

MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF SIR R. PEEL'S UNPRINCIPLED AND FATAL COURSE, DISQUIET, OVERTURN, AND REVOLUTION.

CHIEFLY FROM THE NEWSPAPER WRITINGS OF
ISAAC BUCHANAN,

FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE BOARDS OF TRADE OF TORONTO AND HAMILTON, C. W., AND MEMBER FOR TORONTO, THE THEN METROPOLIS,
IN THE FIRST PARLIAMENT OF UNITED CANADA.

"Our Colonies are passing from us before we have learned the use of them."—*Spectator*.
"The fact is that in our politics in Great Britain and Ireland, no less than in the European countries is revolt, we are being taught that there is a government of the affairs of this world superior to that of statesmen. We see that a wrong principle cannot possibly be carried out, because its own operation cuts its own throat. We see that if the late commercial machinery we have set up in this country will not operate practical philanthropy, it can, (like the continental royalties), only exist till the evils it occasions become intolerable."—*The Crisis of Sir R. Peel's Mission*.
"I will overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until He comes whose right it is; and I will give it Him."
The Original of all authority thus declared for the moment; and why? I now anticipate more fearful consequences than have yet flowed from the cruel principle of Peel's Money Law of 1810, is because I see clearly that our protective system, as restricting imports of foreign produce, necessarily prevented the export of Gold and the blowing up of the Banking System, which in his wisdom Peel has based on the shifting foundation of our stock of the precious metals, imitating the man who built his house on the sand, in all except the important point that it is not his own, but the Public's, vital interests which he has so abominably trifled with.
"To the great question, CAN THE BRITISH MONARCHY BE PRESERVED?—THE GREATEST—THE MOST ENDURING—THE MOST DEPENDENT—PERSONIFICATION OF RIGHT AND PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES THAT HAS BEEN TESTED BY TIME! I answer No, emphatically No, unless our Upper Classes permit the immediate adoption of measures which their personal interest will, I fear, make them denounce as revolutionary, just as the Slave-breeding Lord of Republican America prefers risking the integrity of the Republic rather than yield the wretched 'institution' of slavery. I believe the people of England are as loyal as ever to the Monarchy, but I don't believe, their self-respect will any longer permit them to tolerate church establishments, exclusive universities, or the uncontrolled interference of the nobility in the legislation of the country. The time has come when the possibility of saving the crown itself, depends on our having it distinctly understood, that the objects of the Government are just the simple, practical, and disinterested objects of philanthropy, so boldly and unequivocally expressed by Oliver Cromwell when he said, 'If any man thinks that the interest of these nations and the interest of Christianity are two separate and distinct things, I wish my soul may never enter into his secret.' And I have not the least doubt that every Government, till it has come to feel itself the mere instrument of God's purposes, is liable to the moral consequences of its conduct, disquiet, overturn, and revolution."—From my letter to Lord George Bontine on the breaking out of the Revolutions on the Continent, dated New York, 25th March, 1848, and published at the time. A great part of Peel's legislation of 1846, taken in connection with the entirely contrary principle (the one piece of legislation makes gold necessary to confidence or prosperity in this country, the other leads to the exportation of gold) of his money law of 1810, loudly demands an immediate union of the friends of our own working classes; this is rendered a thing practically impossible by our now irreconcilable divisions as to the effects of a Church Establishment; so that, as the vital question of labour cannot at present receive an unprejudiced discussion, Peel and his irrevocable Free Trade will be submitted to, even though they are seen evidently to reduce our national employment, because our protectionist legislators love their Church (the particular ecclesiastical machinery which they sacrilegiously call the Church) better than they love their country.
"The triumph he covets is the laborious triumph of just ideas, without distinction or origin; it is the reform of all inveterate abuses; it is the simplification of all the complicated, imperfect, costly wheels of routine; it is the realisation of Henry IV. and Napoleon—emperor; it is the extinction of pauperism; it is the completion of universal suffrage by universal wellbeing. Universal wellbeing! If you say it is an Utopia, we answer that it is a necessity, and that civilization is placed now, in this narrow alternative, to get over the obstacle, or into the abyss. Universal wellbeing, general ease, is not an Utopia; no, pauperism is not a necessity; it does not exist in nature; there is no reason it should be perpetuated in society. Pauperism is not the work of God; Providence, by laying on it a heavy burden, which is wholly human."—*The Press* of last Thursday, 31st January, 1850.
"To see the Noble Lord and his Honourable Friends on the one hand, with Messrs Hunt and Wooler on the other, united in their attempt to pull down the mighty fabric erected by the immortal Pitt, was at once ludicrous and painful." The first Sir Robert Peel's Speech in Parliament on 24th May, 1819, on the memorable occasion of his presenting the petition of the Merchants and Bankers of London, deprecating the proposed fixed Gold standard. This, and Peel's father's continued denunciations of his great act ought to put an end to the notion that, in expressing our irreconcilable objections to his principles and measures, we have any personal hostility to the Right Honourable Baronet.
While independence has any existence in this country we must persist in agreeing with his father that Peel has ruined his country, even if (as his father predicted he would) he had not doubled his own fortune by the same act. Peel in 1810 took the low Shylock ground of twisting the question of money, as one only between money and property in circulation, instead of seeing the chief importance of money (or the medium of exchange) to be as a machinery for the production of property and its distribution so as to give the greatest possible advantage to the industrious classes, as opposed to the lazy rich, annuitants, or non-producers; this alone will make his name sink in the nostrils of future generations, and make history deny him the place either of a great man or a great statesman; and I hold this alone sufficient justification for my assertion, that "no tyrant in any country has so long been the cause of so much suffering to his subjects as Sir R. Peel has been to our industrious classes." But the directly disonest conduct of the unwearying classes who then ruled supreme in Parliament (as in fact they do yet), the landlords having first been bribed by the corn law of 1815, was in their enabling Peel in 1819 to add one half to our national burdens as measured in the value of commodities, or to speak more plainly, in the Poor man's time. Peel's money bill of 1819 enacts that the public creditor should be paid in gold pounds worth 20s, instead of gold pounds worth about 13s 4d. Even if the Government, when borrowing in paper (and the debt is greatly composed of funded no more to be expected to be sustained than could a similar transaction by a Trustee, the party lending the money knowing it to be no more than £3 17s 10d per ounce! I cannot in short space explain the distinction drawn by Mr Pitt between gold money and paper money, as by the following quotation from *CONSERVATIVE PAPER AGAINST GOLD*. In the debate on 28th February 1827, the Opposition had charged the Minister with having taken money from the Bank and sent it abroad in subsidies, and this quotation is the substance of Mr Pitt's victorious and most complete reply—"Pitt said that Mr Hussey was wholly in error to suppose that the bank made advances to the Government in specie; Pitt said, that the advances were made in notes, and paid in the same manner; that if the Government were to raise money and pay the bank, the bank would not therefore be supplied with an additional guinea note; that the taxes were not paid in specie, that loans were advanced without any idea of repayment in specie; that the bank never had it in contemplation that every quarterly dividend was to be paid in cash; that the receipt of the revenue was in paper, and that the whole of Mr Hussey's observations were entirely founded in mistake." Who then can deny that Peel's Legislation was most immoral, while to industrious nothing can go beyond the cruel spirit of his act of 1819, which makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer, more and more, as the millionaires' accumulations sap the independence of higher and higher classes in the working industry!
seinded in "prices,"
as from wages.