Sin,—As in your article on Saturday (Foreign and Colonial Trade) you gievously misrepresent the views, against out-and-out free trade, which I have put orth in the Scotch Reformers' Casette, I hope you will or refuse me the privilege of setting myself right with caders of the Guardian.

Allow me to say, that there is not a man in England whose sympathies are more with the working classes than mine are; indeed, I have always held that the other classes or orders in such a society as ours are only a public benefit to the extent that, directly or indirectly, they are of we and assistance to those who labour for their bread.

My objection to the principle of Sir Robert Peel's le-gislation, is, that he regards the poor only se consumers, and legislates for them only in common with the rich. (How blessed the poor would be to find themselves so

free trade is introduced.

The fact is, that ignorantly governed as that colony has been by Downing-street, the loyalists will not be able to stand their ground against the republicans in Canada West, if the former are armed with no fact, in favour of the British Government; and if the monatrous principle is avowed, that England wants territory in America, not to benefit, but only to rule, or misrale it!

The Republican party in Upper Canada are all free traders, and a favourite means of getting the province free from England (by making it of no use to the mother country) used to be the pushing for free trade with the United States.

In 1836, the Lower House of the Canadian Parliament (which had then a majority of Republicans) petitioned the King on this subject, and the following remarks of my own, in the colony at the time, I happen to have preserved:—

The loss of British America thus effected, the empire, instead of seen being able (through applying calightened and serive management in these colonies) to raise up a colonial trade intrinsically as aluable as all our foreign trade, will have the present colonial trade reduced to the average of the United States, or about one-fourth the amount per head that colonis; stake of British goods. This is the consummation so devoutly desired by the Americans. They will tell you otherwise; but never let us forget the sympathiesrs of 1837 and 1838, nor allow ourselves to be gulled into the belief that the hearts'-wish of every Republican is not to see the United States possessed of Quebec, and monarchy driven from America, and not one of the Manufactors of the States possessed of Quebec, and monarchy driven from America, and not not see Manufactors's favourite variet carried out of conserving to their Republic the Gibraltar of our West Indian colonies, the Bermudas, to make them a nest of hornests for the annoyance of English commerce in times of trouble.

You also accuse me of ALLEGING THAT THE BRITISH

You also accuse me of ALLEGING THAT THE BRITISH ARTISAN 'S DEPENDANT ON COLONIAL TRADE FOR THE EMPLOYMENT WHICH HE RECEIVES.

Now, I aliege no such absurdity, although I think that, had we for the last twenty years followed a sound and extensive system of removing to the colonize of our surplus population, this country might now have been very independent of foreign trade. What I ALLEGE IS, THAT THE OMLY PERMANENT DEPENDENCE OF THE BRITISH ARTISAN IS THE PROSPERITY OF BRITISH AGRICULTURE, OF WHICH COLONIAL INDUSTRY IS A BRANCH. I allege, moreover, and that truthfully, that the Colonial, like the Home trade, has the only limit to its purchases of manufactures in the extent of its entire means, while Brother Jonathan, and all other foreigners, will not take English goods for one-half the emount even of that part of their means which they draw from England. The following extract of my letter of 14th March, in the Scotch Reformers' Gazette, will show exactly the views I expressed:—

In a former number it was shown that free trade must mecassarily, in its very nature, lose us the colonies, because the principle of protection abandoned, the colonia 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 eassed 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.

legislate for their trace, and the world.

But I argue for the retention of the colonies only, because it is the interest of England.

I hold that it were better for England to lose her colonies, magnificent though these be, than to forbear doing anything which is shown to be clearly in favour of the anoressed population in this country.

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 argue 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 manufacturers, to degrade the condition of our manufacturers, and thus to secure for the aristocracy by-and-bye a mono-

(TO THE EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.)

| Observed of Political power in England, as rendering it in character more an agricultural country than at present!
| I would do this as a duty to the working classes, even if the tearing up of every treaty and parchment in existence was involved.

| Sir. — As in your article on Saturday (Foreign and the weavers. I cannot suppose any last for us to adopt a system that not only gives, but poly of political power in England, as rendering it in chaster more an agricultural country than at present!

Is fact I view that free trade is suicide on the part of Mr. Cobden and the weavers. I cannot suppose any stay by which Sir Robert Peel has secured the support of their dependent members of the aristocracy, who are avarable to his measure, in the face of the scorn of the friends, and the inward contempt of their former pikteal adversaries, and by their seeing it to be the ultimate interest of their class.

Sir Robert Peel may have shown them that, as they included in the seed of their class.

Sir Robert Peel may have shown them that, as they included in the seed of their class.

Sir Robert Peel may have shown them that, as they included in the seed of every interest in the country into the narrow is that formerly enabled them to control the government of the country.

Sir Robert Peel's measure, in fact, as he well knows, which is the seed of the seed of the seed of se

lam of opinion, on the contrary, (as stated in my letter in the Reformer's Gazette of 4th April), that, like the Americans, THE WHOLE OBJECT OF OUR LEGISLATION SHOULD BE THE BENEFIT OF THOSE WHO LABOUR.

If, then, you and I are both friends of the people, our controversy becomes the friendly and generous one of WHOLE PLAN SHALL BENEFIT THEM MOST.

Now, I object to what you call the principle of free trade, because I do not call it a principle or system at all, but just in trade what free-thinking is in religion, a departure from all principle or system, than which the worst possible embodyment of sincere belief is less fatal or danagerous to the community.

To Sir Robert Peel's tariff, as reducing the protection on manufactured goods, I would object still more than to the removal of protection to British and colonial corn, were it rot that one of the immediate effects flowing from the latter, viz.,—the loss of the British American Colonies—would be irremediable.

I frankly admit, however, that with free trade in manufactures, the retention of a daty on foreign corn ought not to be submitted to by the British artisan.

These measures must go together, or together be stopped.

If they pass into law, we will not only lose the trade of the colonies, but the colonies themselves; and, with them, firstly, our naval supremacy, and, secondly, Ireland.

With regard to the possibility of retaining the colonies, I defy the Colonial Minister, or any one clae, to show me any bond of union between Canada and England, After free trade is introduced.

The fact is, that ignorantly governed as the colony has been by Downing-street, the loyalists will not be able to pay for seventy-five per cent. (eithree-fourths) the amount of goods (they now take, the task of any goods (a thing impossible), will, like either classes of the community, prefer some (less or mos) foreign articles, and thus a falling off in the manufactures, the retention of a daty on foreign corn ought not be submitted to by the British artisan.

All the pass into l

they nust take fewer goods.

4th The manufacturer will not have all these deficiencies it demand from British and hitherto favoured channels hade up to him by a similar or greater amount of increase in the foreign demand. On the contrary, instead of increasing, the foreign demand will gradually fall off; governments abroad will, by their duties, prohibit British goods the more they see that they can in British gold for their products find for a few years that impulse for their domestic manufactures which hitherto they have wanted but which in a few years would not only create in an increased manufacturing population a great enduring home barket for their produce (enduring if they den't take up free trade theories), but enabled them to compete with Eagland in other foreign markets, if not in England itself.

Mr. Hadson, in his speech, states—
Mr. Hadson, in his speech, states—
That the probable average price of corn under the new bill would be from 35s. to 40s. a quarter.

The hon. member's calculation will prove quite correct.

Let us suppose a farm now let thus—

10e acres, at #3 per acre.

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

#300

I asseme that neither tenant nor agricultural labourer will, till absolute necessity compels it, work for less than at present; and that the first brunt of this free trade in

weaver.

I think that foreign competition will lead to the following result in the case of the best lands:—

Leaving the same result to the tapant..... But take the case of land whose yield cannot be in-

The ability of the country trade is reduced, or one-third £233 15 0 But the landlord could not stand by and see his property wholly sacrificed, so that his land will be forced back into grass or woods, as the colonies will be forced out bands by the competition of foreign corn, instead of, as Sir Robert Peel assures us, creating more employment or labour for the surplus population of the country!

ment or labour for the surplus population of the country!
You will thus see clearly my position to be, that (as it is only by their labour that the people can attain provisions) the self-evident proposition is, that no amount of "FOOD IN THE COUNTRY" would be of benefit to the poor if it is not paid for in BRITISH LABOUR.

As anxious only to attain for our oppressed working classes the nearest approach to "a happy independence," I would at once give the people the ray of confidence and contentment which would flow from their being made to feel sure that FOR THE FUTURE THE WHOLE OBJECT OF BRITISH LEGISLATION WILL BE, FIRST TO PROCUES, AND THEN 10 BENDER PERMANDENT, THE LAGGEST SMOUNT OF EMPLOYMENT FOR THOSE WHO LABOUR FOR OF EMPLOYMENT FOR THOSE WHO LABOUR FOR

THEIR BREAD.

This, in reality (apart from Anti-Corn-law slang and humbug) is the GREATEST AMOUNT of BREAD FOR THE

POOR.

In the now imminently artificial state of this country, I would be willing to advance to the extremest point of liberality to the foreigner to induce a reciprocal trade with

him.

I would even arrange to take his wheat on the same duty-free footing as home and colonial wheat, if the foreigner takes payment in the labour of the British artisan.

But for us to adopt a system that not only gives, out professes to give, our hard money to the foreigner to take to the nowth of Europe and America, for the avowed purpose (a most sensible and patriotic one on his part) of bullding up rival manufactures to those of the British mechanic, and then to admit these duty free to compete with our own heavily taked labour, seems to with our own the part of both the ME TO AMOUNT TO SUICIDE ON THE PART OF BOTH THE MANUFACTURING AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THIS COUNTRY.

I view THE FREE TRADE PROPOSED as only removing the restrictions from, and giving freedom to, the industry of foreign countries.

Far from being an encouragement to native industry, FREE TRADE PRACTICALLY DENIES TO BRITISH ARTISAN'S RIGHT TO LABOUR, BY TAKING AWAY HIS OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO.

Small though the exports to the Colonies show in your tables, it is wonderful to me to see the secunts they are, knowing how grievously the progress of the Colonies has been neglected.

Neither the two most practical of purposes—the AME-LIGRATION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF TER BRITISH ARTISAN, AND THE PROCURING PERMANNT MARKETS FOR OUR MANUFACTURES, through phating in our Co-lonies a population with British habits—have come home to governments, which have not usually been many months at a time otherwise engaged than in here struggles for existence.

caistence.

The comparative value of Home and Colonial, as compared with Foreign trade, must not be judged by mere figures.

It should be remembered that as much or more profit accrues, in the Home and Colonial trade, to British subjects on the goods after they leave Mannester as before, and that the Home and Colonial trades take no gold, while to the Americans we pay more gold than goods, and do not materially increase our exports to the United States; although in 1845 we took from them 1,499,600 bales of cotton, against 329,906 bales in 1822, with a similar increase in most of our other imports. From the Colonies you have an increasing demand, as the population increases; but the United States, with a population of twenty millions, do not take double the quantity of goods they did when a colony, with scarcely over two millions of a population.

Tis true that your tables show a large business with the Americans in 1835 and 1836, but your readers will scarcely forget the immense distress through the abrupt stoppage of the mighty machinery set in motion in Manchester and Huddersfield to supply fancy goods for a demand which was so artificial, that the arrival of one packet from New York blew it all to the winds!

The Republican vary in Upper Canada are all free trades, and a brownine neares of gettin, the previous free trades, and a brownine neares of gettin, the previous free trades, and a brownine neares of gettin, the previous free trades when the properties of the trade leading articles of the cotton manufactures:—" Plain Calicoes," and "Printed and Dyed Calicoes," in 1841 and 1845, respectively, to the undernotes colonial markets. I should remark that I include China, elthough not strictly a colonial market, partly from its intinate connexion with our East India trade, and the influence which our East respectively.

that country; be 1841 including th				eturns for
EXPORTS OF	COTTON	GOODS TO	THE COL	ONIES.
	Calicoe	Culicoes, Plain. Calicoes, Printed and Dyed.		
	1841.	1845.	1841.	1845.
British West Indies British N.America Cape of G. Hope . India	7.767,332	11,580,586 3,894,241		3,520,39
Total	134.045.431	3 0 360 506	45.020.222	70.091.55

The total exports of "Calicoes, plain," to all countries, in the two years, Mr. Burn sets down as follows:-

Balance - Exports to other

Thus, in 1841, our colonial trade, is this staple article of the cotton manufacture, was to our trade with the rest of the world as 134 to 232 millions of pards, or a fraction above one-half. In 1845, however, the former was to the latter as 309 to 303 millions, the colonies having thus become greater consumers than the whole of our other markets!

Balance -- Exports to other ....... 232,827,053 , 240,769,139 ... Thus, in 1841, the proportion of the colonial consumption of this most important class of manufactured fabrics, to the consumption of the rest of the world, was as 45 to 232 millions, or short of one-fifth; whilst in 1845, the proportion was as 70 to 240 millions, or apwards of two-sevenths.

I now subjoin the following comparisons, my purpose being to show-

lst, That the trade of our present colonies, through the neglect of the Government and otherwise, is yet only in its infancy, and that it is therefore unfair to judge of it by the PAST.

2d, That while such trades as that to the United States are taking (and must necessarily from the increase of their own manufacturing ability take), every year, fewer and fewer stapic goods, there is, in the face of every drawback, a MIGHTLY INCREASING PEMAND FROM THE COLONIES.

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF EXPORTS TO UNITED	STATES AT	-
" Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1841	11,957,063	wde.
Ditto to British America	7,707,889	,
		**
Balance in favour of United States in 1841	4 100 001	
	4,199,731	
"Calicoes Printed and Dyed" to United States		
in 1841		
in 1841	26,025,281	
Ditto to British America	10,708,416	
		•••
Balance in favour of United States	15.321.066	••
		**
"Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1845	19 419 001	
Ditto to British America	11,400,001	**
	11,000,000	
Balance in favour of United States, only		
minute in Jacour of Chites states, only	832,396	
I Delated and Does College H		
"Printed and Dyed Calicoes" to the United		
States, in 1845	13,097,851	
Ditto to British America	13.369.179	
	,,.	**
Balance in favour of British America	264,322	
In 1845, instead of 15,321,866 against in	204,322	
TO 1040, tantoms of 15,521,800 against I	1841.	
COMPARATIVE VIEW OF EXPORTS TO UNITED	STATES AT	-
BRITISH WEST INDIRG.		-
" Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1841	11,957,053	-4-
Ditto to British West Indies		•
	9,831,280	
Balance in favour of United States		
Datable in Juddar by United States	2,125,778	
If Diein Collegesti to Vinter & State & Co.		
"Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1845	12,412,081	
Ditto to British West Indies	16,987,142	•
Balance in favour of British West Indies in		
1845		
Instead of 2,125,733 yards against in 1	4,874,861	
Calicon Printed and Dundti to Their against in I	541.	
"Callcoes Printed and Dyed" to United States		
in 1841	26,025,261	
Ditto to British West Indies	0.774.790	
		••
Balance in favour of United States in 1841	16 944 461	
,	10,200,001	
Calicoes Printed and Dyed" to United States		
iu 1845		
Ditto to British West Indias	13,097,851	
Ditto to British West Indies	20,739,641	
		-

ployed, on an average of three years, 1,078 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 £3,924,606.

"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 £3,528,807.)"

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 you advance or will you recede?"

And again—

"What should be the motto of a country hhe this?
Should it advance or retrograde?"
Now, Sir Robert Peel knew full wall 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.

vance, even temporarily, any one 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 abcade on arthograph in the Liberality of our legistation 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.

or agriculturists.

All that Sir Robert Peel's former friends charge him with is that HE SHOWS HIMSELF DETERMINED TO GO

with is that HE SHOWS HIMSELY 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 secrecity 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—

their political leader as Hamley did the Ghost of Aie 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 sulphurous and tormenting flames

Mustrender up myself.

Hamlet—Alas! poor ghost!

But the melancholy fact is, that the British Government is now, and has for nearly 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) loolers-on at the fights of the Free Traders 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 sumbers in their moral contests; but the fact is, that the present and the other governments we have had, since the days of Canning, have not had the moral power in England and her dependencies, even of the Norths and the Walpoles of the last ontury.

I am, Sir, your obedient humble servant.

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

(TO THE EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.)

Glasgow, 8th April, 1846.

Sin,—As in your article on Saturday (Foreign and Colonial Trade) you grievously misrepresent the views, against out-and-out free trade, which I have put forth in the Scotch Reformer's Gasette, I hope you will not refuse me the privilege of setting myself right with readers of the Guardian.

Allow me to say, that there is not a man in England whose sympathies are more with the working classes than mine are; indeed, I have always held that the other classes or orders in such a society as ours are only a public benefit to the extent that, directly or indirectly, they are at use and assistance to those who labour for their

My objection to the principle of Sir Robert Peel's le-gislation, is, that he regards the poor only as consumers, and legislates for them only in common with the rich. (How blessed the poor would be to find themselves so

I am of opinion, on the contrary, (as stated in my letter in the Reference' Gazette of 4th April), that, like the Americane, THE WHOLE OBJECT OF OUR LEGISLATION GROULD BE THE BENEFIT OF THOSE WHO LABOUR.

If, then, you and I are both friends of the people, our controversy becomes the friendly and generous one of PROSE PLAN SHALL BENEFIT THEM MOST. Now. I object to what you call the principle of free trade, because I do not call it a principle or system at all, but just in trade what free-thinking is in religion, a departure from all principle or system, than which the worst possible embodyment of sincere belief is less fatal or dangerous to the community.

To Sir Robert Peel's tariff, as reducing the protection on manufactured goods, I would object still more than to the removal of protection to British and colonial corn, were it not that one of the immediate effects flowing from the latter, viz.,—the loss of the British American Colonics—would be irremediable.

I frankly admit, however, that with free trade in manufactures, the retention of a duty on foreign corn ought not to be submitted to by the British artisan.

These measures must go together, or together be

These measures must go together, or together of stopped.

If they pass into law, we will not only lose the trade of the colonies, but the colonies themselves; and, with them, firstly, our naval surremacy, and, secondly, Ireland.

With regard to the possibility of retaining the colonies, I defy the Colonial Minister, or any one else, to show me any bond of union between Canada and England, after free tradus is introduced.

The fact is, that ignorantly governed as that colony has been, by Downing, street, the loyalists will not be able to stand their ground against the republicans in Canada West, if the former are armed with no fact, in favour of the British Government; and if the monstrous principle is avowed, that England wants territory in America, not to benefit, but only to rale, or misrale it!

is avowed, that England wants territory in America, not to benefit, but only to rule, or misrule it!

The Republican party in Upper Canada are all free traders, and a favourite means of getting the province free from England (by making it of no use to the mother country) used to be the pashing for free trade with the United States.

In 1836, the Lower House of the Canadian Parliament (which had then a majority of Republicans) petitioned the King on this subject, and the following remarks of my own, in the colony at the time, I happen to have preserved:—

arved:—
"Though addressed to the King, the province is evidently its intended sphere of usefulness. The pretition carries to the foot of the Throne suggestions, which if acquiseced in, would leave Canada of no use to England. In fact, the repeal of our frontier duties would at once endanger the connection with England, seeing that we could expect nothing less than the repeal as a consequence of those love of the United Kingdom which give our produce advantages in the home market, in roturn for our employing the British artisan and ship-owner. The Republicans (the present petitioners) will then triumphently say to us, where, now, are all your old arguments, to show the value to our farmer of the connection?"

In the following year (1837) the State of New York

"connection?"

In the following year (1837) the State of New York stepped specie payments, by act of the legislature, and we had thus brought before us more clearly than ever that even as a protection for our circulation duties on the frontier were required, and that if free trade had existed the only safety for the stocks of our merchants and the labour of our farmers and mechanics (in Canada they feel as brothern), would have been to depreciate our currency cles, and retain our gold, till our neighbours returned to a specie standard.

a specie standard.

I go into these particulars to show that free trade between Canada and the United States (the necessary concequence of the introduction of free trade into England), as EQUIVALENT TO THE MEPARATION OF THE COLONY FROM ENGLAND. The Americans will not in turn free trade with us; and having all the disadvantages of the trade with the United States, the natural desire of the Canadians to have the advantages of it too, will precipitate the americation sooner than the general difference between the views and habits of the Canadian and the American

the same and habits of the Canadian and the American would lead parties at a distance to expect it.

The loss of British America thus effected, the empire, instead of seen being able (through applying enlightened and active management in these colonies) to raise up a colonial trade intrinsically as valuable as all our foreign trade, will have the present colonial trade reduced to the average of the United States, or about one-fourth the amount per head that colonists take of British goods. This is the consummation so devously desired by the Americans. They will tell you otherwise; but never let us forget the sympathiesrs of 1837 and 1838, nor allow ourselves to be guilted into the belief that the hearts' wish of every Republican is not to see the United States possessed of Quebec, and monarchy driven from America, and not one Warenneron's favourite project carried out of semering to their Republic the Gibraltar of our West Indian colonies, the Bermuias, to make them a nest of hornests for the annoyance of English commerce in times of trouble.

of trouble.
You also accuse me of ALLEGING THAT THE BRITISH

You also accuse me of ALLEGING THAT THE BRITISH ARTISAN IS DEPENDANT ON COLONIAL TRADE FOR THE EMPLOYMENT WHICH HE EXCEIVES.

Now, I allegs no such absurdity, although I think that, had we for the last twenty years followed a sound and extensive system of removing to the colonies of our surplus population, this country might now have been very independent of foreign trade. WHAT I ALLEGE IS, THAT THE ONLY PERMANENT DEPENDENCE OF THE BRITISH AGRICULTURE, OF WRICH COLONIAL INDUSTRY IS A BRANCH. I allege, moreover, and that truthfully, that the Colonial, like the House trade, has the only limit to its purchases of manufactures in the extent of its entire means, while Brother Jonathan, and all other foreigners, will not take English goods for one-half the smooms even of that part of their means which they draw from England. The following extract of my letter of 14th March, in the Scotch Reformers' Gazette, will show exactly the views I expressed:

The following extract of my letter of 14th March, in the Secteh Reformers' Gazette, will show exactly the views I expressed:—

In a former number it was shown that free trade must necessarily, in its very nature, lose us the colonies, because the principle of protection abandoued, 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 cossed 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 argus for the retention of the colonies only, because it is the interest of England.

I bold that it were better for England to lose her colonies, magnificent though those be, than to forbear doing anything which is shown to be clearly in favour of the oppressed population in this country.

Though I before poisted out that the adoption of free trade would necessarily less the colonies (wnose markets there is no reason for us going to the expense of defending, unless our manufactures are protected there). I do not present to argue 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 manufacturers, and thus to accure for the aristocracy by-and-bye a mono-

poly of political power in England, as rendering it in character more an agricultural country than at present!

In fact I view that free trade is suicide on the part of Mr. Cobden and the weavers. I cannot suppose any way by which Sir Robert Peel has secured the support of those independent members of the aristocracy, who are favourable to his measure, in the face of the scorn of their friends, and the inward contempt of their former political adversaries, and by their seeing it to be the ultimate interest of their class.

Sir Robert Peel may have shown them that, as they in-

Sir Robert Peel may have shown them that, as they individually are now able to submit to a loss, they should do so, as this would be the only means of rolling back the tide of popular feeling in politice, and securing the reduction of every interest in the country into the narrow limit that formerly enabled them to control the government of the country.

Sir Robert Peel's messure, in fact, as he well knows, while it puts all interest down, puts down the manufacturing interest more than any other, and will eventually make it a secondary interest in England.

Sir Robert Peel's measure may deprive the landlords of luxuries, or even comforts, which an artificial state of society has named necessaries, but the weaver will be deprived of actual employment (as a weaver): thus,

lst. The landlords who are not driven to become absences will not be able to pay for seventy-five per cent. (or three-fourths) the amount of goods they now take, and a large part of that diminished quantity will be foreign manufactures.

and a large part of that diminished quantity will be foreign manufactures.

2d. The tenants and agricultural labourers, even if they take as many goods (a thing impossible), will, like the other classes of the community, prefer some (less or more) foreign articles, and thus a falling off in the manufacture of the British article will accrue; but as the British agriculturists and weavers will both have to compete with foreigners of less expensive habits or modes of life, who are, in fact, content with coarser food than the Esglish get in workhouses, and do not require the same amount of fuel or clothing—their views in these respects must, no doubt, come down to prevent them starving amid so cruel a competition (foreigners having the use of British markets, but not the British in foreign markets).

3d. The colonies will, in the same way, take fewer Bri-

3d. The colonies will, in the same way, take fewer British goods, under free trade between each colony and all the world even if their means of buying were not reduced. It is self-evident, however, that, to the extent that their wheat, or their sugar, or their timber produces less money, they must take fewer goods.

they must take fewer goods.

4th. The manufacturer will not have all these deficiencies in demand from British and hitherto favoured channels made up to him by a similar or greater amount of increase in the foreign demand. On the contrary, instead of increasing, the foreign demand will gradually fall off; governments abroad will, by their duties, prohibit British goods the more they see that they can in British gold for their products find for a few years that impulse to their domestic manufactures which hitherto they have wanted, but which in a few years would not only create in an increased manufacturing population a great enduring home market for their produce (enduring if they don't take up free trade theories), but enabled them to compete with England in other foreign markets, if not in England itself.

itself.

So that the isdependent 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, or rather weavers, the final result will assuredly be, that the landowners will be the permanently predominant and popular or powerful interest, the weavers having been one-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.

Without imputing improper, or rather dishonourable

Without imputing improper, or rather dishonourable motives to Sir R. Peel, we assert, beyond the fear of contradiction, that at present he is the means of mislead-ing the public mind. Toward the end of his great speech on the evening of the 16th ult., he says:—

on the evening of the 16th alt., he says:—

And suppose the transt said, "But this is a labourer's question?" I should answer, "Then, my good fellow, if we make this land, which now produces three quarters, produce five quarters, we shall employ more labourers. There will be a greater demand for labour, and all parties will be benefited. The estate will be benefited; the quarantee for the rent will be improved; your comfort will be increased; there will be more labour employed; and all this by the application of a little of that saving which the hon geutleman says the rich are to derive from the tariff I introduced." (Loud cheers.)

from the tariff I introduced." (Loud cheers.)

Those business men who cheered Sir Robert Peel knew fall well, if he did not, that his remark, if true of any land, is only true of the very best land; and that showing that some lands would grow two-thirds more wheat, is just showing that the price of wheat would be so reduced with free trade as to make it necessary to throw the poorer lands (such as would yield no more than the present crops) into woods or grass, as being worth no rent at all for purposes of cultivation.

If the poorer lands are thrown out of cultivation, it will be impossible to make up the loss out of an increase of even two-thirds on the better lands, and there will be nothing like the means in the country to buy manufactures.

Mr. Hudson, is his speech, states—

That the probable average price of corn under the new bill would be from 35s. to 40s. a quarter.

The hon, member's calculation will prove quite correct.

Let us suppose a farm now let thus— 100 acres, at £3 per acre. £300 Produces 300 quarters at a clear profit of 26s. 8d, equal to. £500

I assume that neither tenant nor agricultural labourer will, till absolute necessity compels it, work for less than at present; and that the first brunt of this free trade in corn will come on the two extremes, the laudiord and

weaver.

I think that foreign competition will lead to the following result in the case of the best lands:—

Leaving the same result to the tenant......£100 But take the case of land whose yield cannot be in-

The ability of the country trade is reduced, or one-third£233 15 0

The ability of the country trade is reduced, or one-third£233 15 0

But the landlord could not stand by and see his property wholly sacrificed, so that his land will be forced back into grass or woods, as the colonies will be forced out of our hands by the competition of foreign corn, instead of, as Sir Robert Peel assures us, creating more employment or labour for the surplus population of the country!

You will thus see clearly my position to be, that (as it is only by their labour that the people can attain provisions) the self-addent proposition is, that no amount of "FOOD IN THE COUNTRY" would be of benefit to the poor if it is not paid for in BRITISH LABOUR.

As anxious only to attain for our oppressed working classes the nearest approach to "a happy independence," I would at cace give the people the ray of confidence and contentment which would flow from their being made to feel sure that FORTHE FUTURE THE WHOLK OBJECT OF BRITISH LEGISLATION WILL BE, FIRST TO PROCURE, AND THEN 10 REMBER PERMANENT, THE LARGEST amount of Employment FOR THOSE WHO LABOUR FOR wat of employment for those who labour for

THEIR BREAD.

This, in reality (spart from Anti-Corn-law slang and humbug) is the gabatest amount of Bread for the

Poor.

In the now imminently artificial state of this country,
I would be willing to advance to the extremest point of
liberality to the foreigner to induce a reciprocal trade with

I would even arrange to take his wheat on the same duty-free footing as home and colonial wheat, if the foreigner takes payment in the labour of the British artisan.

I would do this as a duty to the working classes, even if the tearing up of every treaty and parchment in existence was involved.

But for us to adopt a system that not only gives, but professes to give, our hard money to the foreigner to take to the north of Europe and America. For the avowed purpose (a most sensible and Patriotic one on his part) of building up rival manufactures to those of the British mechanic, AND THEN TO ADMIT THESE DUTY PREE TO COMPETE WITH OUR OWN HEAVILY TAXED LABOUR, SEEMS TO MR TO AMOUNT TO SUICIDE ON THE PART OF BOTH THE MANUFACTURING AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF

I view THE PREE TRADE PROPOSED as only removing the restrictions from, and giving freedom to, the industry of foreign countries.

Far from being an encouragement to native industry, FREE TRADE PRACTICALLY DENIES THE BRITISH ARYI-SAN'S RIGHT TO LABOUR, BY TAKING AWAY HIS OPPOR-TUNITY TO DO SO.

Small though the exports to the Colonies show in your tables, it is wonderful to me to see the amounts they are, knowing how grievously the progress of the Colonies has been neglected.

Neither the two most practical of purposes—the AME-LIGRATION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BRITISH
ARTISAN, AND THE PROCURING PERMANENT MARKETS
FOR OUR MANUFACTURES, through planting in our Colonies a population with British habits—have come home
to governments, which have not usually been many months
at a time otherwise engaged than in mere struggles for
existence.

existence.

The comparative value of Home and Colonial, as compared with Foreign trade, must not be judged by mere figures.

It should be remembered that as much or more profit accrues, in the Home and Colonial trade, to British subjects on the goods after they leave Manchester as before, and that the Home and Colonial trades take no gold, while to the Americans we pay more gold than goods, and do not materially increase our exports to the United States; although in 1845 we took from them 1,499,600 bales of cotton, against 329,906 bales in 1822, with a similar increase in most of our other imports. From the Colonies you have an increasing demand, as the population increases; but the United States, with a population of twenty millions, do not take double the quantity of goods they did when a colony, with scarcely over two millions of a population.

'Tis true that your tables show a large business with the Americans in 1835 and 1836, but your readers will scarcely forget the immense distress through the abrupt stoppage of the mighty machinery set in motion in Manchester and Huddersfield to supply fancy goods for a demand which was so artificial, that the arrival of one packet from New York blew it all to the winds!

Free trade in England in corn will not be the immense practical advantage to the Western States that many suppose; but no commercial advantage whatever will induce the Americans to adopt so suicidal a course as to hesitate in their present excellent policy of becoming independent of foreigners in staple manufactures, so that we should be glad if the present amount of our exports to the United States is kept up, without expecting any increase.

Any man who has been among the immensely extended factories of New England, as I have been, must hold this

For different is the staple, greatly increasing, and permanent Colonial demand, of which I shall now give some

manent Colonial demand, of which I shall now give some particulars.

And that I may not be accused of selecting unfair data with respect to the Cotton trade, I may remark, that of the total weight of yarn in manufactured cotton goods exported in 1845, viz. 202,330,687 lbs., the two leading staples—"plain calicoes," and "calicoes printed and dyed"—referred to below, made up (according to the estimate of Mr. Burn, in his Commercial Glance for the past year, whose general correctness will not be doubted) is 194,080,490 lbs., leaving only 8,230,195 lbs., to be otherwise accounted for, as entering into the production of the finer and miscellaneous fabrics, of which, however, the colonies take a fair and yearly-increasing share. The total value of manufactured cotton goods exported in 1845, not including cotton yarn and thread, is estimated by the same authority at £15,282,447. Of this amount, the value of the undermentioned staples makes up £13,576,279. The fallacy of quoting, in such an inquiry as this, merely gross quantities, irrespective of the sort of goods exported, is exemplified by the fact that, of the other great branch of our cotton exports for 1845—the trade in yarns—amounting in the state of the tother great branch of our cotton exports for 1845—the trade in yarns—amounting in the state of the continent, whose almost worthless commerce with us, we are thus, by our measures, preferring to the valuable trade of finished goods, of which labour is the great component part provided by our own colonies and the home trade. By a reference then to Burn's Commercial Glance, for the past year, I find the following to have been the exports of the two then to Burn's Commercial Glance, for the past year, I find the following to have been the exports of the two leading articles of the cotton manufactures:—"Plain Calicoes," and "Printed and Dyed Calicoes," in 1841 and 1845, respectively, to the undernoted colonial markets. I should remark that I include China, although not strictly a colonial market, partly from it in intimate connexion with a colonial market, partly from its intimate connexion with our East India trade, and the influence which our East possessions efford us in maintaining our relations with that country; but chiefly from the fact of the returns for 1841 including the exports to both markets.

EXPORTS OF COTTON GOODS TO THE COLONIES. Calicoes, Plain. 1841. 1841. | 1845. | Yards. | Yards. | Yards. | Yards. | 9,831,280 | 16,937,142 | 9,774.590 | 26,790,641 | 11,580,586 | 10,763,415 | 13,862,173 | 10,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239 | 1,942,239

Total. . . . . 134,045,431 3 9,250,506 45.920,222 70,081,558 The total exports of "Calicoes, plain," to all countries, in the two years, Mr. Burn sets down as follows:—

Balance - Exports to other

Thus, in 1841, our colonial trade, in this staple article of the cotton manufacture, was to our trade with the rest of the world as 134 to 232 millions of yards, or a fraction above one-half. In 1845, however, the former was to the latter as 399 to 303 millions, the colonies having thus become greater consumers than the whole of our other markets!

In the article of dyed and printed calicoes, the propor-

Total " Dyed and Printed Ca. 1841. 1845. licoes" to all Countries ... 278.748.275 yds. 310,830.697 yds. Ditto to Colonies ... 45.920,222 , 70,081,355 ,,

Balance - Exports to other 

I now subjoin the following comparisons, my purpose

lat, That the trade of our present colonies, through the neglect of the Government and otherwise, is yet only in its infancy, and that it is therefore unfair to judge of it by the PAST.

2d, That while such trades as that to the United States are taking (and must necessarily from the increase of their own manufacturing ability take), every year, fewer and fewer staple goods, there is, in the face of every drawback, a MIGHTLY INCREASING DEMAND FROM THE

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF EXPORTS TO UNITED	STATES AN	D
BRITISH AMERICA.		_
Plain Calleges" to United States in 1841	11,957,053	ds.
tto to British America	7,757,332	
	71,77,000	••
Balance in favour of United States in 1841	4,199,721	,,
Calicoes Printed and Dyed" to United States		
in 1841	26,025,281	
itto to British America	10,703,415	**
two to binness asserted	10,700,410	••
Balance in favour of United States	15,321,866	
	10,000,000	••
Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1845	12,412,981	,,
itto to British America	11,580,586	
		••
Balance in favour of United States, only	832,395	
Printed and Dved Calicoes" to the United		
States, in 1845	13,097,851	
itto to British America	13,362,173	,,
		••
Balance in favour of British America	264,322	
In 1845, instead of 15,321,866 against in	1841.	••
COMPARATIVE VIEW OF EXPORTS TO UNITED		
BRITISH WEST INDIKS.	SIATES A	
Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1841	11,957,053	-4-
itto to British West Indies	9,831,280	•
nto to binish west mater	9,001,200	*
Balance in favour of United States	2,125,773	
Durance in Justice by Committee Courter Committee	-,,,,	"
Plain Calicoes" to United States in 1845	12,412,981	
itto to British West Indies	16,987,142	:
nto to pricial west mates	10,90/,140	**
Balance in favour of British West Indies in		
1845	4,874,861	
Instead of 2,125,733 yards against in	4,0/1,001	**
Calicoes Printed and Dyed" to United States	••1.	
in 1841	26,025,281	
itto to British West Indies		
THE TO BITCHER WEST INCHES	9.774,790	**
Balance in favour of Faited States in 1841	14 010 161	
Balance in favour of United States in 1841	16,250,561	
Calicoes Printed and Dyed" to United States		
in 1845	13,697,851	
itto to British West Indies	20,729,641	**
Balance in favour of British West Indies in	7 691 700	

Balance in favour of British West Indies in
1845... 7,631,799 ,,
1845... 1845... 7,631,799 ,,
1845... 1845... 1845... 1845... 1841!

And it may not be inapropose that I here quote the following from my letter in the Scotch Reformer' Gasette
of 14th March, as proving the inestimable value of colonial trade as well as THE MIGHTY PLUCTUATION WHICH
IS THE INSEPARABLE CHARACTER OF TRADE WITH ALL
COUNTRIES WHICH ARE BEYOND THE PALE OF OUR OWN
CURRENCY AND TRADE LAWS AND REGULATIONS:—

'I desire shortly to recur to the subject of colonial trade

"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 statement of the exports and imports of Great Britain in 1843, not having the later returns at hand. "In the trade between Britain and her colonies in the western world, about 60,000 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.

cannot be less than \$2,500,000 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 Chins, 10,000 scamen are employed, and at a similar rate their wages, provisions, &c., will amount of £500,000; and the replacement of capital and insurance £800,000; in all, £1,300,060. 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, tounage, 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, to which we have alluded, we find that the whole weight of cotteen years and cotton goods exported from Great Britain annually is 120,000 tons, and the value £2,852,441) 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 agriculturist nor colonist has ever shown any disposition to undervalue that I am aware of.

"I cannot better finish off this statement than by recenting that, while the trade of British America and the Vest Indies, stated in 1843 to be only £14,000,000, employe 2,900 ships of 270,000 tons, and 60,000 seamen, our trade with the United States, estimated at £22,00

"The trade of America schen our colony in 1769 employed, on an average of three years, 1,078 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 £3,924,605.
"The population of the United States is now pearly

being £3,924,606.

"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 £3,528,807.)"

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 you advance or will you recede?"

And again—

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.

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 RECEDE OR RETROGRADE IN THE LIBERALITY OF OUR LEGIS-LATION 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

blow to the industry of our own people, whether artisans or agriculturists.

All that Sir Robert Peel's former friends charge Lim 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—

their political leader as Hamler did the Ghost of his father—

Hamlet—Whither wit 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 sulphurous and tormenting flames

Must render up myself.

Hamlet—Aias: poor ghost!

But the melancholy fact is, that the British Government is now, and has for nearly 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 Freethinkers against the Protectionists, and the winning party for the time being.

Such men as Chatham. Pitt. Fox, Earl Grey, Canning, Wilberforce, and Anti-Corn-Law Villiers, disdained to counf sumbers in their moral contests; but the fact is, that the present and the other governments we have had, since the days of Canning, have not had the moral power in England and her dependencies, even of the Norths and the Walpoles of the last century.

I am, Sir, your obedient humble servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.