, not men acquainted with the state of the country; the last men who should have been questioned, if government wanted to arrive at the merits of the case."

From the speech of Peel's father, the late Sir Robert Peel, delivered in the House of Commons, on the 24th May, 1819, in presenting the petition of about five hundred of the Leading Merchants of the City of London, against the conclusions at which the Bank Committee had arrived. It will be observed that not only is his son's Money Bill denounced, but the *Jeremy Biddler* way in which it was then being forced on the country. This, and the late Sir R. Peel's appeal to the members of both Houses of Parliament in 1829 (with which I shall close the Introductory Article), ought to put an end to the notion that, in expressing our irreconcilable objections to Peel's principles and measures, we have any personal hostility to the Right Honourable Bart.

"And it may not be inapposite that I here quote the following from my letter in the *Glasgow Reformers' Gazette* of 14th March, as proving the inestimable value of colonial trade as well as the mighty fluctuation which is the inseparable character of trade with all countries which are beyond our own currency laws and regulations: 'I desire shortly to recur to the subject of colonial trade to show its infinite superiority over a foreign trade, or a merely manufacturing commerce, and I take my figures from the official statements, of the exports and imports of Great Britain in 1843, not having the later returns at hand. In the trade with Britain and her colonies in the western world, about 90,000 seamen are yearly employed, for whom the amount of wages and cost of provisions cannot be less than £3,500,000 per annum; and the repairs, insurance, and replacing of capital in the ships £4,500,000 more, in the trade between Britain and India and China, 10,000 seamen are employed, and at a similar rate their wages, provisions, &c. will amount to £500,000; and the replacement of capital and increase £800,000; in all, £1,300,000. The whole, or nearly the whole of the supplies necessary to maintain these seamen and tonnage, are the productions of British soil and labour, which, in a national point of view, shows the superiority of such a trade over a merely manufacturing commerce. A comparison of the trade of the eastern with that of the western world, taking the value of imports and exports, stands nearly thus:—From and to China and the East Indies, about £16,000,000; and from and to British North America and the West Indian Colonies, £14,000,000. It thus appears that the latter or British American trade requires nearly five times more ships, tonnage, and seamen to carry it on, than the former or trade to all India and China; thereby affording an incalculable advantage to a naval power, and the support of a naval force, and also to the employment of British labour and capital. From the official statement of the exports and imports of Great Britain to the different parts of the world for the year 1843, in which we have alluded, we find that the whole weight of cotton yarn and cotton goods exported from Great Britain annually is 120,000 tons, and the value £28,500,000. It follows, then, that one-half the tonnage employed in carrying the West Indian exports (value £2,882,441) would be sufficient to carry the whole cotton export trade of this country; and as regards the North American trade, one-seventh of the tonnage would be sufficient to carry all that cotton trade about which Mr Cobden has made such a noise, but whose real and great intrinsic importance to the empire, no mercantilist nor colonialist has ever shown any disposition to undervalue that I am aware of. I cannot better finish off this statement: but by repeating that, while the trade of B. America and the West Indies, stated in 1843 to be only £14,000,000, employs 2,900 ships of 970,000 tons, and 60,000 seamen, our trade with the United States, estimated at £22,000,000 three-fifths being imports of raw cotton, &c., is carried in 350 ships of 233,000 tons; and the import from China, amounting to £5,000,000 is brought in 84 ships of 30,712 tons. The trade of America when our colony in 1793 employed, on the average of three years, 1,678 ships, and 28,910 seamen, and the value of the goods taken from Great Britain was £3,370,000; the exports of the colony being £3,024,000. The population of the United States is now nearly ten times what it then was, without any great permanent increase in our exports to America, (causes over which we had no control, brought them down in the year 1842 to £3,528,507.) Before closing my remarks, I desire to recur to the disingenuous conclusion of Sir Robert Peel's great speech, which I have quoted from. Yes, the Premier triumphantly concludes—'This is what you have to decide by your vote on this question—Will I advance or will you recede?' And again—'What should be the motto of a country like this? Should it advance or retrograde?' Now Sir Robert Peel knew full well that he had not shown, and could not show, how FREE TRADE is to advance, even temporarily, any one of the great interests of this country. And Sir Robert Peel knew, moreover, that neither has any class of politicians, nor any body of men in England felt, or expressed, any wish or determination to SECURE OR RETROGRADE IN THE LIBERALITY OF OUR LEGISLATION for the regulation of commerce. Nor is Sir Robert Peel ignorant of the fact that ALL PARTIES ARE WILLING AND ANXIOUS TO ADVANCE to the greatest extent they think they can without giving a fatal blow to the industry of our own people, whether artisans or agriculturists. All that Sir Robert Peel's former friends charge him with is that he shows HIMSELF DETERMINED TO GO FORWARD IN THE DARK! They only demand an explanation, and it seems high time that they should do so, when they can now see in the Premier scarcely the shadow of his former principles. Pausing,—Sir Robert Peel's followers simply address their political leader as HAMLET did the Ghost of his father—

Hamlet—Whither wilt thou lead me?

Speak! I'll go no further.

Ghost—Mark me. [This is Sir R. Peel to the life.]

Hamlet—I will.

Ghost—My hour is almost come,

When I to sulph'rous and tormenting flames

Must render up myself.

Hamlet—Alas! poor Ghost!

"But the melancholy fact is that the British Government is now, and has for more than twenty years been, in hands so morally weak as to have no real control of the greater affairs and interests of the country. The statesmen of the present day aspire to no more than to be (apparently unconcerned) lookers-on at the fights of the Free Traders against the Protectionists, and the Free-thinkers against the Protestants, and side with the winning party for the time being. Such men as Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Earl Grey, Canning, Wilberforce, and Anti-Corn-Law Villiers, disdained to count numbers in their moral contests; but the present, and most of our governments since the days of Canning, have not had the moral power in England and her dependencies, even of the Norths and Walpoles of the last century."—From the *Glasgow Reformers' Gazette* of 8th April, 1846, being my answer to the *Manchester Guardian*.

GENERAL REVIEW.

The Ex-Premier had better have resigned himself to the tender mercies of his old than his new friends. "Save me from my friends," if applicable to old friends, is yet more so to new ones; and Peel should not have forgotten that in his place in Parliament, he has acknowledged that the loss of respect is only on the part of his quondam friends towards him, not on his part towards that patriotic, however mistaken band. He should have asked his own breast whether it is not even now the pride of his heart to have been an instrument in rearing this living monument to principle "ere perennius." Was it an easy thing for Peel's old friends to part with a leader of unrivalled tact if not talent? This was only more easy for them than to forsake their principles, and to prefer their party to their country. Peel knows that they did not part with him rashly, and even at last that they did so more in grief than in anger. Had not their respect for his practical talents, compared to contemporaneous statesmen, shut their ears against what Sir James Graham called "the insurrection of a populace" on the subject of Peel's Money Law? And in the case of the Emancipation of the Catholics did they not go farther with him than any lover of constitutional government can ever pardon, (however much like myself he may have desired the emancipation), when at that time they passed over Peel's delinquency to the necessities of the empire, arguing that it was at least a generous act, and one which gave something to a deserving portion of

* In giving up our Western Colonies to the United States, Peel nearly doubled their tonnage in Foreign trade which was, in 1840, 1,241,312 tons.