

are entirely
ion—for in-
antipodes of
vote for him
which each
and deli-
cated amount
a voluntary
ed, especially
the union, and
riots of your
upon these
otion. I will
artisan at his
—I have seen
economy."

we are being
principle can-
nery we have
evils it occa-
degraded the
the truth still
is able to pay
he out, if he
Thus (we may
staved off by
revolutions of
would, in my
of agitation;
apose it must)
d this, without
lited economy.
I remember
factive Industry
e people in the
at irreciprocal
they are not,
nists can come
must be a pre-
lished for their
The Reforma-
bour, or of the
to involve the
is also required
e empire. The
cannot. Some
art. But let us
arnings and an-
r fellow-Chris-
ish Poor Law,
the State guar-
half for lagged
for murder will
The foregoing
appreciated by
have a church
it were the best
erous treatment
rs borne by Irish-
and forward
outlet for British
instead of, as at
Canada, when
mbed) as British
ad in similar lan-
noment, our cause
have a permanent
pt to coerce that
a supported after-
sh Tories; and, I
into the states they
to do away with
eland, would have
ular one, probably
icipation was that
that he would have
as I explained in
ed to head the La-

stances calling for an extreme course. He must have given to the winds all split straws of opinion, and offered the *Aana* o fellowship to every man with the heart of a patriot. Will you support the British crown and a Protestant succession? Will you hold with me that the greatest and best paid employment of our own working-classes shall hereafter be the great constitutional question and security of our times? Those are the two elements of opinion out of which we looked to see Lord George Bentinck form the greatest and most enduring, because the most nobly patriotic political superstructure the world ever saw. We trusted that it was he who should have been the proper instrument of extricating our nation, and saving it from our factions. We could not, indeed, agree with all his views as he avowed them, but we laid this to the ohivarious way he followed Lord Stanley as his leader. And, observing that the meeting of the churchmen in parliament, which nominally discarded Lord George as leader in the House of Commons, on account of his Jew vote, was held at Lord Stanley's house, in this we saw the first ray of hope of the final separation of minds so unequally yoked. We are unaware how far the alienation between their lordships had proceeded, but we feel certain that the spell that bound Lord George was broken, and that the utter alienation of a great from a little mind could only have been a short matter of time. We have supposed it possible that they might have sat together in one ministry, and that a very short lived one; and we felt sure that one short trial is all the country wants of Lord Stanley. The Stanley ministry past, we hoped to see a purely Bentinck or "native industry" administration, one that, disdaining to dwindle its resources in party struggles, would throw itself for support on the entire democracy of the country, on the principle of allegiance only to the throne. And had a pure-minded man, like Lord George Bentinck, of the highest rank, with the greatest firmness and ability, adopted such a course, who can doubt the success?—who can doubt, what is far better, that a class of politics, whose alpha and omega were the elevation into men first, and then into Christians of one of our now wretched masses, deserved success? Thus it is that, with bitter and deep regret, we lament the premature decease of one of the noblest of the British people, in every sense of the word. The memory of Lord George Bentinck is one which will for ever be green with the laurels of his country's best and warmest affections. In common with nearly the entire country, (this was to appear in a liberal paper,) we at one period believed him wrong in his almost superhuman exertions to impress on the community that Sir Robert Peel had not introduced Free Trade, but only free imports. But, however opposed to the means by which Lord George Bentinck never doubted (even in what he considered the country's darkest day) that the British empire has got within itself more elements of greatness and prosperity than this or any other country ever before possessed, if only they could be reduced from their present state of chaos by some master mind. Such a mind was his own, although Lord George Bentinck's characteristic modesty made it his unending regret that there had not been found a better man than himself to fight the battles of his country's working classes. With all the advantages of early political training availed of by Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell, we ourselves have no doubt that the subject of our present notice would have been immeasurably their superior as a fine British character and statesman. And by men of all parties and all shades of opinion, he will, at least, be allowed to have been one of our finest examples of the "JUSTUM ET TENACEM PROPOSITUM VIRUM."

the sketch alluded
obleman who lately
Humanly speaking,
attachment to Lord
you admired friend
true sense a states-
of government for
ould have become as
a point we expected
This' incapacity in
ment. And Lord
own with the circum-

My enjoying the confidence of Lord Metcalfe for the *Adus Arachas* in India of his uncle, Lord William Bentinck, was the cause of my intercourse with Lord George Bentinck being unrestrained by the possibility of doubt as to the objects I would recommend being moderate and practical, although so often clothed by my indignation in violent language. At our first meeting I pointed out to Lord George that Peel's assertion of the omnipotence of Parliament, in the room of the omnipotence of Principle, moral and constitutional, must (if we would prevent unfortunate legislation becoming a cause of revolution) lead to the responsibility of our Legislative Acts being transferred to the entire people, because omnipotence may become tyranny, which could only safely be exercised by principle. And I expressed to his Lordship my opinion that Peel's unprincipled course would be fatal to (cause the alteration of) every institution in the country, except the crown, distinctions hitherto valuable because regulated by principle being now a nuisance—my words were nearly these:—"THE PRINCE HAS LET US IN A CONDITION WORSE THAN POLITICAL CHAOS, AS HAVING REMOVED US OF OUR PRINCIPLES. EVEN THE PRINCIPLE THAT SELF-PRESERVATION IS THE FIRST LAW OF NATURE HAS BEEN REPUDIATED; AND HITHERTO POLITICS HAVE BEEN REDUCED INTO THE TWO ORIGINAL ELEMENTS OF ALL NATIONAL POLITICS—THE LABOUR-POWER AND THE MONEY-POWER. THE LABOUR-POWER MUST COME TO BE REPRESENTED BY SOCIAL ECONOMISTS, OR PRACTICAL MEN, OR PATRIOTS, AND THE CHARACTER OF WHICHEVER LEGISLATION WILL BE THAT IT TAKES THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF OUR OWN SOCIETY INTO ACCOUNT; THE MONEY-POWER BEING REPRESENTED BY POLITICAL ECONOMISTS OR COSMOPOLITAN THIRONS, WHO WOULD HAVE THIS COUNTRY ENLEGATE FOR THE WORLD, WHILE THEY BUY POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A SYSTEM OF PURE MATHEMATICS, OR, AT BEST, ONE FOR THE CREATION OF WEALTH, WITHOUT ANY REGARD TO ITS DISTRIBUTION."

Indeed, to my mind, it never appeared that the permanently important question was as to whether it was a right or a wrong thing, *per se*, that Peel did in 1810. His impulse, however great, appears to me to stand, in relation to his repudiation of moral and constitutional principle, just as a misfortune does to a crime. I myself, for instance, am opposed to Established Churches, even if (these were the best churches possible, viewing partially to any class of her Majesty's subjects an impediment to general confidence in the Crown and Law of the Land; but give me the power to injure the Church, or any other vital interest by a *side wind*, would I, as a minister, or even as a legislator do it? If the constituencies don't wish the Church demolished, dare I, their servant, put it down? And if the constituencies do wish it put down, what need is there for me to interfere unduly? It has always seemed to me to be the duty of a minister rather to try to find evidence in favour of a respectable existence; and a state of things does not deserve the name of constitutional or of moral, unless it is one in which a Great Interest can repose with even more safety in the hands of its avowed enemy, seeing that he, as an honourable man, would require the greater evidence for its overthrow, to leave no shadow of a suspicion, even in his own mind, that his personal predilections had influenced his conduct as a public man.

The reverse of the picture is a very humbling one. Behold the constituencies of the empire, standing in the position of trustees of the entire people, employing, as agent under the trust, the man of Tamworth, who immediately turns round and repudiates all obligation to abide by the terms of the trust deed, or even to act on any principle whatever! And what are we to think of our contemptible trustees in snubbing thus to be bullied? What are we to think of our constituencies in delegating, by their *ex post facto* assent to Peel's conduct, an omnipotence or arbitrary power to parliament which they had not to give! My own view has always been that we have in this transaction so gross a violation of our Legislative constitution as to amount (whatever may have been Peel's intention at the time) to a virtual abdication by the present constituencies. But the immediate importance of this unprincipled proceeding is what we have chiefly at present to do with, and that arises from the ACT DONE BEING IN ITSELF VITALLY WASTED, as tending to lessen instead of to increase the employment of our masses, at home, at sea, and in the colonies—thus containing in it the seeds of Revolution, both at home and in our foreign dependencies, whether done constitutionally or unconstitutionally.

In a word, two great objects present themselves to British subjects—1st, viewing Britain in the isolated and simple light of a *country*, to save it from revolution by saving its industrious masses from starvation—2d, viewing ourselves as members of a great glorious, and commanding *empire*, the trustee of liberty and progress, to preserve its integrity. The second of these objects cannot be attained except by having peculiar privileges bestowed on, as we require peculiar duties of, our Colonial fellow-subjects; but the first may be otherwise attained, at least in a great degree—*viz.*, by our adoption of paper money as the legal tender. There must be a different value attributed to money to be exported than we allow to money remaining here to vivify our own industry, which can only be done by permitting gold to rise, under the law of supply and demand, like all other commodities; and we need not wait, before issuing paper money, to quarrel over what security to give the public for the paper-issues to be made a legal tender. For twenty millions of paper pounds, the evidences of the deposit of twenty millions in the vaults of the Government, or Bank of England, will depreciate, or in more correct phrase permit gold to appreciate, quite as well as a more rational, because less expensive, machinery of paper money. Our great practical difficulty is the nobleness of our object—so degraded and unlostering are the statements of the present day. The movement for Emblematic money (as opposed to counters embodying in themselves intrinsic value) is a movement in constitutional, not in party or mercenary, politics; and our objects are high and disinterested compared to those of a mere party struggle. We desire the establishment of a great principle, and have in our ranks men who on the merely local or banking question take different sides—just as all Protestant or Bible Christians may unite in a movement for a PROTESTANT SABBATH AS THE ONLY SECURITY OF A PROTESTANT THRONES, (not seeing that there is any more authority for the 6th, 7th, and 8th commandments than for the 4th), although they may be split up into two parties as to whether a Church Establishment is a blessing or an evil in our particular circumstances. Emblematic money, as the great machinery for securing national industry its full development, and thus employing the masses, will come to be seen to be as necessary to the well-being of every country's industry as a

stances calling for an extreme course. He must have given to the winds all split straws of opinion, and offered the *Aana* o fellowship to every man with the heart of a patriot. Will you support the British crown and a Protestant succession? Will you hold with me that the greatest and best paid employment of our own working-classes shall hereafter be the great constitutional question and security of our times? Those are the two elements of opinion out of which we looked to see Lord George Bentinck form the greatest and most enduring, because the most nobly patriotic political superstructure the world ever saw. We trusted that it was he who should have been the proper instrument of extricating our nation, and saving it from our factions. We could not, indeed, agree with all his views as he avowed them, but we laid this to the ohivarious way he followed Lord Stanley as his leader. And, observing that the meeting of the churchmen in parliament, which nominally discarded Lord George as leader in the House of Commons, on account of his Jew vote, was held at Lord Stanley's house, in this we saw the first ray of hope of the final separation of minds so unequally yoked. We are unaware how far the alienation between their lordships had proceeded, but we feel certain that the spell that bound Lord George was broken, and that the utter alienation of a great from a little mind could only have been a short matter of time. We have supposed it possible that they might have sat together in one ministry, and that a very short lived one; and we felt sure that one short trial is all the country wants of Lord Stanley. The Stanley ministry past, we hoped to see a purely Bentinck or "native industry" administration, one that, disdaining to dwindle its resources in party struggles, would throw itself for support on the entire democracy of the country, on the principle of allegiance only to the throne. And had a pure-minded man, like Lord George Bentinck, of the highest rank, with the greatest firmness and ability, adopted such a course, who can doubt the success?—who can doubt, what is far better, that a class of politics, whose alpha and omega were the elevation into men first, and then into Christians of one of our now wretched masses, deserved success? Thus it is that, with bitter and deep regret, we lament the premature decease of one of the noblest of the British people, in every sense of the word. The memory of Lord George Bentinck is one which will for ever be green with the laurels of his country's best and warmest affections. In common with nearly the entire country, (this was to appear in a liberal paper,) we at one period believed him wrong in his almost superhuman exertions to impress on the community that Sir Robert Peel had not introduced Free Trade, but only free imports. But, however opposed to the means by which Lord George Bentinck never doubted (even in what he considered the country's darkest day) that the British empire has got within itself more elements of greatness and prosperity than this or any other country ever before possessed, if only they could be reduced from their present state of chaos by some master mind. Such a mind was his own, although Lord George Bentinck's characteristic modesty made it his unending regret that there had not been found a better man than himself to fight the battles of his country's working classes. With all the advantages of early political training availed of by Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell, we ourselves have no doubt that the subject of our present notice would have been immeasurably their superior as a fine British character and statesman. And by men of all parties and all shades of opinion, he will, at least, be allowed to have been one of our finest examples of the "JUSTUM ET TENACEM PROPOSITUM VIRUM."

But it will not do for the friends of native industry and monetary reform to dwell too long on the heavy loss we have sustained in the death of a friend of the people, so commanding at once in his character and practical talents. Whatever our instruments be, we must carry our purpose, or a revolution must soon be the consequence of diminished wages and lessened employment. If all the statesmen, backed by all the electors in the country, were on one side, they could not make our one-sided Free Trade to work. Many of the protectionists—spaniel-like, *fawning the more they are kicked*—are already declaring that no man is left for them to follow but Sir R. Peel! We urge the friends of the working classes to be united. We ourselves do not see how any united action can be attained otherwise than through the means of a completely new organisation in politics.