

# THE CRISIS OF SIR ROBERT PEEL'S MISSION;

THE ASSERTION OF THE OMNIPOTENCE OF PARLIAMENT, IN THE NAME OF THE OMNIPOTENCE OF PRINCIPLE, MORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL, MUST—If we would prevent unfortunate Legislation becoming a cause of Revolution, after losing the Colonies and our supremacy on the sea—PRECIPITATE

## UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATION, HOWEVER, AS BEING SYNONYMOUS WITH SHIELDING THE LABOUR AND FIXED PROPERTY OF THE COUNTRY FROM THE ALIEN MONEY-POWER, IS THE BEST OR ONLY PERMANENT SECURITY FOR MONARCHY IN THE EXECUTIVE, IN THESE DAYS OF REVOLUTION; AND, WITHOUT THANKING SIR R. PEEL, WE MIGHT TAKE COURAGE—IF WE ONLY HAD A MAN SUCH AS WE LOST IN LORD GEORGE BENTINCK, OR LIKE WILLIAM PITT, AT THE HEEL—FROM THE FACTS THAT THE CONSTITUTION HAS INVARIABLY BEEN STRENGTHENED BY THE WIDENING OF THE FRANCHISE, WHETHER IN THE TIME OF KING JOHN, CHARLES I., OR THE MORE RECENT REFORM BILL, AND THAT THE NAVIGATION LAW WAS THE WORK OF OLIVER CROMWELL AND THE LONG PARLIAMENT, WHILE OUR COLONIAL SYSTEM, ALTHOUGH IT MAY DATE ITS NOMINAL ORIGIN FROM QUEEN ELIZABETH, OWED ALL ITS VITALITY AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE EXTREME DEMOCRACY OF THE GREAT REBELLION.—OUR UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE SHOULD ALSO BE USED TO RESCUE THE UPPER HOUSE, WHICH IS AT PRESENT WITHOUT MORAL WEIGHT IN THE COUNTRY, PEERS AND BARONETS, WITH THEIR SONS, BEING ELIGIBLE AS MEMBERS OF IT HEREAFTER.—

FROM THE NEWSPAPER WRITINGS OF  
**ISAAC BUCHANAN,**

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

"The protective system is purely democratic in its tendency. It fosters industry, and enables the poor man, who has no capital, but is own labour, no surplus but what is found in his own shew, to acquire a competency to support and educate his family. It is designed not for the few, but for the many; and though it will be productive of the common good, its peculiar blessings will fall upon the labouring classes. But there is a sort of looseness in the phrase 'Free Trade,' which renders this discussion embarrassing. The advocates of this doctrine do not tell us with sufficient precision what they mean by the phrase. If they mean that we should take off all restrictions from commerce, whether other nations do or not, it is one thing; but if they mean that we should do it towards those nations which will reciprocate the favour, it is quite another thing. But the phrase must imply a trade which is mutually beneficial, or it must not. If it does not imply a trade that is mutually unrestricted and mutually beneficial, that is a good reason for rejecting it. I have not made sufficient proficiency in the science of political non-resistance to advocate a system of trade which enriches other nations by impoverishing us. I cannot consent to open our ports, duty free, to those nations which throw every embarrassment in the way of our commerce. My political creed does not require me to love other nations better than my own. But if Free Trade implies a trade mutually advantageous, I am willing to adopt it; but this can never be done by taking off all commercial restrictions. If the trade is to be mutually beneficial, it must not only imply a reciprocity in commercial regulations, but a similarity in institutions. We, as a nation, are peculiarly situated. We are separated from the Old World by distance, and by the nature of our institutions. Our leading characteristic is, that our citizens are freemen, and are labourers. THE NATURE OF OUR INSTITUTIONS TENDS TO ELEVATE THE WORKING CLASSES, AND TO SECURE TO THE LABOURER AN AMPLE REMUNERATION FOR HIS TOIL. This raises the price of labour—IT MAKES THE LABOURER A MAN. So long as we retain this our national characteristic, by protecting our own industry, our country will be prosperous. But let the pleasing but exclusive doctrines of Free Trade obtain in our land—let that policy under which we have grown up and prospered be abandoned, and as we open our ports to the fabrics of those nations whose hardy labourers can obtain but a shilling a day, and board themselves, and it requires no spirit of prophecy to predict the embarrassment and distress which would ensue. When our navigators are driven from the ocean, and our manufacturers and mechanics from their mills and their workshops, and all are compelled to cultivate the soil, the beauties of Free Trade would be realized. We might have agricultural products, but we should have no market. BEING DEPENDENT UPON OTHER NATIONS FOR MANY OF THE COMFORTS OF LIFE, AND AT THE SAME TIME DEPRIVED OF A MARKET FOR OUR PRODUCE, WE SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO TOLL FOR A MERE PITTANCE, AND SHOULD, LIKE TANTALUS IN THE FABLE, PERISH IN THE MIDST OF AGRICULTURAL PLENTY."—From *Hunt's New York Merchants' Magazine*.

"In democracies, where the right of making laws resides in the people at large, public virtue and goodness of intention is more likely to be found than in either of the other qualities of Government. Popular assemblies are frequently foolish in their contrivance, and weak in their execution; but generally mean to do the thing that is right and just, and have always a degree of patriotism or public spirit."—Blackstone.

From the published conversation of a French gentleman, (at Claremont, in November 1848), with Louis Philippe, late King of the French:—"Gentleman.—But the expression of Lafayette, 'Sire, you will be the best of Republics!' King.—This was not said at the Hotel de Ville; but a week previously at the Palais Royal, and far from leaving it without reply, I immediately added: Not the best of Republics, for the very best is good for nothing. 'Well, then,' added General Lafayette, 'a Monarchy surrounded by Republican institutions!' Ah! Yes! said I, a Monarchy surrounded by Republican institutions, I approve of.—a Republic, No!"

From *Cooper's Residence in France*, in 1839:—"Lafayette frankly admitted, what all now seem disposed to admit, that it was a fault not to have made sure of the institutions before the King was put upon the throne. He affirmed, however, that it was much easier to assert the wisdom of taking this precaution, than to have adopted it in fact."

This and the above quotations go to show that had the legislation been Republican, Louis Philippe could not have lost France to monarchy; while from the following, (the best-informed view of the present state of France that has been published,) it seems probable we may soon have an example there of the state of things, which Peel's unprincipled course must inflict on England, *scilicet* a republic.

"At present, indeed, such is the state of France, that the exercise of the supreme power repels more than it attracts, and the leading statesmen of the nation have shown more anxiety to escape from the responsibility of so arduous a position than to rescue their country from insurmountable dangers at the cost of their own reputations."

It is characteristic of the confusion still prevailing in France, that the most opposite and inconsistent political doctrines are expressed with equal openness; and the nation is less adverse to the regret publicly displayed by the partisans of the late dynasty, or to the claims of a still more formidable Pretender, than it is to the extreme theories of the democratic Republic.

A most of the departments an impression prevailed favourable to the revision of the Constitution, but none undertook to affirm what extent the requisite changes ought to be carried, or what result they should produce.

Some of the central districts openly professed the doctrines of the Red faction. In none was there any striking or decided manifestation of Bonapartist opinions, or any personal homage to the imperial pretensions of the President. Nevertheless, it is still the opinion of many of the most profound and experienced observers of the French nation, that, with the assistance of opportunity and of fortune, an imitation of the Empire is the next transformation we are destined to witness.

The urgent want of money for the support of this quasi-royalty—the claims of a needy and ambitious family—and perhaps eventually the attitude of a powerful Opposition in the Assembly, will precipitate the crisis; and as Louis Napoleon has fully succeeded in maintaining his popularity with the army, it is possible that in the hour of action that powerful instrument may again decide for a time in favour of an Imperial dynasty.—*Times*.

**GREENOCK:**

**PUBLISHED AT THE ADVERTISER OFFICE,**

And to be had at the Offices of the *Greenock Advertiser* in Greenock and Glasgow (40, Union Street); at Mr. Munro's, Bookseller, Cornhill, London; and at Messrs John Barthill & Sons, Waterloo Place, Edinburgh—where may also be had the entire Pamphlet, then completed.